

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of July 10, 1996(approved)

revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

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

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [State of the University \(Vice-President Robert Wagner\)](#)
3. [Other Matters](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that he had met with the chairs of the standing committees, some of which have been active during the summer, and with several Deans. He noted that, for the coming year, there are several gaps to be filled in the membership of these committees.

Professor Welch also reported that he had attended a meeting on Faculty Productivity in Los Angeles (Long Beach), at which the participants expressed much support for the principles discussed, although the details of evaluating productivity remained somewhat "sticky".

Professor Welch reported that he had also spoken with colleagues at Stony Brook, whose Faculty Senate co-sponsors a system of evaluation of senior administration officers which has proven very useful.

The Chair announced his plan to circulate the revised document of Senate resolutions over the past ten years, since he felt it important to disseminate the actions of the Senate.

He then asked for discussion and advice on where to convene Faculty Senate meetings for the coming academic year. The two main options available were the Center for Tomorrow and the 3rd-floor room of the Student Union. Professor Malone noted that another possibility, that of meeting in the Center for the Arts, would prove to be prohibitive in cost. Professor Meacham asked

whether there was enough seating in the Union, to which Professor Eberlein added that if the Senate were indeed to convene in the Union, it would need to reserve the room soon. Professor Wetherhold expressed mixed feelings about the Union site, saying that it was convenient, but restrictive in its seating arrangement. Professor Horvath suggested moving the beginning of the Senate meetings from 2:00 to 2:15 pm. since this would make it easier for Senators from the South Campus to attend. Professor Schuel remarked that the parking problem would be solved if the meetings were to be held at the Center for Tomorrow. Professor Ferry asked whether the Cornell Theater could be used; Professor Horvath added that there is also a meeting room across from the theater. Professor Wooldridge noted that meeting at the Student Union would attract more students, but that the Center for Tomorrow was much more favorable for parking.

Professor Farrell commented that faculty could also ride the shuttle bus to the Center for Tomorrow, and thus would not lose their parking spaces. Professor Jameson wondered whether special hang tags could be issued for South Campus personnel attending meetings on the North Campus. Professor Acara thought more meetings should be held on the South Campus. Professor Welch concluded the discussion by suggesting a compromise, by which occasional FSEC meetings would be held on the South Campus, but that Senate meetings would be convened in the Center for Tomorrow.

Item 2: State of the University and Budget Update

Senior Vice-President Robert Wagner reported on the nomination and appointment (effective immediately) of Dr. John W. Ryan as Interim Chancellor. He distributed a memorandum on this matter from Thomas Egan, Chair of the SUNY Board of Trustees, as well as a letter from the Office of University Relations. To Professor Welch's question as to whether other senior positions are being filled, Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that all searches for such positions must wait first until Ryan's arrival, and then until the appointment of a permanent Chancellor.

Senior Vice-President Wagner then distributed an updated summary of the State Operating Budget for 1996-97, which lists the initial and current contexts as well as implications for UB. He discussed these briefly before entertaining questions. Professor Malone asked whether there is any interest in the early retirement program. Senior Vice- President Wagner replied that slightly over 100 had opted for it. Professor Horvath asked if that figure was statewide, to which Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that it represented 100 at UB alone. Professor Horvath wondered whether facets of the current budget plan were still up for negotiation. Senior Vice-President Wagner answered affirmatively; all were awaiting resolutions on policy issues, but his sense was that the numbers will not be changing. Professor Jameson asked whether the issue of differential tuition was entirely dead. Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that there was agreement on differential tuition, but not for 1996-97; it might be possible in

1997-98, but a certain amount of lead time is necessary. Professor Jameson asked then if he was encouraged by differential tuition as envisioned by President Greiner. Senior Vice-President Wagner answered that there is no clear sense of how it would be enacted or executed.

Professor Schuel asked what percentage of the total budget the \$6 million reduction constituted, and whether retrenchment would be a consequence of this reduction. Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that the amount comprised 3 percent of the total budget, and he did not anticipate any retrenchment or elimination of programs for fiscal 1996-97. Professor Malone asked whether the \$3 million capital equipment allocation included replacement(s); Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that it was half-and-half. Professor Malone also asked about the possibility of increasing tuition for graduate and out-of-state students; Wagner replied that he did not expect this. Senior Vice-President Wagner then briefly discussed two other points. First, he mentioned that unexpended operating funds from increased management effectiveness carried over from one year to the next; otherwise, there was not much to report on this matter. Secondly, he explained that the fee increases were a complicated issue, since several are out of our control and are determined by the Board of Trustees.

Professor Schuel wondered whether it was possible to recoup the money which the State took out; Senior Vice-President Wagner replied negatively, adding that it would not offset the budget reduction. Professor Welch inquired about the new Mathematics Building. Senior Vice-President Wagner said that Phase II of the FSNM was certainly in the long-term plans. The building would be simple, basic, used mainly for offices, would be under construction in 12 to 15 months, and should be available by Fall 1999. He added that Cooke-Hochstetter was being refurbished, repaired for leaking, and "down-sized for energy purposes". Professor Horvath asked about construction projects for the Medical School. Senior Vice-President Wagner answered that this was part of the South Campus master plan; among the many changes to be enacted were inside rehabs, moving, upgrading the architecture and technology of several buildings. Professor Horvath asked whether the move of Mathematics would precede that of Nursing. Senior Vice-President Wagner said that the Mathematics Building was not crucial, that the renovation of Harriman Hall was more important and, once completed, would allow other moves to be made. Professor Welch, noting that the new Math building would not have classrooms, wondered whether planning could reduce the flow of students faster. He remarked that a few faculty members can move more easily than hundreds of students, and suggested that Math classes could potentially be held on the North campus early than 1999. Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that the Faculty of Natural Sciences & Mathematics would look into this. Professor Wooldridge mentioned that the School of Nursing was tied to the renovation of Harriman Hall, and asked about the estimated time of completion. Senior Vice-President Wagner answered that he was not sure, and would look at the schedule.

