



University at Buffalo
The State University of New York

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
November 19, 2014

CHAIR:

Ezra B. W. Zubrow

SECRETARY:

Cynthia Tysick

ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING:

Ernest Sternberg

ARTS & SCIENCES:

Alex Anas (absent)

Michael Cowen

Stephen Dyson (excused)

Peter Morgan

Paul Zarembka

DENTAL MEDICINE:

Michael Hatton

ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCES:

Adly Fam (excused)

Joseph Mollendorf

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION:

Lynne Yang (excused)

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH & HEALTH PROFESSIONS:

Jim Lenker

LAW:

Martha McCluskey

MANAGEMENT:

Larry Sanders

MEDICINE & BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES:

Michael Chaskes

Peter Elkin (absent)
Jung Hoon (absent)
Gabriela Popescu

NURSING:

Grace Dean

PHARMACY:

Fred Doloresco (excused)

SOCIAL WORK:

Robert Keefe

SUNY SENATORS:

Henry Durand
Adly Fam (excused)
Kathleen Kielar (excused)
Robert Van Wicklin (excused)

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES:

Glendora Johnson-Cooper

PARLIAMENTARIAN:

Richard Gronostajski

GUESTS:

Satish K. Tripathi, President
Charles (Chip) Zukoski, Provost
Ann Marie Landel, Professional Staff Senate (excused)

1. Chair's Report:

- Extra Fac. Sen. Meeting on 11/18/14 went very well. We had five amendments proposed.
- Ezra asked whether or not FSEC had actually made the request for the President and Provost to comment on the Decanal Review report prior to FSEC sending to Fac. Sen. in Nov. A review of the minutes was interpreted to show that we did not agree to get feedback from the Provost and President.
 - At the end of the meeting it was decided that FSEC did want to ask for President and Provost feedback and give them until one week (January 27, 2015) before the February Faculty Senate meeting (February 3, 2015) to provide that feedback in writing. Regardless, the report will go to the Faculty Senate at the February meeting.

2. Provost Report:

- VP for Research, Tim Kaleen, will step down to go to Illinois.
- Extreme weather will move back through tonight but events are still scheduled for the campus.
- Ezra asked the Provost about the hiring of people under the new General Education proposal. Could you comment on how you perceive the roles of the ladder faculty and non-ladder faculty proposed in this new program?
 - Provost-State rule that if you work here at UB in a certain status, after seven years you become a permanent employee and that's as good as tenure. He's unclear whether or not the teaching faculty for the new General Education program would fall under that. There are other groups on campus here that are employed in those types of teaching roles so he did not see why those employed to teach the general education courses could not be included in those types of positions that are granted permanent appointment. He asked the General Education steering committee to limit the reliance on adjunct and contingent faculty so that is as much embedded in the current proposal.
 - Gabriela Popescu-some fields have lost NIH grant money so ladder track teaching faculty can't contractually give 30% to research so are there ways that they can contribute to the university in lieu of the 30% research. At what level do these decisions get made?
 1. Provost-Depends on the discipline. May come from University but usually comes from the department. Discussed examples of teaching load disparity across departments and schools due to their national and departmental norms. We already have, at least teaching, percentage differences.
 2. President-basic science faculty at other medical schools are guaranteed to 15-30% salary the rest must come from their own generated grants or they don't get paid. Here we are

- under a 12 month appointment so we don't have the same grant funding issues.
3. Ezra points out that at Johns Hopkins the percent is 80% for grants.
 4. Provost-Gabriela is asking not about percentages but how do we contribute and serve to the university if we aren't tied up with research? What else can we do to fulfill our obligations? This needs to be discussed in almost every department on campus. We also need to adjust those percentages as research funds move in and out of the department.
- Gabriela-teaching is becoming a profession itself so the notion that you are going to take someone who is expecting to get funded and move them into a teaching role when you have someone versus hiring someone who is trained to teach is an issue.
 1. Provost agreed and thought there was room for campus-wide discussion of this issue. The new General Education program has just brought this issue to the forefront but it has always been there. The notion that we don't value or reward teaching as much as research when it comes to tenure. When you are tenured and aren't generating grants how do you contribute to the university.
 2. Michael Cowen-you don't reward for excellent teaching as you do generating research grants.
 3. Provost-two years ago asked the schools if they would consider rewarding tenure based in large part on a candidate's teaching abilities and the answer was NO.
 4. Martha McCluskey-commented on a recent conference she attended where some the best practices research dealt with researching faculty teaching and its effectiveness and impact on the academy and students.
 - a. Provost-The sense from UB colleagues he has talked to is NOT supportive of this type of ladder faculty whose role is primarily to teach. They would come back and say we're a research university and we need to focus on and value research and scholarship.
 - Martha-with the cost question of the new General Education proposal we could move from 44 non-tenured teaching staff with a 4:4 load to 88 ladder track faculty with a 2:2. But that was seen as too expensive but it's not a net because the 88 will be doing more than just teaching as their contribution to the university on service and research. Some of the colleagues she talked to said we shouldn't be wasting a hiring opportunity on courses aimed at freshman, this attitude needs to be changed. Teaching freshman outside of their major is an important part of our mission.

