

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of April 3, 1996 (approved) (revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the Minutes of February 28, 1996](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Promotion and Tenure Policies](#)
5. [Revised Report of the Grading Committee](#)
6. [Revised Report of the University Governance Committee](#)
7. [Report of the Graduate School Executive Committee](#)
8. [Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 9, 1996](#)
9. [Sesquicentennial Update](#)
10. [Old Business](#)
11. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of February 28, 1996

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of February 28, 1996. Professor Malone requested that "motto" be changed to "prologue" on page 8, paragraph 9. The minutes were approved as amended.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch stated that:

- He appreciated the contribution to the American Heart Association by FSEC members in memory of his father.
- He had replied to an invitation, together with President Greiner, for possible participation of the University in a joint Roundtable with the National Science Board to assess the status of research in higher education.
- The meeting of the FSEC on April 10, 1996 would be an Executive Session with the Provost with the possible discussion of Professor Johnstone's paper on faculty productivity.
- He had written to Associate Vice President Martens requesting a written statement on the University's policy on privacy of electronic communication.
- It was necessary to consider names for membership for the reconstituted Committee on Teaching and Learning and a list would be circulated during the meeting.
- The University-wide Faculty Senate would be meeting on April 19th and 20th and FSEC members should communicate concerns to the Senators for discussion at the meeting.
- Information available from Professor Gold and Institutional Analysis showed that undergraduate students in good standing leave UB for a variety of reasons including academic (42%), finances (11%) and the "fit" between UB and the student (33%). He reported that of the 74% of transfer students expecting advanced degrees, 36% remain at UB. The General Education progress of students entering the University in fall 1992 revealed that 75% to 99% of requirements have been completed. However, only 54% of students expecting to graduate in spring 1996 have completed all requirements with American Pluralism having been completed by only 75% of the students.

Professor Nickerson introduced a draft resolution from the Senate Committee on Information and Library Resources regarding funding for acquisitions and adequacy of holdings. Professor Malone agreed that the issue was important and in need of resolution but he questioned the source of funding. Professor Welch stated that adequacy was in the eye of the beholder regarding the collections

of the libraries. It was noted that funding of digitalization of the library might result in a 5% cut in the acquisitions budget. Professor Nickerson stated that the intention of the resolution was to raise awareness of the situation. Professor Wetherhold suggested that the cuts should be stopped.

Professor Nickerson stated that the draft resolution was trying to address questions of better coordination. Professor Jameson requested elaboration regarding the issue of coordination. Professor Nickerson explained that the issue was how information technology or computing interfaced with the libraries.

Professor Albini stated that it was critical to comment on the libraries. Professor Welch stated that consultation with the Faculty Senate was an important part of the resolution. He stated that timeliness was crucial since there were only two meetings remaining in the semester. Professor Boot stated that the administration should be alerted to the faculty concerns related to the library. Professor Wooldridge voiced agreement with Professor Boot and Professor Wetherhold suggested moving forward with the resolution. Professor Acara stated that the resolution brings attention to the fact that there is a crisis.

Professor Welch stated that at the Faculty Senate meeting of April 9, 1996, members of the Library Committee could be present. He noted that it was not the work of the FSEC to rewrite the draft resolution. He remarked that it was the responsibility of the FSEC to raise questions and be alert to questions that might be raised on the Senate floor.

Professor Nickerson moved that the draft resolution on the libraries be included on the agenda of the April 9, 1996 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was passed with one abstention.

[ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost](#)

President Greiner provided an update on the situation involving "Students for Life" and the desired display of crosses on campus. He stated that he questioned whether the agenda of the "Students for Life" was for a campus or a public relations event. He reiterated that the administration had been very forthright with the "Students for Life" members who had pulled out of meetings and were very "press

wise". He commented that there were "untruths" being publicized and that it was inappropriate for alumni to apply pressure. He stated that Vice President Palmer had handled the situation "fairly".

