

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of May 7, 1997 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on May 7, 1997 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. Report of the Chair
2. Report of the President
3. Report of the Affirmative Action Committee
4. Report on Arts and Humanities
5. Approval of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of May 13, 1997

Item 1: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that the Hearing Panel held its first meeting this morning; Vice-Provost Goodman spoke in favor of the proposed College of Arts & Sciences, and Professor Wang in favor of a tripartite arrangement consisting of Life Sciences, Physical & Natural Sciences, and a combination of Arts & Letters and Social Sciences. Professor Welch intended to address the Panel to compare the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed CAS reorganization, in terms of general organizational principles and personal observations of higher education administration.

The University Faculty Senate has officially recognized as outstanding four UB Student Life programs: the Student Academic Integrity Campaign, the Linda Yalem Memorial Run, the Guide to Important University Numbers, and Automated Placement Services. He also circulated materials on early

retirement incentives, the search for a Dean of Pharmacy, and a policy on procurement from minority- and women-owned businesses.

Faculty Senate Committees which met recently included Public Service, Teaching and Learning, and Athletics and Recreation. The Chair of the last committee, Professor Jameson, mentioned that it was presently discussing the anticipated impact and importance of a recent Supreme Court decision, the graduate student Athletics Fee, and the impact of the academic good standing policy on student athletes.

Professor Nickerson he had attended a meeting of the deans on Monday, May 5. He reported that the Provost reminded the deans ("in very strong words") that a response on the Women's Task Force was due and expected one to be submitted soon. Other items of discussion included retirement, hiring at Assistant Professor levels, the next steps in academic reorganization, and annual reports from the faculty.

Both the Chair and Professor Nickerson had met with the President, Provost, and Senior Vice-President to discuss President Greiner's acceptance of the principles of establishing a College of Arts & Sciences as quickly as possible; Professor Welch also indicated the possibility of convening a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in June, if appropriate, given the central position of the Senate in faculty governance.

Item 2: Report of the President

President Greiner talked about the academic planning process and the impending reorganization. he agreed with the sentiments expressed by Professor Trzinka in a letter to the *Reporter*, which stated that faculty members are not sufficiently engaged in the diagnosis of the University's problems, and are thus in effect removing themselves from the planning process. Although some have criticized the goals which the Provost outlined, no one has yet offered alternatives; if, as the President suspected, the Provost's diagnosis is right, then it is time "to move on to the prescriptions".

Three "macro" issues are of central concern: The College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), Responsibility-Centered Methodology (RCM), and resolutions of the problems surrounding the formation of centers and institutes --- in particular, finding ways of fostering interaction across departmental and school lines, which entails rethinking promotions and tenure. What we do, how we resolve these issues will determine what we do for the next 30 years, just as the planning in the 1960s have determined how we have operated until now. (At this point, the Provost disagreed, noting that, given the constant change in modern society, nothing will last thirty years; rather, what we establish now will better equip us to deal with the changes we will undoubtedly face.) The "micro" issues, for instance the American Studies/Women's Studies initiative, are to be worked out at the departmental and school levels.

He mentioned that the Hearing Panel is currently "taking testimony from the faculty" in their deliberations on the creation of a CAS, and hoped the faculty would take advantage of this; at present, however, hardly anyone is willing to talk to the Panel. Most AAU institutions, and all of our peer groups, he added, organize themselves through a similar CAS; those with different structures are much larger than UB. This and alternatives have been "studied to death", and it is time to move on. The creation of a CAS as an umbrella structure would

- state clearly the centrality of the Arts and Sciences at UB, and
- help us get a handle on several issues, including undergraduate education and the difficulties resulting from the separation of the three faculties.

The FSEC discussed scheduling an additional Faculty Senate meeting in June; Professor Wooldridge voiced some concern about convening a meeting during summer break, when few faculty are around. President Greiner warned against postponing the matter to the Fall 1997 semester, since this would only result in needless delays.

Item 3: Report of the Affirmative Action Committee

Professor Moore, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Affirmative Action (FSCAA), reported that that her Committee had met six times this past year and summarized its activities. Most important of these were the establishment of two subcommittees, one charged to determine why protected groups are underrepresented in higher administration and to suggest ways of changing this, the other charged to develop procedures for addressing salary disparities. The first subcommittee is scheduled to report in academic year 1997/98. On the matter of salary discrepancy, the FSCAA recommended the following:

- That the responsible administration officers (chairs or deans) discuss how they have addressed the salary inequity issue every year in their Annual Reports, providing information on salaries and other benefits, such as office space and the use of equipment and supplies, by protected category.
- That requests for pay equalization be considered as confidential.
- That the administrative officer treat all requests for equalization seriously, especially when a person is a member of a protected group, and provide good quantitative information relevant to the case.
- That the administrative officer devote some resources to equalization, and state the amount publicly.
- That the administrative officer treat requests for pay equalization separately from those for merit increases, since the two are separate items.
- That if a faculty member feel it necessary(s)he be able to appoint an advocate for assistance on pay equalization. Each case is to be addressed separately and judged on its own merit.
- That members of protected categories be able to communicate directly with the administrative officer at the next level, if the first level cannot resolve the matter satisfactorily.

