

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Minutes of September 13, 1995 (approved >
revised 10/3/95)**

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Jeannette Martin Room to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the FSEC minutes of August 30, 1995](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Reports of the President and Provost](#)
4. [Data Security](#)
5. [Academic Dishonesty Among Students](#)
6. [Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness](#)
7. Old Business (none)
8. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the FSEC minutes of August 30, 1995

Professor Welch, following establishment of a quorum, asked for additions or deletions to the minutes. Professor Stevenson asked to have his name added to the list of attendees. Professor Schuel moved to approve the minutes as amended and Professor Ferry seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch noted that:

- Requests for advisory panel members for The Reporter, Responsible Conduct and Affirmative Action had been fulfilled.
- The Investigator Disclosure policy had been implemented which requires disclosure of "significant financial interests and significant obligations". It was noted that income from the University, from public

or non-profit entities and from aggregated royalties and other payments under \$10,000 annually were not included in the policy.

- In view of letters circulated from President Greiner and Professor Fourtner, the EPPC be asked to reconsider the UTA resolution and examine issues of remedial courses and "community service". Professor Jameson moved to refer the issues to the EPPC and Professor Malone seconded the motion. Professor Malone stated that the matter reached beyond the effect on athletics. An amendment was offered to broaden the motion to include the overall appropriateness of courses for college credit. Professor Jameson mentioned the ambiguity existing related to college credit for foreign languages such as first year Spanish and French courses for students with high school credits in these areas. She spoke in favor of broadening the study by EPPC to include all college credit received for high school level work. Professor Wooldridge noted high school courses offered for college credit and commented that an overlap might be beneficial. Professor Welch commented that high school level Western Civilizations courses had in the past utilized significant portions of the same text as the University level World Civilizations courses. Professor Churchill stated that he disagreed with extending the study since it was not unreasonable to expect a beginning course to have a basis at the high school level. The motion was amended was requested as follows: "that the FSEC wishes the EPPC to report on college credit for courses which duplicate requirements for high school graduation and in addition examine specific courses including physical education and community service." Professor Malone stated that differentiation between high school level courses and remedial courses was necessary. Professor Meidinger stated that service was an issue in higher education. Professor Hadighi commented that the service course in the School of Architecture was a valuable experience. Vice Provost Levy stated that Calculus could be included in the domain of being offered in high school but not required by the Board of Regents. Professor Welch suggested that a vote should be taken on the motion and then the appropriate committees could work on the details. The motion carried and Professor Welch stated that Professor Metzger, the Chair of the EPPC would be invited to a future FSEC meeting.
- Vice Provost Goodman notified Women's Studies that WSC 213 could be offered in its current format for one more year since there was no institutional policy on the utilization of UTAs. Provost Headrick stated that since it appeared that there would be problems with implementation of the Faculty Senate resolution on UTAs, the Senate had been asked to reconsider the resolution.

Professor Welch asked whether the EPPC should be requested to review the issue. Professor Malone stated that he was against the EPPC reviewing the resolution which had been formulated by the EPPC originally. He wondered if there was any reason to think that the EPPC had changed its view on the same data. Professor Welch noted that the data were different in view of the response of the administration to the Faculty Senate resolution. Professor Jameson commented on the implicit suggestion of teaching quality and the focus on qualifications. She urged that the matter be referred to the Senate Committee on Teaching Quality once that committee was reconstituted and that the Chair of the EPPC (Educational Programs and Policy Committee) be invited to participate in discussions. Professor Wetherhold stated that the EPPC was an extremely active committee with complex responsibilities. He noted that budget issues related to UTAs had not been a consideration. Professor Acara asked if it was acceptable to review the issue in a year. Professor Welch replied that the specific correspondence from Vice Provost Goodman to Women's Studies had granted permission to utilize UTAs for only the current year. Professor Acara questioned the correspondence in view of the Faculty Senate resolution and Professor Welch reiterated that the Faculty Senate was advisory to the President. Professor Nickerson recommended consulting with EPPC. Professor Wetherhold stated that the recommendation to the EPPC should be specific rather than broad. Professor Nickerson noted that specific comments regarding Women's Studies had not been included in the EPPC report. Professor Welch suggested that the turn-around time might be quite brief in the EPPC since the committee was familiar with the details. Professor Welch stated that the issue raised by Professor Jameson regarding teaching quality would be discussed later in the session.