Professor Malone questioned whether a legal action had been filed. President Greiner stated that once there was a lawsuit, "it was not our problem anymore". He stated that the original request from the "Students for Life" had been reasonable and the cost of the bond was far less than claimed. He stated that it was not clear whether the "Students for Life" had requested funding from the Student Association for the bond.

Vice President Palmer stated that the local media were beginning to see through the "Students for Life". He stated that the situation was not a major issue for the majority of students.

President Greiner stated that it was a poignant issue but that events outside the normal were harder to do since the University was so budget driven. He stated that in the current economic climate, students had to budget and pay to use facilities for events. He stated that despite the fact that the "Students for Life" had been treated fairly, the media had been contacted immediately.

Professor Wetherhold asked whether it was the choice of "Students for Life" regarding the size of the event. Vice President Palmer replied that "Students for Life" could have selected less expensive coverage by limiting the time and the size of the display. He stated that it had always been "all or nothing".

[ITEM 4: Promotion and Tenure Policies](#)

Professor Nyberg, Chair of the Presidential Review Board on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (PRB), and Professor Acara, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure and Privileges were identified by Professor Welch. Professor Welch commented that the Charter of the Faculty Senate provided the Senate a degree of responsibility for the criteria for tenure and promotion.

Professor Nyberg stated that the PRB tries to be open minded regarding the quality of contributions to the University as a whole. He stated that scholarship in three forms was used: 1) original research

leading to discovery of new knowledge, 2) integration and synthesis of existing knowledge resulting in fresh perspectives, and 3) application of research to consequential problems or research working in a practical context. He stated that the second and third forms of scholarship contributed to the quality of the University as a whole but did not fit under original research. He stated that Provost Headrick agreed with an open minded search for contributions to the University but that problems existed with recognition of forms of scholarship.

It was noted by Professor Nyberg that a thorough, detailed description was needed to explain the nature of scholarship. Acquiring evidence regarding the impact of ones work from evaluations of outside readers was suggested. He remarked that this type of information was most relevant in promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

Professor Henderson inquired if using a broader view would influence the length of time within a particular rank. Professor Nyberg concurred and added that the goal was to encourage and reward further contributions.

Professor Malone stated that tenured associate professors made valuable contributions and he asked how the PRB viewed patents. Professor Nyberg replied that the PRB was sympathetic that patentable achievements were worthy of credit towards promotion. He noted that quality was more important than the form of achievement.

Professor Acara stated that the Medical School was having trouble implementing the changes in guidelines. She stated that it was difficult to overcome a particular "mind set". She remarked that a change in culture was needed. Professor Nyberg stated that research scholarship or clinical scholarship should be identified in the dossier. He noted the existence of two categories of research with two sets of criteria.

Professor Welch expressed the importance of examining all categories of research. Professor Boot voiced total support for a variety of ways to achieve promotion. He stated, however, that tenure or promotion should not be denied in the absence of public service for a candidate with excellent research and teaching credentials. He stated that it was difficult to judge the quality of public service.

Professor Nyberg distinguished community service from professional service. He stated that professional service utilized professional expertise to improve society. He drew a comparison between teaching and application of research. Examples of professional service included serving on task forces, clinical work, staff development, editing of journals and holding offices in professional organizations. Professor Boot inquired into the methods involved in judgment of these examples; Professor Nyberg listed letters of support and verification of the quality of the edited journals.

Professor Welch commented on individuals from industrial grounds transitioning to tenured positions. Professor Wetherhold stated that excellent administrative positions were available in engineering but that it was unlikely that an individual would leave an industrial position without a tenured appointment. Provost Headrick stated that hiring from industry usually involved tenure.

Professor Stevenson commented on the area of teaching quality and inquired into the status of evaluation of teaching. He voiced concerns with the process, especially with the abolishment of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness. Professor Nyberg agreed that there was no effective instrument for evaluation of teaching. He mentioned indirect evidence including the employment of advisees, the number of advisees and uniformly below average evaluations. Professor Stevenson suggested looking for multiple indicators.

Professor Nyberg commented that mentoring in the Medical School had provided enlightenment for different models.

