

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of March 6, 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 of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the minutes of February 7, 1996](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Learning](#)
5. [Presentation by Dean Lopos and Acting Vice President Sheffer on MFC](#)
6. [Presentation by Associate Vice President Martens and Professor Cowen on Vision 99 and Computing](#)
7. [Approval of the agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 12, 1996](#)
8. [Old Business](#)
9. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the minutes of February 7, 1996

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of February 7, 1996. Professor Sellers noted that Professor Hopkins had advised to add Vice Provost Fischer and Professor Kramer to the guests listed in the attendance section of the minutes and that paragraph 8 on page 3 should be modified to "sending the Secretary-elect and the Chair-elect to the meeting". The minutes were approved as amended.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch commented that: It was unfortunate that Professor Noble had not had sufficient time during her report on the Task

Force on Women at UB to provide concluding remarks and respond to questions and that he would request her return at a future date.

The Academic Planning Committee (APC) would be meeting with the Provost regarding a set of suggestions for the academic future at the University. He noted that it was the responsibility of the Senate to ensure wide discussion of the "Managing the Academic Future of UB" document. He suggested including discussion of the document on the agenda of the Faculty Senate.

The President had sent a note to Professor Welch requesting clarification of information on the revisions of the Bylaws and Charter and had been sent another clearer print copy of the document.

Materials had been sent from the Provost to the Deans to collect data on Faculties and Schools for verification. Vice Provost Fischer had concurred that the Deans should supplement and correct the information and return the data to the Provost.

The Provost would be unable to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee during the regularly scheduled Executive Session next week and Professor Welch suggested discussing the "Managing the Academic Future of UB" document or the program inventories being collected by the Deans.

The Provost had implemented the Faculty Senate resolutions on Undergraduate Teaching Assistants and the Fresh Start Policy and had commended the Faculty Senate for its wisdom and judgment with the Fresh Start Policy. He remained cautious regarding the Undergraduate Teaching Assistants resolution but had endorsed the policy.

Discussion continued regarding low enrollment classes and the use of Independent Studies to reflect that the course had been taken. Professor Malone stated that if a course was taught, it stayed on the books and there was no need for zero enrollment courses. He noted that a course being taught should rightfully be included in one's course load. Professor Danford stated that the section capacity could be listed as zero with the enrollment using the actual number of students registered. Professor Malone questioned the authority of Registrar Eck to comment on Independent Studies not counting as part of one's teaching load. Professor Welch stated that not counting Independent Studies was impossible. Professor Malone commented that with low enrollment teaching, faculty might be asked to do

something in addition. Professor Nickerson suggested zeroing out a section without stopping low enrollment courses. Vice Provost Fischer stated that immediate agreement was needed between the faculty member and the Chair and that the situation was "tricky". Professor Welch remarked that the issue should be reviewed in depth. Professor Malone stated that a large increase in Independent Studies would not be appropriate. Professor Welch suggested discussing low enrollment courses as an agenda item in the future. Professor Horvath stated that courses needed to be included in scheduling plans nine months prior to being taught. Professor Danford stated that he would raise the issue with Assistant Vice President Noll.

The likelihood of a state budget being passed prior to passage of the federal budget was slim. The impact of the federal budget questions on the state budget was noted and the fact that there was no action in the state legislature addressing the budget issue. Strong support for TAP restoration for the public and private colleges and universities was reported. It was noted that SUNY was "in trouble" if reductions of \$90 million did not include the flexibility items.

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost

Provost Headrick stated that he was interested in feed regarding the Managing the Academic Future of UB document. He stated that he was in the process of gathering information for program profiles and future planning.

Professor Malone commented that the Academic Planning Committee was scheduled to meet with Provost Headrick on March 15, 1996.

Provost Headrick stated that he was reviewing missions and resources and attempting to find ways to use resources to enable students to learn more with less direct input. He noted that the issue was quite difficult.

Professor Adams asked how proposals from the Deans were generated. Provost Headrick replied that baseline data were being gathered and that a compendium would be shared. He noted that he

intended to collect as much feed as possible regarding convergence and divergence related to available resources and planning for the future.

Professor Wooldridge stated that student opinions of professors and what the students learned were not highly correlated. He stated that it was necessary to be discipline specific regarding student outcome. Provost Headrick agreed that reasonable measures were needed and that he was not pleased with the present evaluation instrument. Professor Wooldridge noted that process rather than outcome was usually measured. Professor Churchill suggested the use of GRE scores to measure outcome. Provost Headrick noted that student percentile ranking had decreased at Harvard from time of acceptance to time of graduation, illustrating the need for various types of information.