1. Provost-tends to agree with that. The definition of a faculty workload. To go from 44 to 88 with no new revenue means you must use the funds available. Expanding the capacity to do scholarship is a difficult financial balancing act that doesn't belong on the back of undergraduate General Education.
2. Peter Morgan-referred to the University at Michigan Ann Arbor where he knows that there has been a moving away from ladder faculty lines to clinical or lecture faculty lines so that in one department the ladder track and tenured faculty teach one course semester, focus primarily on research, and have a distaste for teaching and see serving on things like faculty senate as a waste of their valuable time. So he cautions against fracturing departments by focusing on hiring too many lecture faculty. However, he did agree that teaching was undervalued in many departments and research overly praised.
 - a. Provost-agreed. Many department chairs at UB are associate professors because full professors see serving as chair as a waste of time, similar to the model Peter had mentioned.
 - b. Richard Gronostajski-thought this was an issue for the Deans to address. The Provost said it was a culture the Deans work within.
3. Ezra commented that the new General Education program hiring section does much to improve the conditions of contingent faculty who will have job security beyond a yearly basis because it moves to a 2-3 year contract.
4. Michael Hatton pointed out that the clinically based faculty has a difficult time getting powers that be to articulate what is required to get to the next level. It's very nebulous even after all the years he has with the institution. Should not be based on the "feeling" of a department chair on an individual it should be more structured and open.
 - a. James Lenker gave credit to his department chair for creating criteria for promotion and articulating that to his teaching faculty. It was a very positive move for the motivation of the department staff.
5. Larry Sanders-How do we move from associate professor to professor?
 - a. Provost felt that it was a department culture that needs to be dealt with from within because his office can't make them own the issue of promoting their unit and colleagues.

6. Paul Zarembka felt there was a misunderstanding that people here after 6 years will be permanent, that is not true for clinical faculty.
 - a. Provost agreed and said that there are various lines at UB with differing levels of permanency.
 - b. President-professional staff gets permanent appointment after 6 years.
 - c. Martha-we do have clinical faculty on the tenure track although there are not as many. These roles are very confusing.
 7. Glendora Johnson-Cooper pointed out that we have librarians on tenure track and professional staff as well as visiting lines, but those are fewer.
 8. Grace Dean says that Nursing Dean values clinical faculty and we have gone to the literature for our promotion criteria.
 9. Ernest Sternberg pointed out that in his school adjuncts, who may teach only one course a semester, are highly regarded experts in the profession and not starving teachers. They enrich the program with their experience.
 10. Martha-if students' main contact with a department is with these types of faculty who have a mainly teaching role then they miss out on the research aspects of our institution. They need to have contact with research faculty as well. We should reward tenure for those who engage in creating great pedagogy.
 - a. President said a case for Full Professor was made for a professional school faculty member based on their pedagogy but the argument/case has to be made within the school or department.
 11. Paul asked about Engineering
 12. Joseph Mollendorf-there are folks who have a 3:3 case load, clinical status, who are not on the tenure track. They have no research responsibilities but some would like the option to do research and gain tenure/permanent appointment.
3. Old Business:
- New FSEC Procedures. **Approved**
 - Send items to be placed on the agenda by the Thursday before the Wednesday meeting.
 - FSEC and Faculty Senate agendas can then go out 1-2 days ahead of the scheduled meeting.
 - Emergencies will happen, that's fine.
 - Election Procedures.
 - FSEC members from that college or school will go back and try to get that information before the first spring meeting of FSEC

(February 11, 2015). We have responses from University Libraries, School of Public Health and Health Professions,