Asking a procedural question, Professor Malone asked if PRB members were involved in cases in which they had participated with the candidate in an activity such as a joint paper. Professor Welch commented stating that it was the expectation that a member of the PRB would share personal knowledge. Professor Malone stated that he was thinking of possible negative factors. Professor Nyberg stated that the PRB did an excellent review of the evaluative information and that a single individual could not subvert a case.

Professor Welch stated that Professor Acara would summarize the issue through the Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure and Privileges in an interim report. He stated that the charge to the committee had been to review the criteria for promotion to full professor. He stated that a review of guidelines of

units had been attempted with the following Faculties or Schools not yet represented: Architecture, Arts and Letters, Natural Science and Mathematics, Social Sciences and Social Work. Professor Acara stated that Provost Headrick had also been consulted.

Professor Acara commented that the Faculty-Staff Handbook included a broad interpretation of the criteria for promotion and tenure and suggested a balance. Regarding promotion, it was noted that research and scholarship carried the most weight. Professor Acara stated that in the Dental School and the Medical School, clinical teaching and research were factors in need of consideration. Guidelines gathered from other universities had included solid criteria. Descriptions had included a level of excellence in one area and a level of satisfactory in other areas.

Recommendations from Professor Acara's Committee on Faculty Tenure and Privileges included a greater emphasis on the criteria of teaching and service. A rationale was provided that an individual could be halted in research through lack of funding or the popularity of other ideas; talents could be directed to teaching and service as an alternative means of productivity. Professor Acara emphasized that these essential roles should be given sufficient consideration. She noted that recognition of teaching and service might "re-energize an individual". Discussion regarding specific itemization of parameters for the standard, and consultation with relevant University committees on teaching and service, were recommended. Suggestions for changes in timing for promotion were offered and it was noted that the sole emphasis on research might not be entirely beneficial in career development. A possible time frame for promotion to Full Professor was seven years post promotion to the Associate level. Involvement of the PRB Chair and the Vice Provost for Faculty Development was noted in the areas of overseeing the timing and uniformity in guidance. It was mentioned that there had been varied views amongst the committee members.

Vice Provost Fischer stated that a specific set of credible, peer reviewed documentation standards was needed for the evaluation of teaching and service.

Professor Welch noted the proposed guidelines were not such a departure from the standard criteria when teaching and public service were viewed as scholarly and creative activities similar to research. He noted that inclusion of teaching and public service was really truer to the full implications of the criteria. He voiced surprise that four major units did not have published criteria.

Professor Henderson stated that the Personnel Committees of individual Schools played critical roles in implementation of the changes. He questioned how to change the culture of groups that did not agree with the proposed standards. Professor Acara stated that implementation was a leadership directed activity.

Provost Headrick stated that the standards had been re-written in the early 1980s and had become established over a period of time. He voiced sympathy with the view of the committee that the problems were complicated.

Professor Henderson suggested that a key point was solicitation of references supporting inclusion of teaching and public service in the criteria. Provost Headrick stated that it was important to engage outside reviewers in the initial stages of the process. Professor Miller stated that the Distinguished Service and Teaching Professorships and the Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching were parameters to consider in the process. He noted that transdisciplinary cases should be identified early in the process. He commented that the process might not be popular.

Professor Benenson introduced a different perspective, stating that in order for the University to achieve strong international recognition as a first rate University, research had to be the emphasis. He stated that to do otherwise would result in the University being "on a slippery slope to academic mediocrity". He recommended increasing the traditional standards for promotion. Provost Headrick stated that he did not disagree and that 85% to 95% of the promotion cases were "traditional" in nature. He stated that there should be significant time elapsed subsequent to promotion to the Associate level prior to utilization of the alternative process. He stated that research must be considered the key ingredient in decisions.

Professor Acara acknowledged the support for the proposal for the consideration of teaching and public service within the tenure process. Professor Welch commented that the report might be presented to the full Faculty Senate during fall 1996.

