



University at Buffalo
The State University of New York

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 15, 2014

CHAIR:

Ezra B. W. Zubrow

SECRETARY:

Cynthia Tysick

ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING:

Ernest Sternberg (excused)

ARTS & SCIENCES:

Kenneth Dauber (excused)

Stephen Dyson (absent)

Peter Morgan

Paul Zarembka

DENTAL MEDICINE:

Michael Hatton

ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCES:

Adly Fam

Joseph Mollendorf

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION:

Lynne Yang

**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH &
HEALTH PROFESSIONS:**

Bob Burkard (excused)

LAW:

Martha McCluskey (excused)

MANAGEMENT:

Larry Sanders

MEDICINE & BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES:

Michael Chaskes

Peter Elkin

Jung Hoon (absent)

Garbiela Popescu

NURSING:

Grace Dean

PHARMACY:

Fred Doloresco

SOCIAL WORK:

Robert Keefe (excused)

SUNY SENATORS:

Henry Durand
Adly Fam
Kathleen Kielar

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES:

Glendora Johnson-Cooper

PARLIAMENTARIAN (interim):

Paul Zarembka

GUESTS:

Sharon Nolan-Weiss, EDAAA

Ann Marie Landel, PSS

Dave Hill, Reporter

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting 10/15/14

Meeting started at 3p

1. Chair's Report

- There are 10 nominations for Chair of Faculty Senate and one for Secretary
- Involved with University Senate and Operations committee. SUNY Performance Measurement System. Central administration trying to create performance indicators for academic excellence, innovation, research, and operational efficiencies within the university. The Operations Committee of the SUNY University Faculty Senate has felt that the central administration has not spent much time talking to individual campuses or faculty about how these performance measures are taking place. We have created a resolution to the University-wide Faculty Senate. Resolves that the SUNY system engage all the participants in the development of these performance measures, each campus assessing the impact of these measures on their individual campuses and Ezra has asked for an amendment to this resolution that states that until the resolutions are acted upon positively then the SUNY Faculty Senate is opposed to these measures. He is waiting for SUNY Faculty Senate to vote on accepting or rejecting his amendment to the resolution. Some members

of the SUNY Faculty Senate feel that their campuses and faculty were not sufficiently consulted on the creation of these new performance measures.

- Last year the FSEC agreed one member from this body be appointed a liaison to each of the Faculty Senate Committees (<http://faculty-senate.buffalo.edu/committees/1415%20FSEC%20Roster.pdf>) If your committee is not doing anything please do take action and make sure it does act on its charges.
- Ezra has had several hundred emails regarding the Department of Jewish Thought proposal. He has come to some opinions.
 - You can simply vote the Department into existence or you can vote it no. If you choose the latter it will continue as an Institute.
 - You can send the proposal back to the Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee, which has stated that they don't want it back, however you could order them to do so with the proviso that they reconsider this in the context of creating a Religion department of which the Institute will be a program under that department but again he was told the committee would prefer that it not come back.
 - Appoint an ad-hoc committee that will consider a new proposal to create a department of Jewish Culture and Heritage avoiding all those other issues of thought. If you chose this then it would not be appropriate to send it back to the academic planning committee.
 - You could postpone the decision until the next FSEC meeting, which Ezra would greatly appreciate you not doing that.
- Unlike other legislative bodies we have no rules for decorum and civility. So after considerable research Ezra will be appointing, with FSEC approval, an ad-hoc committee on civility and decorum whose charge will be to set rules to make sure our senate sessions are conducted in the proper manner and all issues such as free speech, etc. will be maintained.
- Ezra has asked professor Sternberg to NOT send out the material that he says he has to the faculty senate or faculty senate executive body and he has agreed to this.
- General Education, Ezra urges you to attend those smaller meetings with Andy Stott. Members have said they have been very useful.