On hiring members of protected groups proportional to the available pool, the FSCAA recommended that:

- Search committees include a member who has the knowledge of how to network and recruit members of protected groups. If the hiring unit does not include such a person, than the hiring unit at a higher administrative level provide one;
- Each school or comparable unit designate a person to fulfill the role described above;
- Each school or comparable unit designate or create an office to monitor its Affirmative Action Plan;
- Either the Affirmative Action Office or a Panel designated by the President be responsible for accepting and approving the Affirmative Action Plan for each unit;
- Appointments of members of protected groups to upper administrative positions be a goal during current administrative restructuring;
- A special effort be made to recruit SUNY - Buffalo graduates who are members of protected groups and qualified to be candidates for open faculty positions.

In addition, the FSCAA recommended the creation of a President's Task Force on Racial Minorities on Campus.

Professor Meidinger wondered why the recommendations mentioned only race, and not ethnicity or culture, since several of the relevant problems are cultural rather than racial. Professor Moore responded that the report is intended to be all-inclusive. Professor Bruckenstein asked why the FSCAA recommended hiring the University's own graduate students, since this type of "inbreeding" is not usually practiced; Professor Acara replied that there are arguments for and against, but that there is no *a priori* reason not to hire them. Professor Malone noted that it is important for the University's own students to first prove themselves elsewhere, in part to avoid any exploitation by a former thesis director. Professor Meacham added that hiring our own could cause trouble with outside reviewers as well

Professor Noble mentioned there are instances of other institutions developing their own students beyond the doctoral level in order to expand their own faculty; she also noted that a disproportionate

number of the women who have contributed in the past have been local products, usually either students, or the wives of faculty spouses, or both. The FSCAA, Professor Banks noted, was particularly concerned that "we are letting a certain number of wonderful students get away, and that there should be some mechanism [by which to keep them here at UB]".

The main point of the recommendations, Professor Frisch emphasized, is not to develop a series of rules for hiring and reimbursing, but rather to rethink a lot of the normal assumptions of hiring, and to increase diversification.

The FSEC voted to forward the report to the Faculty Senate for a first reading on May 13..

Item 4: Report on Arts and Humanities

Dean Grant explained that in February 1996 Provost Headrick had asked, while planning the budget process for the following year, for an unusual array of responses about programmatic involvements and interactions as part of that budget planning process. Instead of centering on the question of "How many dollars do you need to do what you've always done?", the issue focussed on "How is the institution going to get more from you while we invest less in you?" The question was particularly important for Arts & Letters, since this faculty was simultaneously involved in implementing the new curriculum, which had an enormous impact on its instructional resource allocation. The result was an \$800,000 structural deficit, i.e., providing essential instruction with "nothing under it except *float*" --- leave savings, half-time salaries, [...] and virtually anything else we could do to free a loose dollar".

Budget cuts, past and present, have eroded the base budget of Arts & Letters. The Faculty now faces the need to reduce its cost while increasing access to its programs, not only in the sense of meeting new needs from the undergraduate curriculum, but also in recognition of the relatively modest FTE generation within A&L. These three items --- the structural deficit, a new curriculum without any additional funding, and a sense that the historical teaching pattern in A&L "had let us slip in a competitive environment" --- came into play at the same time, forcing A&L into an outcomes-oriented strategy.

All this takes place, he reminded the FSEC, in a Faculty that has never been rich: For example, when he took office some six years ago, there was no faculty computing infrastructure, and rotary telephones were shared by three to five faculty members. In his opinion, A&L had responded well in protecting every dollar, while sacrificing any reasonable supportive professional environment. Since A&L did not have "the ability to participate in the economy of the University" in the ways other faculties do for funding research activities, Dean Grant had suggested to former Provost Bloch that some resources be reserved for travel and research support, publication subvention, and the development of a computing infrastructure for A&L faculty. Although some faculty had advocated abandoning all this supportive infrastructure in favor of sustaining the instructional capacity, he had declined to entertain the idea for several reasons: First, morale was more important than any marginal savings. Secondly, the added infrastructure totaled the equivalent of perhaps one newly promoted Full Professor. Third, and perhaps most importantly, "the long-term health and reputation of Arts & Letters" clearly justified the expense. Dean Grant added that "we have never cut a TA" since he has been Dean, "despite all the budget cuts".

The series of small reductions over the years resulted in the elimination of virtually all instructional activities that were not required; courses retained either served the majors, were part of the core curriculum, or provided essential support for the graduate programs. Moreover, the problem is further complicated by the diversity of A&L, consisting of 11 Departments ranging in size from about three to sixty faculty members. The budget reduction target of \$800,000 was larger than the budget for the three smallest faculties combined. The simplistic solution of removing eight faculty lines from English (the largest department in A&L) was not feasible, since English has one of the most highly regarded graduate programs at UB.