Professor Henderson remarked that different information was appropriate at different times. He stated that yearly evaluations were adequate but the outcome information would be more critical during tenure and promotion. Provost Headrick agreed and mentioned course restructuring and the importance of teaching quality.

Vice Provost Fischer noted that changes in profile would be necessary due to economic pressures. He noted that shifts and changes in structure and curriculum might result. He commented on institutional and disciplinary change.

Professor Eberlein noted that the document had intimated changes in teaching and she recognized that teaching evaluations varied dependent on class size. She asked if the umbrella organization would include members of different disciplines. Provost Headrick replied that the structure and provision of education might involve integrated propositions based on an estimate of future needs for preparation of students. He stated that compartmentalization might not be the expectation of society. Provost Headrick stated that there were traditional and innovative ways to convey information and he noted that education occurred without the classroom regularly and cited the example of an assignment to read a text.

ITEM 4: Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Learning

Professor Welch noted that the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching and Learning had been formed subsequent to the abolition of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness. He stated that the committee was composed partially of a group of distinguished teaching faculty with Vice Provost Fischer as convener. Professor Welch commented that the committee was an important example of joint thinking between senior faculty and the administration.

Vice Provost Fischer stated that the Office of Teaching Effectiveness had been abolished due to a budgetary decision. He noted that resources for teaching support would hopefully be brought closer to faculty within decanal units. He listed the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee which included Deans Goldberg, Grant, Petrie and Lopos and distinguished teachers, Professors Ebert, Herreid, Thomas and Ludwig. In respect to the charge, Vice Provost Fischer stated that the proposal was not for the exact nature of responsibility but to structure a context of activities and associated responsibilities. He commented on the concept of a tier of committees with a focus at the decanal level. He suggested the possibility of committees within departments and an overview committee at the level of the Provost.

Vice Provost Fischer stated that he welcomed responses regarding establishment of the committee and suggested that there should be representation of each decanal/School unit resulting in approximately 15 members. In creating the structure of the committee, Vice Provost Fischer stated that the issues were substantial and open to modification and change. He encouraged public dialogue on the issue of teaching as it related to scholarship. He suggested reconstitution of the Teaching Quality Committee of the Faculty Senate as the Faculty Senate Teaching and Learning Committee and proposed that the committee work closely with the provostal level committee to move the teaching agenda.

Professor Welch thanked Vice Provost Fischer for the steps taken and noted that additional work remained for the committee. Vice Provost Fischer stated that the recommendations would be shared with the Faculty Senate and the Provost.

Professor Adams voiced concern about the number of levels on the committee and filtering the responsibility. She mentioned the differences between decanal and departmental levels and that the provostal committee was composed of liaisons from the decanal levels. Vice Provost Fischer replied that the vision at the provostal level was from the decanal units. He agreed that accountability and

responsibility was important but that the major issue was human resources and support. He stated that it was necessary to find ways to be innovative in teaching support activities with the actual resources available. He noted that it was important to be close to the disciplines in the support and mentioned workshops and mentoring. He commented on reconfiguration and marshalling of resources as necessary.

Provost Headrick commented that input was important regarding the quality of teaching from departments, Deans and the provostal level in that order.

Professor Jameson commented that the Office of Teaching Effectiveness had provided a forum for interdisciplinary discussions and she inquired into an alternative for this function. Vice Provost Fischer replied that supervision of the quality of teaching had not been in his original portfolio but that the duties of the former Office of Teaching Effectiveness had devolved to his office and that an alternative would be provided for interdisciplinary opportunities. Professor Jameson noted the value of in-house colloquia of an interdisciplinary nature. Vice Provost Fischer stated that he was open to ideas for collaboration and initiation of colloquia. Professor Jameson commented on teaching evaluations and Vice Provost Fischer replied that questions needed to be worked out at the decanal level. Professor Jameson asked if there were University-wide norms. Vice Provost Goodman responded that Professor Thorpe had attempted to develop a teaching evaluation instrument. He noted that UB CATS was used in Arts and Letters, the School of Management and Social Sciences. He recognized technical problems and the fact that an easier to use instrument was under consideration and formulation. He stated that academic input was needed as to the right questions to ask that would be useful across the University. He acknowledged that as the technical tool developed, it was hoped that it would be useful across the University.

Professor Welch commented that the Faculty-Student Handbook stated an institutional policy of each department developing, adopting and implementing a method of teaching evaluation.

Vice Provost Fischer replied that there was a universal practice to complete teaching evaluations without a universal method for solicitation and access. He stated that it was desirable to bring teaching into the public eye.

Professor Malone inquired into specific charges and a reporting date on the formation of the committee. Vice Provost Fischer replied that he had a sense that the Provost and the Faculty Senate needed to fashion a charge and determine the structure of the committee. Professor Nickerson questioned the role of faculty governance at the decanal level. He recommended inclusion of faculty within the formation of the committee.