➤ Committee Reports:

- Not coming in regularly as required. The chairs of these committees were asked to present at the LAST FSEC meeting of the spring semester.
 1. Glendora-what if they don't present?
 2. Ezra-they'll be removed as chair of the committee
 3. Martha-we should have more than one report. Every September we are required to review the committee membership but we don't do that. We should not rely on the Chair of Fac. Senate to do that we should have a committee, like the nominating committee, to oversee this membership review.
 4. Gabriela-what are our teeth? Do we write a letter to the chairs of these committees that they have not lived up to their obligation as committee service?
 5. Michael Chaskes what happens if faculty don't participate in their 30% of service. Right now they'll be relieved but life goes on-in some cases easier. It's disturbing that you're in an academic environment but don't want to teach or provide service to the institution.
 6. Martha-faculty who give a lot of service to these committees but nothing gets done like the Decanal Review committee. That report was put on the back burner and now goes through these procedural shenanigans. People on this committee reported to her that this is another example why people are told not to participate in faculty senate or faculty senate committees, because no one takes your work seriously.
 7. Ezra feels hammered by people want to follow procedures against people who want things done rapidly. Your point is very well taken-there has been service that has done great work.
 8. Gabriela makes a motion to have the Chair of the Faculty Senate send out letters, at the end of the academic year, to those who have served as chairs on faculty senate committees and faculty senate executive committee members, along with their respective departmental chairs, either positively or negatively summarize their service to the Faculty Senate during the academic year. Grace Dean seconded the motion.
 - a. Paul concerned about this happening in the middle of someone's term.
 - b. Martha says we should ask those who are not doing their job as chair what is standing in their way?

- c. Michael Cowen concerned we are grading chairs on what they are going to report.
 - d. Michael Hatton we as simply saying how they served, we are not grading them on their service. What will the chairs do with this information? There should be some effect on the chairs.
 - e. Henry Durand-this is just an acknowledgment that you served. It should be a practice to send an acknowledgment letter to everyone who served. There are those who are not faculty who serve but this counts towards their promotion.
 - f. Gabriela-Chairs of the committees should do this.
 - g. Richard-we need a full motion.
 - h. Gabriela tries to articulate it clearer but could not so agreed to go back and write it out for the next FSEC meeting.
 - i. **Motion was tabled.**
- Agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on December 2, 2014
 - Sole function of the meeting, after approval of previous minutes, will be voting on the new General Education Proposal resolution and its amendments. **Approved**
 - Remove FSEC members with poor attendance.
 - Two absences in a row without excuses.
 - Joseph-we should do this, we are talking about accountability.
 - Martha-enforce that rule for the senate before the opportunity to vote on Gen Ed. Motion that we take whatever steps necessary to permit alternates to FSEC meetings. Gabriela moved to table that. **Motion was tabled.**
 - Joseph-we don't need a motion to do this.
 - Ezra we will start this process now.
 - Martha-FSEC and the Senate
 - Cindi-I will send emails to those who were absent advising them of the bylaws and their removal from FSEC. Their Deans and electoral units will be notified as well. They will be notified that they can appeal to the Chair. This would be done to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members first then, after the December 2nd meeting to the Faculty Senators. If one is a FSEC member they will still be a senator but their unit will need to appoint another of their already elected senators as the FSEC representative. If they are removed from the senate due to two consecutive senate meeting absences their unit will have to elect a new senator. Again, Cindi will provide the specific Standing Order that pertains to both types of membership.
 - Faculty Senate December 2nd meeting voting order
 - Ezra was advised by FSEC to first vote on each amendment THEN the original resolution AND limit the time for comment. Non

senators will NOT be recognized, voting faculty can be there but not acknowledged they can go to their senators to make comments before the meeting.

- Faculty Senate December 2nd meeting voting type
 - What type of vote? Show of hands, secret ballot, roll call vote. Ezra asked for advice. Some argue it should be open, show of hands because people need to know how their senators represented them. Some argue that senators have been pressured to vote a certain way so it should be secret. Roll call vote would allow voting faculty to know that how their representatives voted. Paul motioned that a notice should go out Faculty Senate advising them that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has decided that the votes on the amendments goes first followed by the original resolution. Ezra called Paul out of order, Paul protested the ruling of the Chair.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:35p

Submitted by
Cynthia Tysick,
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
12/3/2014