- The meeting of the Voting Faculty had been inadvertently scheduled on Rosh Hashanah and had been postponed and would be rescheduled at a later date that did not conflict with a major religious holiday.

ITEM 3: Report of the Provost

Provost Headrick stated that he was open to questions. Professor Malone inquired regarding the SUNY document which had requested identification of academic programs for possible elimination. Provost Headrick replied that the memo had been "buried". He stated that he expected minimal budgetary impact from eliminating unnecessary program duplication within the system. Provost Headrick noted that it was unfair to blame SUNY Central for decisions that should have been made on campuses. Professor Welch inquired into meetings with faculty focusing on the long term effects on SUNY from the

current economic and political climate. He noted that time was a most precious commodity and asked about the strategy for gathering information about programmatic reductions and areas close to criticality. Provost Headrick replied that the strategy was to be proactive with the SUNY system. He mentioned shifts within the institution based on sound academic principles and hoped for no cuts beyond the current level as an aggregate. He commented on plans to "play the tuition card" and elaborated that funneling the tuition increases to UB was desirable. He listed analysis of tuitions and market elasticity in programs as areas of further study. He acknowledged the requirement for increased financial aid from the increased tuition. Provost Headrick stated that both the new and the old trustees possessed an attitude favoring change. Professor Wooldridge stated that further cuts in state appropriations for education would cost the state far more than any savings that might result. He stressed the need to convince those responsible for making budget decisions and the public that further budget cuts for higher education would be "penny wise and pound foolish" through careful documentation and presentation of the detrimental effects of past cuts.

Provost Headrick stated that he believed that further budget cuts would be contrary to the interests of the state. He mentioned reorganization proposals with the other centers.

Professor Albini commented on the search for the combined position of Dean and Vice Provost for Health Sciences and requested that the job description be shared with the faculty. He noted that the faculty in the health sciences was "so heterogeneous" that it was essential to engage in consultation with faculty to assure appropriate input. Provost Headrick replied that he had been working with the Ad Hoc Committee during the summer regarding the nature of the position. He explained that a draft proposal of the job description would be forwarded to the Steering Committee. Professor Schuel inquired into the two-tiered search committee and Provost Headrick responded that he was the chair of both committees. Professor Schuel stressed the significance of faculty input in the process. Provost Headrick replied that he had utilized the names suggested in drafting the committee and had selected the members as representatives of a variety of constituencies.

ITEM 4: Data Security

Professor Welch introduced Senior Associate Vice President Innus, Associate Vice President Martens and Professor Cowen, Chair of the Faculty Senate Computer Services Committee.

Senior Associate Vice President Innus stated that the document on the University at Buffalo Policies

Regarding Data Security, Access and Acceptable Use of University Information had been reviewed and approved by the PACCIT (Priorities for Administrative Computing and Communications in Information Technology) Committee, the Administrative group and the Assistant and Associate Deans group. He stated that the policy was being presented to the FSEC for comments.

Associate Vice President Martens stated that Senior Associate Vice President Innus had provided a good ground for discussion.

Professor Cowen stated that there were specific areas requiring review before the FSEC. He noted that the policy was a top-down model but that data originated in a bottom-up fashion. He cited that the policy did not state how to share locally available information such as undergraduate quality point averages for graduate applications. He questioned release of data and differentiation between individual vs aggregate information. He remarked that the stance of the policy regarding the responsibility of the data custodians and trustees for access to data was impractical.

Professor Cowen mentioned implementation of DARS and the fact that data for transfer and UB courses were not readily available. He noted that individuals not authorized to access the data were unaware of the availability of the data.

Professor Welch expressed gratitude to Professor Cowen and his committee.