Professor Welch recommended a joint consultative process. Vice Provost Fischer commented on the committee emerging as a result of a collaborative process. Professor Welch noted that the Faculty Senate Public Service Committee had discovered that less than half of the Schools and Faculties had developed committees specifically to define public service in fashions appropriate to the particular decanal unit as requested by the Faculty Senate resolution, and that response time to the request for committee formation had been slow. He voiced skepticism about the process of committee formation and noted that teaching was even more central than public service.

Professor Horvath commented that a key issue was development of rapport with the student body. He inquired into access to information regarding student evaluations during tenure and promotion matters. Vice Provost Fischer replied that practices were uneven across the University. Vice Provost Goodman stated that course evaluations provided important information to students and suggested a return to publication of the data.

Professor Malone stated that course evaluations provided useful information and he questioned whether the practice had raised concerns with UUP. Professor Jameson stated that broader, reliable norms were needed. Professor Welch advised consideration of involvement of colleagues in the matter. Vice Provost Fischer stated that the Senate should decide if the Teaching Quality Committee should be modified to the Teaching and Learning Committee. He noted that the committee should play a role in assessment of teaching in cooperation with the Provost.

Provost Headrick commented that to meet the current economic challenges, creative teaching might necessitate student learning with less faculty input.

ITEM 5: Presentation by Dean Lopos and Acting Vice President Sheffer on MFC

It was noted that the number of students applying to MFC had declined in recent years. Vice President Sheffer stated that MFC serves a critically important role in Public Service and fulfilling the mission of the University. He remarked that MFC cannot afford to "stand pat". He supported the effort of Dean Lopos to reinvent and respond to the challenges facing MFC through new initiatives.

Dean Lopos mentioned the Telecommunications Act and noted that he had shared copies of the important sections with Professor Welch. He commented on the effect of the Telecommunications Act on MFC associated with distance learning.

It was noted that enrollment in MFC has decreased from 1971 to the present at an approximate rate of 15% per year. Anomalies such as downsizing of industry were mentioned and the desired steady state number of students of approximately 2,000 was noted. The number of students twenty-five years ago was reported to have been approximately 6,000. The decreased enrollment was correlated with increased tuition and it was noted that part-time and full-time registrations were fairly equivalent.

Numerous reasons were noted for the declining enrollment including increased local competition, a poorer economy, changes in demographics, decreased availability of academic programs and increased tuition. Additional reasons for reduced enrollment which were responsive to change were an identity problem, a focus on undergraduate studies, limited marketing and undifferentiated enrollment targets.

Regarding the identity problem, Dean Lopos revealed a marketing study which had suggested a change in logo and the concept of "your University at night". MFC was identified as the only national University in Western New York. An internal review had been completed to identify weaknesses and strengths which included staff and programs of all units. The possibility of an external review was discussed. Dean Lopos stated that he was open to suggestions for the process.

Monthly meetings including faculty and students with the Dean were reported and the importance of on-line resources to facilitate faculty communication.

Regarding academic program reviews, the charge to review the approximately twenty certificate programs was mentioned and the difficulties involved in offering attractive courses to non-traditional students. Dean Lopos stressed that the evening should not be a clone of the day. He noted the current focus on undergraduate studies and stated that MFC was beginning to offer graduate programs that were complementary rather than duplicative of day offerings.

In terms of program development, Dean Lopos stated that faculty were encouraged to develop new programs. He mentioned a community survey related to interests, visits to community colleges and articulation agreements. He noted that upon completion of an Associate's degree, a mechanism was available to complete a Bachelor's degree on a full-time basis but that a mechanism for part-time study was not readily available. Distance learning was labeled a key to opening doors. Dean Lopos stated that with lucrative grants and faculty assistance, the field of distance learning was within reach. A grant application for distance learning and continuing education was mentioned.

Dean Lopos stated that differentiated targeting of students was an imperative and he noted the various publics to be served including the urban, suburban and rural areas. He mentioned mailings and cable television advertisements and contacts with business and industry.

Professor Horvath mentioned outreach programs and the Minnesota Plan. Dean Lopos stated that MFC was involved with negotiations with the Williamsville Central School District.

Professor Albini inquired into the academic mission of MFC. Dean Lopos replied that the mission of MFC was to make UB available to students unable to attend the University during the day. He noted that the typical student was non-traditional and desired access to a program to fill professional or educational needs. He stressed the importance of selective offerings. Professor Albini asked if offerings were more vocational in nature and Dean Lopos responded positively.

Professor Nickerson inquired about day students registered in MFC. Dean Lopos reiterated that the focus was to serve non-traditional students but that day students would not be excluded.