2. President's Report

- Performance measures are called SUNY Excel. 15-20 states have these performance based funding models. A state university gets funded up or down based on undergraduate performance in terms of retention and graduation. In Ohio their university system came up with a similar measure ahead of their governor's expected performance measure proposal. President Tripathi feels that the SUNY Chancellor might be looking to do something similar in New York because if SUNY is going to the governor to ask for more money he will ask for performance metrics. So for example in Ohio you could lose up to 8% of your budget if you don't perform. So how we do it in SUNY is under discussion. Although he hasn't seen the new measures his sense from discussions is that there are less parameters and more acceptance of each SUNY's unique mission and vision. The Texas model has every faculty

member is evaluated on the number students they teach, the students' performance, the research money they bring in and their salary.

- Ezra the senate is not opposed they just want to be consulted.
- Critical Conversations series this year will be Professor David Wellman from Stanford Oct. 30-31st. He is an expert on infectious disease. Keynote-Butler Aud. Oct 30th and panel discussion on the 31st.
- President State of the University this Friday the 17th.

Comments/questions for the President:

Paul Zarembka: Asked for clarification on mentoring-is it the administration's policy that assistant professor's be mentored.

President: Yes, the provost that worked work on the committee for this made that recommendation that everyone be assigned a mentor.

Michael Hatton: do you have timeline for those metrics?

President: No, but probably this year for the budget.

Joseph Hollendorf: If the state imposes the rules/measures do we have a legal right to oppose these measures.

President: Not aware of the legal ramifications. We are part of the Executive branch so we can have cuts from the governor. This is not a fight just a way to possibly get more resources.

Peter Elkin: We are asked to give our AAU measures was this part of the performance measures.

President: the state mostly cares about the retention and graduate of Undergraduates so they don't rely as heavily on AAU.

3. Ezra: approval of minutes of Sept. 24th. Minutes approved.

4. Faculty Senate Budget Committee

- Ezra asked for a vote to dissolve the Joint Budget Priorities Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee in order to create a single budget committee. The Joint Budget Priorities Committee consisted of faculty senate members and university administration members. Members were jointly appointed with the Chair of faculty senate and the President having veto powers. Members signed a confidentiality oath, which meant they were able to see all aspects of the budget. This allowed the Provost and other administrators who dealt with the budget to discuss issues with them and not worrying about information leaking out. The FSEC decided they wanted an independent committee that had no joint appointments in its original form. It would be a priorities committee that would look independently at the budget. They would ask permission to look at aspects of the budget, the Provost would agree or disagree they could FOIL, etc. etc. The Provost said he would not have two budget priorities committees. Paul

Zarembka and Kathleen Kielar were asked to work together to create a recommendation for one Budget Priorities Committee. The Provost did not indicate if he wanted to appoint two non-voting members.

- Gabriela Popescu: would like to get documents like this proposal in advance.
- Adly Fam: if the does appoint 2 non voting members they would not be allowed into the executive session but would have to be told what had occurred.
- Ezra: if the Provost appoints 2 non-voting members they will not be allowed into the executive session. This totally independent committee was the will of this body.
- Gabriela: will this [budget] committee have the required information to make [decisions]?
- Ezra: it can request information from the Provost and the President but it is not the same agreement that we had previously, that they would have access to the budget. The President and the Provost can simply say no thank you. We can FOIL them, this was a debate we had I believe Ken Dauber, Peter, Paul you all lead the idea of having an independent committee and I think we should do so. All I'm doing is implementing the will of the body.
- Paul: I didn't feel it was a hostile situation. I felt like a senate body is a senate body therefore we have to, it has to be a senate committee it can't be administrative...whatever. But otherwise, there's no problem. I don't see.
- Ezra: Chip's reaction to all this was, fine-the faculty senate do as you wish to do. He will consider whether or not to appoint 2 non-voting members but we are in no position to tell him to appoint members to our committee.
- Kathleen Kielar: commented on who the Provost might appoint to the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee both of whom would have much more insight and knowledge of the budget than voting members of the committee.
- Ezra: once we approve this committee I will gladly go to the Provost and ask him to appoint the appropriate people to this committee.
- Glendora Johnson-Cooper: so the old University Budget Priorities Committee will go away.
- Ezra: yes
- Paul Elkin: what power does the Faculty Senate have over the university budget? Does the administration have any obligation to listen to anything the committee decides?
- Ezra: the committee has persuasive powers. Ezra gave an example of how when the rational budget came out the Provost wanted to put all the money into new hires in the Strategic Strengths. The Budget Priorities Committee spoke out that it would be a danger and argued for a 50/50 reallocation, with 50% of new hires going to the Strategic Strengths and 50% going to the traditional departments. The Provost eventually followed their recommendation. We already voted this in, we just have to decide on an implementation strategy.