[ITEM 5: Revised Report of the Grading Committee](#)

Professor Schroeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate Grading Committee, stated that the committee had established a consensus document. He noted that the new proposal introduced a distinction between "academic good standing" and "satisfactory and timely progress toward a degree". He stated that there was no further requirement for 75% completion of coursework in the immediate past semester and that the requirement of a QPA of 2.0 or above in the immediate past semester was now moved to the second category of "satisfactory and timely progress toward a degree".

Professor Wetherhold stated that the language did a good job in resolving the previous proposals for a warning after one semester and probation for the second instance of not meeting the requirements.

Professor Malone noted that the language had been dropped that required students to remain full-time after dropping a course.

Professor Adams commended the committee members for addressing the majority of the concerns.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that the problem of many juniors and seniors not being accepted to majors had been reduced through hard work, implementation of changes and application of pressure. He stated that he was not happy that not being in a major did not come under "academic good standing". Professor Schroeder stated that the only change was that there were two semesters to be accepted into a major. Vice Provost Goodman stated that in health-related areas, the programs were impacted and students had to choose an alternative major under the previous "academic good standing" policy.

Professor Churchill stated that the public relations problems would diminish without lowering the standards. Professor Malone asked if the consensus document was consistent with "satisfactory progress" rules in the undergraduate catalogue. Vice Provost Goodman replied negatively, stating that there were three sets of rules in the catalogue: those of the University, TAP and the federal rules for Pell Grants.

Professor Nickerson asked why two semesters were allowed for lack of a major. Vice Provost Goodman suggested moving the consequence of probation to mid-junior year. He noted that upon acceptance

into a major, probation ceased. Professor Adams stated that with only one semester, a student did not have time to make an attempt to be accepted into a major.

Professor Jameson moved and Professor Churchill seconded the motion to forward the consensus document to the full Senate with FSEC endorsement; the motion passed.

[ITEM 6: Revised Report of the Governance Committee](#)

Professor Benenson expressed thanks to Professors Albini, Doyno, Hopkins and Kramer for preparing the resolutions. He stated that the Governance Committee had always intended its ideas to be considered as resolutions for Senate action.

Professor Benenson presented each of the fifteen resolutions.

Professor Welch commended the Governance Committee for its work and stated that he preferred to forward the resolutions to the full Senate.

For purposes of clarification, Provost Headrick stated that the Vice Provost of the Graduate School and the Dean of the Graduate School were the same person. The FSEC agreed to forward the resolutions to the full Senate for consideration.

[ITEM 7: Report of the Graduate School Executive Committee](#)

Professor Nickerson reported that the Graduate School was "alive and well" and that the Dean was "on top of things". He noted that the Graduate School required better information centrally since the quality of information available to the Graduate School was currently incomplete.

[ITEM 8: Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 9, 1996](#)

The Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 9, 1996 was approved.

[ITEM 9: Sesquicentennial Update](#)

Associate Vice President Petro stated that informational items and products such as calendars and pins were being prepared for the event. She noted that an attempt was being made to participate on "Good Morning America". Events reported included a birthday wreath on the tomb of Millard Fillmore, a medical history conference, the University convocation on October 4, 1996 and various departmental activities.

Professor Ferry questioned the presence of an historical society exhibit and Associate Vice President Petro replied affirmatively, stating that the exhibit was largely concerned with the Medical School.

[ITEM 10: Old Business](#)

There was no discussion of old business at the meeting.

[ITEM 11: New Business](#)

Professor Jameson presented the draft resolution on e-mail privacy:

The Faculty Senate calls on the University's senior administrators to formulate and publicize University policy about the privacy of e-mail content.

The motion to forward the consensus document to the full Senate with FSEC endorsement was made and the motion passed.

Professor Churchill stated that there was a complaint from the Math Department about financial disclosure.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: T. Headrick, W. Fischer, N. Goodman

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: G. S. Danford

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin. M. Hyde

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidinger

Management: R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albini, H. Schuel

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy; N.

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, D. Henderson

SUNY Senators: J. Boot, M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson

University Libraries: J. Adams

GUESTS:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall