

**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**January 23, 2013**

**Chair:**

Ezra B. W. Zubrow

**Secretary:**

Edward Herman

**Arts & Sciences:**

William H. Baumer

Melvyn Churchill

Steven Durbin (Excused)

Stephen Dyson

**Dental Medicine:**

Elaine Davis

**Engineering & Applied Sciences:**

Adly Fam

Joseph Mollendorf (Excused)

**Graduate School Of Education:**

Ming Chiu for Suzanne Miller

**Law:**

Lynn Mather (Excused)

**Management:**

Larry Sanders

**Medicine & Biomedical Sciences:**

James Hassett (Excused)

Ranjit Singh

Michael Stachowiak

**Nursing:**

Grace Dean

**Pharmacy:**

Alice Ceacareanu

**SUNY Senators:**

Jennifer Gottdiener

Donald Grinde

Kathleen Kielar

Peter Nickerson

**University Libraries:**

Beth Adelman

**Parliamentarian:**

William H. Baumer

**President**

Satish K. Tripathi (Excused)

**Provost**

Charles (Chip) Zukoski (Excused)

**GUESTS:**

Ann Marie Landel, Professional Staff Senate

Kara Saunders, Registrar

Ernest Steinberg, Urban and Regional Planning

- FSEC approved the minutes of November 28, 2012.
- **Chair's Report:** Zubrow urged Faculty Senate committees to meet with the Campus Advisory Committee that will make recommendations to the Provost about Realizing UB 2020.
- **Institutional course evaluation:** See Appendix A, University-Wide Course Evaluations.

- Scott Weber, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs made the case for implementing a campus wide course evaluation system that would enable the University to compare evaluations among different courses.
  - Weber acknowledged the need for flexibility. The system would include questions asked in all UB classes, plus additional questions unique to schools and departments.
  - Michael Ryan, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, echoed Weber's ideas.
  - Weber would like a committee that includes representatives from all schools, the Faculty Senate, and CIT to make recommendations by the end of the Spring semester. W. Baumer thought such a large group would be unwieldy.
  - Zubrow said a Faculty Senate committee will be formed and will complete its work within the said deadline.
  - Kara Saunders, University Registrar, and S. Weber spoke about the proposed **Winter Intersession**.
- 
- Weber has been talking to schools and departments about the issues.
  - SUNY's other three University Centers have Winter intersessions.
  - Weber emphasized that the goal is to supplement Fall and Spring courses, not reduce their availability.
  - [Click here](#) to view Saunders slides that summarize:
- 
- Why a Winter intersession is necessary.
  - Benefits of the intersession—increased enrollment and revenue is significant. Using Stony Brook as an example, Saunders estimated that 2,200 students taking 3 credit courses would yield approximately \$2 million. Approximately 10% of Stony Brook students take Winter intersession classes.
  - Possible course offerings might include intensive language study, distance learning, internships, undergraduate research experiences, field research, and "boot camps"—courses that would enable undergraduates who had difficulty in prerequisite courses during the Fall semester to master the subject enabling them to continue in the Spring.

- The courses will benefit international students who are already on campus during Winter intersessions.
  - Courses would be at undergraduate and graduate levels.
  - All Winter intersession courses at Albany are online. Binghamton and Stony Brook use a combination online and classroom approach. Online courses at UB would require CIT to change its procedures because it currently does not support this during the Winter intersession.
  - Classroom courses would meet 14 times over 3 weeks. Responding to A. Fam who asked how such a limited time would account for snow days, Web admitted this was not considered.
  - Faculty would receive extra service salary for teaching Winter intersession classes. Saunders said it would be up to departments to make other arrangements about reduced workloads for Fall and Spring semesters to accommodate those who choose that route.
- 
- Bill Baumer led a discussion about **revised academic calendars** that account for the Winter intersession. [Click here](#) to view the proposed calendars and an explanation.
  - Zubrow noted that Spring graduation and final exams in some cases overlap. Baumer responded that it is the usual practice for graduating students to participate in commencement when grades for their last exams are not yet entered. Saunders added that the Medical School is the only unit that holds graduation after final grades are determined.
  - Changes in the Academic Calendar do not affect special schedules followed by the Law, Medical, and Dental Schools.
  - An FSEC member asked Baumer if it makes sense to use a trimester model in place of the revised calendar. He replied that the quarterly system was unsuccessful at the Rochester Institute of Technology, and that Binghamton's attempt at trimesters was disliked by students and faculty. D. Grinde noted that he taught at a school where the quarter system was problematic.
  - Baumer recommended that FSEC adopt Calendar 1A as opposed to 1. Under 1A, the winter intersession begins on Wednesday, January 5, while Calendar 1 begins on Monday, January

3. Baumer argued that January 5 would be more attractive to students and faculty than January 3. FSEC accepted his recommendation by rejecting Calendar 1.

- FSEC postponed discussion of two controversial calendar issues until its next meeting: observance of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

- FSEC approved the following:

### **Faculty Senate Meeting**

**February 12, 2013**

### **Proposed Ground Rules**

The Faculty Senate will hold a special meeting of the voting faculty on February 12 from 3:00-5:00 in the Center for Tomorrow to comment upon and discuss the Realizing UB2020 initiative. The Provost held several open forums about this during past months, and Bruce McCombe or John Thomas held meetings with departments and units to gather feedback. The Faculty Senate Web site has a comment form where professors can add their two-cents on the issues. The purpose of this meeting is to bring the entire faculty together to discuss the issues as one unit.

The following ground rules will govern discussion:

- Comments and feedback submitted prior to publication of this notice will be distributed electronically for meeting participants to discuss. Anonymity will be maintained. Those in attendance will have an opportunity to debate each comment.
- Discussion of each comment will be limited to a maximum of 5 minutes to keep the meeting to a reasonable time period. The Parliamentarian will serve as time keeper.
- Discussion will resemble brain-storming sessions where it is appropriate to air all views in a non-judgmental fashion.

- The Faculty Senate will not vote on which viewpoints ought to be forwarded to the Provost and the Campus Advisory Committee. All viewpoints will be forwarded.
- The Faculty Senate will consider additional comments and feedback under the same rules after discussion of those submitted in advance.
- **Shale Institute:** Ernie Sternberg attended hoping to discuss the Shale Institute, but agreed to do so at the next FSEC meeting due to today's time restraints.

Prepared by  
Edward Herman, Secretary  
Faculty Senate

## **Appendix A**

*Proposal for Faculty Senate Consideration*  
Committee for University-Wide Course Evaluations  
January 23, 2013

## **University-Wide Course Evaluations**

**Challenge:** Currently, the University at Buffalo, has no university-wide standard format for course evaluations. At least four different electronic platforms and three written platforms are used across the twelve schools. The current environment presents challenges by promoting confusion in students, especially undergraduates, who are often using multiple course evaluation platforms within a single semester, inhibits collection of consistent institutional data for university wide assessment of instruction, there is no common data set for evaluating instructional effectiveness at promotion, and is inefficient from both an administrative and cost perspective.

**Opportunity:** Implement a single uniform university-wide course evaluation program that has common questions but also allows for decanal and departmental specific questions.

**Proposal:** Under the auspices of the Faculty Senate, establish a Committee to explore the benefits and challenges of a single university-wide course evaluation system and make recommendations on its format and adoption.