The information he distributed at the FSEC meeting had also been shared with the chairs and faculty in A&L, when Dean Grant had asked for suggestions of how to realize the necessary cuts. They sought to identify not only savings, but also synergies. In addition to a time chart listing the meetings with each department, he distributed a compendium of responses to a questionnaire showing possible cross-affiliations of all A&L faculty, i.e., showing in what other areas each could work. The faculty were asked to consider and suggest possible structural changes in the organization of A&L, and they submitted "an enormous number of responses"; the Dean presented ten potential models arising from

these responses. He suggested these materials would be of particular interest and use in designing a College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), since they illustrate the cross-disciplinary interests of most A&L faculty, as well as possible configurations of both graduate and undergraduate instruction.

"In the end," he continued, "the response from the faculty which was asked to reduce its cost by \$800,000, which we calculated to be between 8 and 12 faculty members, came in with a net *increase* in the faculty at a few FTE". After some initial surprise, his Office recognized "that it is precisely the faculty's job to push the envelope [and] to have a local vision for what we've done, and to say [...] *Look how much more we can do, with just a little more*". Although the A&L faculty did not really think about, or achieve, budget reductions, they did show an understanding of new relationships and synergies and values inside Arts & Letters --- sparking novel conversations and ideas of new configurations.

The Dean recognized the need to reduce a number of redundancies in teaching assignments and overlapping courses in A&L, and to better coordinate the overall curriculum. Nevertheless, he recommended to the Provost that changes be executed over time, since any "precipitous change" seemed unacceptable. Given the natural attrition rate (due to a relatively large group of faculty approaching retirement), opportunities for restructuring --- and for increased disciplinary activities as recommended in the Provost's planning document --- would open up steadily over the next few years. He argued that that there is no need for department closings or faculty relocation. Moreover, having enough time for change to set in would allow A&L to retain most of its present culture.

He then offered a few conclusions about the planning process. First, there is no good decision to be made in a unit that has undergone such drastic changes as A&L; "the issue is not a good decision, [but rather] the best bad decision". Second, one strong lesson from the process is "the absolute critical nature of any advisory body that wishes to have its advice seriously considered: *It must accept the parameters which guided the decision*". Most of the conversation following the A&L planning efforts has been "smoke and gossip, because of the refusal of the faculty to accept the conditions under which the Dean made the decisions". Any advice which fails to take into consideration these conditions is useless and specious, since it does not help answer the problems.

Professor Frisch mentioned that he had composed an extensive and detailed response to the Dean's decisions, in which he tried to assess the costs and benefits of "a proposed particular decision". He had argued strongly that some of the assumptions were faulty, and that it was particularly inappropriate, "at a moment when all the University goals involved inclusion, interdisciplinary, diversification, and so forth, to be destroying the one program that was doing a lot of that". The Dean's response, he continued, seemed to say that "if I were not solving the budget problem, my advice was irrelevant at that point". Professor Frisch insisted that solving the budget problem is not the faculty's job; it is the Dean's job to explain to the Provost why the Humanities are important, and the costs of diminishing their role in the University; and it is not inappropriate for a faculty member, whose department or program is on the line, to try to explain to the Dean why it feels a particular decision is wrong, for whatever reason. Dean Grant agreed that faculty advice is important, and in making the decision, he sought faculty advice in order to "broaden the base of that decision". The deficit will not disappear through any reorganization effort without affecting the size, scope, and mission of Arts & Letters.

Professor Meacham asked if the Dean had developed any enrollment models for the different departments or found some way to make enrollment projections. Dean Grant responded that the process had emphasized other aspects, such as program mission, centrality, and the like; the dilemma was that everything was important, in different ways.

Item 5: Approval of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 13, 1997

The agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: Claude E. Welch

Secretary: Robert G. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: Michael Frisch

Dental Medicine: Robert Baier

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Robert Wetherhold

Health-Related Professions: Atif Awad

Law: Errol Meidinger

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albin, Bernice Noble

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: James Faran, Stanley Bruckenstein

Nursing: Powhatan Wooldridge

Pharmacy: Nathan

Social Sciences: Jack Meacham

SUNY Senators: Maureen Jameson, Dennis Malone, Peter Nickerson, Claude Welch

University Libraries: Marilyn Kramer

Guests:

University Officers:

William R. Greiner, *President*

Thomas Headrick, *Provost*

Robert Wagner, *Senior Vice-President*

Kenneth Levy, *Senior Vice-Provost*

William Fischer, *Vice-Provost*

Sean Sullivan, *Vice-Provost*

Kerry Grant, *Dean, Faculty of Arts & Letters*

Affirmative Action Committee:

Brenda Moore, *Chair*

Margaret Acara

David Banks

Michael Frisch

Elizabeth Kennedy

Mattie Rhodes

Sue Wuetcher, *The Reporter*

Excused:

Management: Ramaswamy Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Herbert Schuel

Absent:

Architecture & Planning: G. Scott Danford

Arts & Letters: James Pappas

Graduate School of Education: James Hoot

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Social Sciences: Michael Farrell