- Gabriela Popescu: would like to support Peter's voice. Do we have an influence or are we just venting. Thank you Ezra for bringing a positive example of faculty having a positive influence.
 - Glendora: This budget committee could deal with budget issues with less information than the previous committee?
 - Ezra: potentially. The President and Provost will be under no obligation. The Provost tries to make the budget process as transparent as possible.
 - Kathleen: this can be decided at the committee. The Provost has said that if it is state budget it's not confidential. If it's other stuff we can agree to go into executive session as the committee rules and governs itself. If they want to do a confidentiality statement then so be it.
 - Ezra: budget information sharing was legislated under the old committee, now it has to be negotiated on a case by case basis.
 - Michael Hatton: the committee would consist of 7-11 faculty members, that's such a wide spread. What's the rationale?
 - Peter Morgan: the number of questions that this committee will be asked to look at simultaneously could be considerable it will require subcommittees to look into these questions and report back to the larger body. The idea of 2 Provost appointments is an effort to show collaboration.
 - Paul Zarembka motioned to create one committee
 - Larry Sanders 2nd the motion
 - Kathleen: the Provost really just wants one committee for time and efficiency.
 - Motion was approved (quorum was verified by secretary)
 - Ezra asked Peter Morgan to contact the members of the two committees to see who wanted to remain on the new committee. If you do not have the 7-11 members come back to the FSEC and we will work on that.
5. Proposal to change the Institute for Jewish Thought and Heritage to a Department of Jewish Thought
- Ezra: the proposal went to the Faculty Senate there was initially a quorum but by the time the vote took place there was no quorum. According to our rules and regulations it now comes back to us to make a decision.
 - Gabriela: Why are we even voting on this? Do schools need our approval from the senate to create departments.
 - Ezra: according to the bylaws schools do not need our approval for graduate departments. Therefore in the graduate schools like the Medical School deans can create and dissolve departments without the faculty senate spending much time involved in it. It is my understanding that that is not true for undergraduate departments. [Gabriela comes in to ask the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to answer this question. Dean Pittman begins to speak as Ezra asks for permission to continue what he was saying]. After speaking with the President and Provost it is within both the SUNY guidelines and the UB guidelines that creation and dissolution of

undergraduate departments reside under the academic curricular responsibility of the faculty senate.

- Bruce Pittman: is it determinative or advisory? He has not gotten a straight answer so Ezra went off to explore the issue further. [Gabriela-what would happens if you just created a department] I wouldn't create a department without the college's governance body behind it. And that I've already done. The CAS Policy Committee has seen this proposal, we had discussions, they voted in support of the creation of such a department. I'm comfortable with that but we are taking it to this body, to the senate because that's the right thing to do. Do I have to, I don't know. What would happen to me if I just went off, I'd like not to have that happen.
- Gabriela: I think this goes back to Peter's question of what we're spending our time on. What if we come to a 'no' and the faculty senate says 'yes' do we have veto power?
- Ezra: as far as I know the Institute for Jewish Thought and Heritage will continue to exist and continue to grant degrees as it has done so previously. It would not become a department unless there was some other kind of proposal. That proposal would have to come through the same process as this current one. I think that in the three years that I have been chair we have taken a bigger and bigger role in the governance of this university, we have not wasted our time.
- Gabriela: If the senate says 'yes' lets make this a department are there any budgetary implications.
- Bruce: there are overhead costs to move 5 current faculty into the new department, new space within the CAS but the college has been bearing most of the costs as an institute. It also has an undergraduate program that this body approved of 3 years ago so the budgetary differences are small.
- Peter Morgan: aren't there projected additional costs? There was intent for graduate studies.
- Bruce: yes the department would look at a Master's degree in 2 years using current faculty. The creation of a PhD. program will require additional faculty. If you look nation-wide there aren't many free standing Ph.Ds in Jewish Studies. Many of them are in concert with a history department or religious department, some other department depending on the organization of that school. Current faculty in the institute have been in contact with those other schools that have such PhD programs.
- Joe: degree granting process of NY. The institute has a BA degree and if it becomes a department it inherits that same degree?
- Bruce: yes it will be the same BA degree. The bachelors degree required approve at the college level, the university undergraduate curriculum committee, this body, SUNY and State ed. It has gone through all of those processes, that has already been done for the bachelors.
- Joe: clarified timeline for Master's and PhD.