Professor Martens stated that it was advisable to keep the guidelines simple to serve as a basis for long-term policies. He remarked that technology would continuously be changing, necessitating changes in data security. He noted the highly confidential nature of the data and the need for custodianship and data stewardship. He commented that future access would be through a network rather than an operating system approach.

Professor Wooldridge acknowledged that there was always tension involved in the use of data related to the potential violation of confidentiality. He cited as an example the potential conflict when data from different sources need to be articulated by using student ID numbers, as in performing a truly accurate appraisal of the relation between admissions criteria and student performance. Procedures need to be established to review and approve such uses while safeguarding the student's rights.

Professor Welch stated that the discussion was intended primarily for reflection on the issues for future revisiting and development of a course of action.

Professor Malone expressed concern regarding accidental misuse of information or use of information for nefarious activities. He stated that confidentiality of information was problematic at best.

Senior Associate Vice President Innus stated that the objective was to provide as much data as quickly and as easily as possible. He commented that the issue was to safeguard students and meet administrative, faculty and academic information requirements. He referred to page 2 of the draft policy about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) related to the provision that an institution of higher education must have written permission from a student before releasing any information. He stated that institutions could disclose these records, without consent, in situations of employees with a "need to know" or for "legitimate educational interests". He commented that the balance between access and confidentiality was at the heart of the problem.

Professor Cowen stated that he agreed with the right to know provision and did not feel that access was an issue in this particular situation. Senior Associate Vice President Innus replied that FERPA did consider access an issue.

Professor Jameson recalled Mr. Townsend's remarks the previous week when he stated that the integrity and the vigilance of the Faculty Senate constituted reassuring safeguards against the questionable academic practices recently discovered among certain NCAA schools. "Given collective faculty responsibility for academic integrity, did it behoove individual faculty members to monitor student performance"?, asked Professor Jameson. The proposed policy made frequent use of phrases such as "need to know" and "legitimate purposes" but provided no clarity to their meaning, she complained. Professor Jameson asked if the intention was to codify all data. Vice President Innus replied that appropriate definitions would require a balance between student rights and the need to know.

Professor Jameson expressed that she believed the more problematic tension involved aggregate data rather than individual student records, which might result in "turf" disputes. Senior Associate Vice President Innus responded that arrangements would be made on a divisional basis.

Associate Vice President Martens reminded the FSEC that the policy was not motivated by problems but by a sense of need for a determination of responsibility for data security. He noted that all universities were involved in enhanced networking and easy, quick access to data. He stated that the University desired to enhance student interaction with data and mentioned touch-tone registration and computer access to grades.

Professor Cowen voiced agreement with Professor Martens regarding the majority of the report. He stated that CIT does encourage access to data and that there was a need to address the problem of release of information. He noted the need to access records of students and that FERPA was externally

directed.

Senior Associate Vice President Innus suggested leaving the issues for further discussion.

Professor Welch recommended consultation with colleagues regarding management of data and security and revisiting the issue in a few weeks.

ITEM 5: Academic Dishonesty Among Students

Vice Provost Goodman stated that higher education as a whole had floundered regarding academic integrity. He noted that it was the opinion of the faculty that support would not be forthcoming in cases of student academic dishonesty and he voiced concern about the unfortunate cynicism that existed. He commented that the Faculty Senate Committee on Grading had suggested the formation of a joint administrative committee from the Graduate School and the Office of Student Affairs. Vice Provost Goodman reported that responses had been received from approximately half of the deans surveyed for policies and prevalence related to academic dishonesty. He stated that recommendations would be formulated and that current procedures were not effective. He noted that it was important to update the policies and procedures for handling academic dishonesty. He noted that the Faculty Senate was cosponsoring the teleconference on academic dishonesty to be held September 29, 1995.

Professor Nickerson inquired whether the teleconference would be available on the south campus and Vice Provost Goodman stated that the teleconference was scheduled for Clemens on the north campus but that he would check into availability on the south campus.

Professor Welch asked Professor Schroeder about the charge to his committee regarding academic dishonesty. Professor Schroeder replied that no final conclusion had been reached during the previous year and that the FSEC should decide if the item should be renewed for reconsideration. He expressed the desire to work closely with the administration committee. Professor Schroeder noted that three of the charges were related to academic integrity and that the other charges covered academic good standing and uniformity of grading.