Professor Jameson asked whether the \$6 million reduction would be parcelled out "across the board", or whether there would be a differential allocation of these cuts. Senior Vice-President Wagner responded that the Vice-Presidents only present plans to the President as to how to accommodate the allocations.

Professor Acara wanted to know about the classroom renovation in Farber-Sherman. Senior Vice-President Wagner answered that there is a priority list, but that he was not sure which rooms are included. Professor Eberlein asked about the cost of buses, since Mathematics would be moving. Senior Vice-President Wagner said there was a \$1.5 million yearly bus contract. Professor Welch added that the costs of the bus service were met largely by fees. Professor Churchill, on the topic of the move of Mathematics, observed that there was a shortage of classrooms of a particular size, and that there will be a great need for larger rooms. Senior Vice-President Wagner mentioned that a longer school day would help offset this problem, and that there are several ways to adjust.

Professor Wooldridge wondered whether there would be a negative impact on UB's image were the State Budget not to pass by the time classes begin. Senior Vice-President Wagner said no, there would not be.

Item 3: Other Matters

Professor Welch reported that he is working on a response to President Greiner's letter of acknowledgement and acceptance of the revisions to Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and the Charter of the Faculty Senate. Professor Welch also announced his plan to send copies of all Senate resolutions to the President. Professor Welch then distributed a tentative schedule for the Senate and FSEC meetings, as well as a list of the major issues the FSEC should consider during the Fall 1996 semester. He then asked for other matters of discussion.

Some concern was expressed concerning the style of exchange between the President and the FSEC; it seems that often the President does the talking and addresses the committee, while the committee listens and merely reacts by asking questions. One member noted that this was to some extent the fault of the members, who most often ask questions which set President Greiner off on a particular issue; instead (the member suggested), FSEC members should express opinions, and not ask questions.

Another suggested that rather than being "hit with the news", FSEC members should come to the meetings prepared with specific questions. Yet another thought that the President was encouraged to "lecture" by the tendency of past reporters to only relate pronouncements of the President instead of the discussions which took place. One member proposed that the FSEC prepare a list of topics to discuss with the President. This member also observed that the comments and questions directed at the President or

Provost were often phrased in a negative way; since anyone would get tired of this, we should seriously consider rephrasing our comments in such a way that would lead to a more positive and meaningful discussion.

Discussion then turned to the resolutions of the Governance Committee. Professor Welch noted that the only issue was what criteria would constitute the breakdown of a unit's governance.

On the matter of decanal evaluations, Professor Welch suggested that the FSEC should direct its attention to the three schools where the deans have departed; assessing the strengths and the weaknesses of the former deans would be helpful for their replacements. Professor Wetherhold asked why decanal evaluations would be valuable. Professor Welch responded that if the faculty is to be held accountable for their performance and productivity, then this accountability should be applicable to all; in addition, the deans should be willing and open to such evaluations. Professor Wetherhold then asked who would carry out the evaluations, and what would be done with them. Professor Welch referred to the example at Stony Brook, and asked Professor Meacham for advice. Professor Meacham stressed that there were different traditions and expectations in different decanal units, and that evaluations should be left to the different Faculties and Schools instead of the Faculty Senate. Professor Malone noted that the issue of decanal evaluations had already come up in the Senate, was put on hold, and, since several deans have already departed, such evaluations may no longer be critical or important. Professor Wetherhold added that if we wish to carry out such evaluations and establish certain principles, now is the time to do so. Professor Acara remarked that at present we have many interim deans, and should be concerned with the search for new deans. Professor Wooldridge urged that these evaluations be done formatively, and not summatively. Professor Schuel stated that higher administration officials should also be evaluated, but wondered how and by whom; furthermore, he believed there should be some mechanism to ensure that unfavorable comments by faculty members would not come to haunt them. Professor Horvath commented that the central purpose of faculty evaluations was teaching quality; this being so, he pleaded that we move forward on this. Professor Wetherhold added that there were several complaints about the questions on the evaluations, and that these must be improved. Professor Malone informed the FSEC that at Stony Brook, several Distinguished Teaching Professors met once a month to discuss these matters; he suggested that something similar might be done at UB.

The FSEC then went into Executive Session to discuss Senate committee memberships.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing

Faculty Secretary

Those present:

University Officers: R. Wagner

Senate Officers: C. Welch, R. Hoeing

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, H. Schuel

Natural Sciences: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein, J. Faran

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, J. Meacham

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, C. Welch

University Libraries: M. Kramer

GUESTS:

Reporter: C. Vidal

Spectrum: S. Watson