- Paul: I'd like to make a comment and then a motion in that order. The first female economist who got a PhD. Is Rosa Luxemburg who everybody knows was Jewish. Would her work be included in either an Institute or Department of Jewish Thought?
- Bruce: the Department of Jewish Thought has as its focus Philosophy, Literature, and Culture beyond that I'm not sure. If you look at the backgrounds of the 5 faculty members one is in philosophy, two are in comparative literature [Paul-no its really dependent on the faculty who occupy those positions now, that could change in 10 years with a completely different set of people]. My point is simply that there is not a narrow definition of what Jewish Thought is. It is this philosophical, historical, cultural, literature background as it pertains to...[Paul begins to comment]
- Ezra: I'd like to respond here. I don't think we actually do the same thing to other departments Paul. I don't think that in anthropology for example, does Boazian thought have to be taught. Those are decisions made by the faculty.
- Paul: my question, you missed my point, the point of my question is Rosa Luxemburg is an Atheist, she didn't care about Jewish Thought. The only characteristic of her is her Jewish background but not because she's involved in Jewish Thought. Would be she be the subject matter in such a department.
- Bruce: As Ezra stated, the department faculty decides what their going to study no one determines what a department studies or not studies. The department has in its mission statement an idea of Jewish Thought separating itself out from Jewish studies. This department is trying to say we're looking at philosophy, heritage, culture that's where our 'home' is, from there you go in different ways. It's trying to create a niche for itself in that area as opposed to a Jewish Studies area. This was a subject of the internal report. Nobody tells an Economics Department what fields they study. The hiring that goes on determines who next generation of thinkers will be.
- Paul: I was just trying to understand the department better. Makes a motion send a proposal back to the Dean and policy committee in the CAS to consider a department of religious thought.
- Kathleen: are we entertaining two motions right now?
- Ezra: I had suggested an order of motions. It made more sense in the system. First vote the department into existence or no. If we vote 'no' then we can send it back to the Dean and to the one of several committees it would appropriate to send it back to. We would then debate which committee would be appropriate. If a majority voted 'yes' then would not have to go back to these set of issues. I would prefer that we did it that way. But legislatively I think you [Paul] have a motion on the floor before anyone else had a motion on the floor. Paul would you pull your motion so that we can vote on the motion that was kicked back to us from the Faculty Senate?
- Cindi and Kathleen: point out that the motion was rejected by the Faculty Senate and came back to the FSEC.