Professor Churchill stated, that as a member of the committee, problems existed related to student grievances.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that no letters related to academic dishonesty had been received in the DUAS office within the last five years. He noted that present procedures were not sensible and cited different rules in DUAS and the Office of Student Affairs. He stressed that the procedures needed review

and clarification.

Professor Wetherhold questioned specifics of academic dishonesty related to papers as part of course requirements. He noted examples of similar papers or a paper of comparatively unusual quality.

Professor Welch commented on faculty actions to minimize cheating such as using different forms on exams, changing paper topics and requiring notes with rough drafts of papers.

Professor Jameson recalled a Senate debate on the Policy on Responsible Conduct and thought a question had arisen regarding the inclusion of undergraduates under the provisions. Vice Provost Goodman commented that undergraduates engaged in organized research projects could be subject to the policy but that coursework and examinations were separate matters.

Professor Wooldridge mentioned a hypothetical situation of dishonesty occurring in relationship to duties of teaching or research assistants.

Vice Provost Goodman replied that dishonesty during research would be covered by the Policy on Responsible Conduct but that exam issues were separate matters.

Professor Jameson suggested streamlining procedures and Professor Welch stated that adjudication was an issue.

Professor Schuel referred to several instances at the Medical School. He noted that procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty were time consuming with resolutions that were usually unsatisfactory.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that balancing was required and that present procedures were unworkable.

Professor Wooldridge stated that it was not 100% clear regarding what constituted cheating and noted the grayness of the area in general. He recommended establishment of clear cut criteria.

Vice Provost Goodman referred to a document from Rutgers on reducing academic dishonesty.

Professor Nickerson suggested phrasing the charge to the Grading Committee positively such as promoting academic integrity.

Professor Stevenson mentioned students seeking editorial assistance with writing assignments. Vice Provost Goodman replied that distinguishing tutoring assistance from dishonesty was a difficulty matter.

Professor Malone discussed the issue of grade inflation and Professor Schroeder noted that grade inflation was part of the standing charge to the committee.

Professor Welch thanked the participants for the discussion.

ITEM 6: Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness

Vice Provost Fischer stated that the Office of Teaching Effectiveness had been abolished during the budget cutting process. He noted discussions that had occurred with Professor Welch and Provost Headrick regarding a proper substitute for this function. He stated that it was the worst time to eliminate the office while attempting to increase the quality of undergraduate education. Vice Provost Fischer stated that credentialing of teaching assistants would continue in cooperation with the Graduate School office and that video assessment of teaching was an available resource.

Vice Provost Fischer stated that it was desirable to resituate the function of teaching effectiveness within particular disciplines at the decanal level. He urged creation of an advisory committee composed of nominees from Faculty Senate recommendations and decanal units to serve during the transitional period.

Professor Welch noted that in mid-July, he had questioned the intention of the Provost to abolish the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and had been informed that the Provost "had made a determination" to abolish the office. Professor Welch reported that he had subsequently attempted to maintain the best features of the office through central encouragement and the efforts of Vice Provost Fischer. He suggested utilization of recipients with the title of Distinguished Teaching Professor or recipients of Chancellor's Awards for Excellence Teaching. He noted that in a short period of time, the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching Quality would be in working order. He noted that discussion and endorsement of the issue of teaching effectiveness was part of the work of the Faculty Senate.

Vice Provost Fischer urged the FSEC to act expeditiously and reiterated his own position of encouraging more faculty to be involved in teaching enhancement. He mentioned curricular reform and improvement of instruction on campus. He agreed that Distinguished Teaching Professors could be helpful and suggested their serving as mentors and as analyzers of teaching videos.

Professor inquired if the decision of the Provost to abolish the Office of Teaching Effectiveness was irrevocable. Professor Welch replied that it would be difficult to reverse the decision and he emphasized the importance of teaching effectiveness in the future environment. Professor inquired if the decision had been a fiscal or philosophical issue and requested information regarding the annual cost of running the office. It was noted that the office had cost approximately \$62,000 to operate annually.