- Cindi: the motion you had from Faculty Senate was whether or not to create a Department of Jewish Thought so you would have to make an amendment to that motion [Paul].
- Paul: my motion is to vote no with a positive recommendation to send it back to the CAS to consider a department of religious thought.
- Ezra: the motion on the floor is you vote does the department go into existence or not. Then if there is a no then we vote on where it should go. We vote that whether or not the Institute for Jewish Thought and Heritage will become a Department of Jewish Thought. Recommend a paper ballot.
- Lynn Yang: it feels top down that we feel that a department of Jewish Thought should be expanded to one of Religious Thought. These five faculty came together to form this department so if there are other faculty in the CAS or on campus who would like to form a department of Religious Thought they should come forward otherwise it would just be us and faculty senate imposing our opinion on a department.
- Cindi: the motion failed by a vote of 6 yes 7 no.
- Ezra: what do we do from here? My suggestion is we appoint an ad-hoc committee to review a proposal to form a Department of Jewish Culture and Heritage, recommended by the Dean. We can send the proposal back to the Fac Senate Academic planning committee, who does not want it, but to consider it as a Department of Religious Thought as Paul had suggested. Or you can ask me to create an independent ad-hoc committee that will review the proposal for a Department of Jewish Culture and Heritage or you can postpone any decision.
- Adly: we should do nothing
- Peter Elkin: we are obligated to give a reason as to why the vote was 'no' back to the proponents because they have no guidance from us and I believe this leaves them in a very difficult situation. It would be up to the proponents to decide what to do next, they are the experts in their area of study. An ad-hoc committee of people from other disciplines is in no position to tell them how to do their job, but if we articulate what the objection to the current proposal is then perhaps they can come back with one that is more acceptable to this body.
- Ezra: I understand that CAS has a new proposal on the books but when it comes up rather than send it to the same committee I would send it to a new ad-hoc committee.
- Paul: I don't know how we can do that, give a reason why. It was a closed vote so how can we open it back up to ask people why they voted the way they did.
- Cindi: since you can't open the vote back up can you not send the proponents the committee report that Dr. Christian chaired?
- Bruce: that report had some major issues with it and has nothing that is useful.
- Paul: Why did I propose that we send this back to the Dean and CAS policy committee to consider a Department of Religious Thought? If you wanted to name one culture we need to know more about it's the Muslim culture. As a university needs as a diverse university. We need a diverse university and not single out one religion.

- Gabriela: The Dean is here so he can take this whole discussion back as feedback. Thinking back to the discussion at the faculty senate about the lack of other religions represented in order to be more inclusive and have more people it should consider a Department of Religious Thought then it would be more than just 5 people getting together.
- Peter Elkin: we have 5 faculty with certain expertise if we go back and tell them to teach Arabic they probably can't do that. They want to attract students at the undergraduate level because they see a need for such a program that can grow academically and intellectually. There might be a separate group of people with Islamic studies background who would like to create their own department.
- Ezra: there have been people who have been trying to create this department on this campus for 40 years but there has not been people trying to create a Department of Buddhist Studies. A Department of Religious Studies would be a great idea but there has not been this grassroots groundswell as there has for Jewish Studies.
- Cindi: do we have a second to Paul motion to send the proposal back to the Dean and the Policy Committee of the CAS to consider the possibility of establishing a Department of Religious Thought.
- Gabriela 2nd the motion.
- Peter Morgan: I don't think this is the proper procedure. I'm going to vote against this not because I'm against the idea but if anything is going to come from [inaudible] it has to come from faculty or students or from the senate itself not from this FSEC we are not expert enough to tell anyone in this university whether we should or shouldn't [inaudible]
- Joe: I feel this is top down and it makes me uncomfortable. I like the idea but it needs to grow from the faculty level.
- Motion failed
- Glendora: when you want to move from program to institute to department there is a lot of work that goes into that and it seems arbitrary on our part. There is so much we don't know about that process.
- Ezra: some people will agree with you on that.
- Lynn: there's no way to unring the bell right?
- Ezra: no I don't think so. It would be inappropriate to unring the bell.
- Glendora: they continue as an Institute and can come back with the same or similar proposal at a later date?
- Bruce: yes
- Ezra: asks the Parliamentarian if we could send this motion back to the faculty senate
- Discussion amongst members says you can't it was voted on.
- Fred Doloresco: the motion couldn't be voted on because we did not have a quorum at the faculty senate so it came back to FSEC
- Glendora: then we shouldn't have voted on it.
- Ezra asks Paul for clarification as Parliamentarian.

- Paul: a person from the prevailing side would have to bring a motion to reconsider.
 - Fred: since it was a written vote we have no idea
 - Gabriela: we have comments and discussions at previous meetings so I think there is a lot of guidance to go on here.
6. Joe motioned to adjourn with Paul 2nd the motion.
- Ezra: I will [Paul tell me if I am doing something illegal] appoint a committee for decorum and civility, appoint a Parliamentarian, I will nominate and appoint people to the 2 CIO committees and I will appoint someone to be the chair of the grading committee because we cannot continue to run [Paul-you're able to do that]. If that is the will of the body then I will agree to adjournment.
 - Voted and approved-meeting adjourned at 4:35pm

Respectfully submitted 10/25/2014 by Cynthia Tysick, Faculty Senate Secretary.