Professor Wooldridge commented that the investment required by the Deans' offices might be more costly.

Professor Albini questioned the idea of decentralization. Professor Wetherhold mentioned supply and demand and discussed the need to increase the interest of the faculty in enhancing teaching.

Vice Provost Fischer acknowledged the pressure on faculty and encouraged "downloading" of the responsibility for teaching effectiveness. He noted the need to address teaching issues as specifically as possible.

Professor Malone commented on distance learning and preparation for techniques of the future. Vice Provost Fischer replied that Professor Lopos, the new Dean of Millard Fillmore College, was extremely interested in this area.

Professor Hadighi stated that he believed that there was pressure to fill a number of slots with students to increase revenue and that a central monitoring of workload and teaching quality was important.

Professor Stevenson inquired regarding the role of the central administration in support of teaching effectiveness. Vice Provost Fischer replied that responsibility resided with the Provost and involved the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Vice Provost for Faculty Development.

Vice Provost Fischer stated that he envisioned a consultative process involving an Ad Hoc Committee to oversee the transfer. He encouraged an expeditious process and mentioned designees from Deans' offices to serve at the decanal level.

Professor Adams suggested utilizing the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching Quality. Vice Provost Fischer advocated for an interim Ad Hoc Committee, citing the need for a fresh start and reconstituting the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching Quality at a later date. He suggested renaming the committee Teaching and Learning. Professor Adams stated that teaching effectiveness should not be limited to undergraduate education and that responsibility at the level of the Deans was not necessarily advantageous.

Vice Provost Fischer commented that his office operated on a limited budget of \$15,000 and that he was willing to oversee teaching quality but urged support from the Faculty Senate, the Provost and faculty colleagues.

Professor Jameson suggested that to increase interest in teaching effectiveness, it might be helpful to publish the top ten faculty members based on teaching evaluations and possibly increase the prestige associated with effective teaching. Professor Churchill voiced agreement with Professor Jameson and questioned what was being measured and what needed to be fixed.

Vice Provost Fischer agreed that improvement in teaching would be beneficial and that video

conferences might be utilized to address the issue.

Professor Ramesh commented that the Office of Teaching Effectiveness could not solve problems within departments. Vice Provost Fischer replied that problems could be brought to a set of resources.

Professor Schuel remarked that student evaluations might or might not be reflective of the classroom. He noted that during the previous spring, a resolution had been passed mandating that Chairs provide mentoring to faculty as part of continuation of appointment in the position of chair. Vice Provost Fischer replied that there had been a retreat for Chairs in June and that the question of mentoring had been discussed. He noted that chairs could not take the responsibility for teaching effectiveness.

Professor Albini expressed doubt that chairs would press teaching and noted that teaching was considered a "punishment" in various disciplines and a "burden to be done as cheaply as possible". He emphasized the need for a central authority.

Professor Wooldridge noted that teaching was one of the criteria for promotion. He suggested that mentoring should be formative. He suggested that moving the responsibility for improving faculty teaching to the department level could potentially for improving faculty teaching to the department level could potentially conflict with the need for such mentoring to be perceived as formative rather than summative by the faculty member being helped. He stated that mentoring from a Distinguished Teaching Professor was valuable and acceptable.

ITEM 7: New Business

Professor Adams offered the following resolution: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee expresses its appreciation to Peter A. Nickerson for his leadership as Chair of the Faculty Senate from 1993 to 1995. His term was especially noted for a revitalization of the Senate committee structure, the passage of a number of resolutions in support of undergraduate education and the ethical conduct of research, as well as Dr. Nickerson's collegial and open communication with the University Administration". The resolution was unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned and went into Executive Session.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: Provost Headrick, Vice Provost Fischer, Vice Provost Goodman

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: M. Hadighi

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

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

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

University Libraries: J. Adams

GUESTS:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

Professional Staff Senate: M. Stokes

Reporter: S. Cox

GUESTS: Senior Associate Vice President V. Innus, Associate Vice President H. Martens, M. Cowen, T.

Schroeder