Professor Malone stated that numerous students attended evening courses due to having day jobs. He inquired into data related to the effect of MFC on employment and the percentage of students using

MFC as an entry to day school. He noted that it would be helpful to citizens to make MFC available at reduced tuition. He commented that the impact of increased tuition would have a negative effect. Dean Lopos replied that there were no data available regarding the relationship between attendance at MFC and employment since there were not exit interviews. He stated that a poll of graduates was worth trying. He mentioned focus groups and the difficulty gathering information since degrees were granted from departments and MFC graduates were not easily identified. He stated that tuition was an institutional question at the SUNY level. He mentioned the family plan with a decreased tuition package which offers a reduced rate of tuition to members of the same immediate family for registration in MFC.

Professor Jameson suggested the logo MFC@UB. She inquired into the bureaucratic infrastructure for a regular faculty member to go on site to industry and have the activity count as a portion of the teaching load. Dean Lopos replied positively to the suggestion.

Professor Danford noted that the curriculum might be attractive to day students. Dean Lopos suggested working with the day advisors related to certificate programs.

Ms Cornwall commented on a certificate program in Public Relations. Dean Lopos stated that certificate programs would be maintained but that duplication of basic courses such as English 101 was not a desirable focus.

Professor Churchill noted that there had been a decrease in the number of students enrolled in Chemistry through MFC. Professor Wetherhold stated that the Summer program in MFC posed a special challenge to connect to regular faculty. He mentioned quality control issues.

ITEM 6: Presentation by Associate Vice President Martens and Professor Cowen on Vision 99 and Computing

Professor Welch noted that a considerable investment had been made with CIT (computing and Information Technology) and that DIT (Distributed Information Technology) was a part of Vision 99. He stated that Professor Cowen was Chair of the Faculty Senate

Committee on Computing Services and he welcomed Associate Vice President Martens to begin the presentation.

Associate Vice President Martens noted the need to adapt, track and be flexible to changing technology. He noted the rapid changes in software and that the course was charted for UNIX as the platform of the future. He labeled CIT as a partner in a service organization and mentioned a five year strategic plan.

Four years was stated as the time period for computer recycling and it was noted that the driving force was competitive standing. He stated that a demand curve was pulling the University forward. He mentioned base adjustments and the total enterprise and capital funds that were needed each year. He noted a \$30 million estimate on spending by the year 2000. He stated that the demand curve was \$3 to \$5 million higher. He noted new resources DIT and the fact that departments were strapped for cash. He mentioned redeploying existing resources and notable initiatives such as the digital library initiative of \$1.3 million per year for five years. He commented on the Provost matching units' resources for educational technology with a \$1.5 million potential in support. He noted that development was ongoing and that development efforts last year had produced more than \$200,000. He stated that the technology fee of \$120.00 per year might increase in the next year. He stated that the goals were formidable challenges.

Associate Vice President Martens reported that a three-fold increase was needed in central staffing for computing services. He stated that the infrastructure required an adequate technical support staff. He noted that training issues must be addressed and that desktops must be upgraded. He noted that equipment was too old, too small and too slow. He remarked that expansion of communication access and the level of investment was necessary. He mentioned development of data communication access in the residence halls. Improving the high level of coordination of IT and increasing research expenditures in IT were noted.

Professor Welch commented on the high priority of investment required in the residence halls.

Professor Cowen agreed with Associate Vice President Martens and stated that the demands for support were overwhelming. He also voiced concern regarding decentralization. He noted the

challenge in cooperation between the center and the periphery. He stated that departmental computer consulting and CIT services had improved. He questioned how the educational technology proposals were being evaluated. Provost Headrick replied that the Provost, IT and an outside advisor were jointly reviewing the proposals. He stated that there was no simple centralized/decentralized solution. He remarked that the manner in which central services drives DIT was important. He noted that the position was tricky and that there were not enough resources.

Mr. Cox commented on access in the dorms and asked about uses of the \$2 million raised through the technology fee. Senior Associate Vice President Innus stated that the technology fee funds had been used for infrastructure for BIRD including access lines.

Professor Adams voiced concern about DIT in the libraries. She stated that funding had been devoted to technology rather than traditional services. She questioned services to be provided by CIT other than for the mainframe. Associate Vice President Martens replied that Associate Provost Sullivan had tracked all CIT expenditures per area and calculated how much of the mainframe cost went to the libraries. Professor Adams inquired about the next step after making the investment in the libraries and Associate Vice President Martens replied that the support cost for the mainframe would be redeployed within approximately the next two years resulting in decreased central expenditures. Senior Associate Vice President Innus supplied a global answer that there would be decreased central expenditure for CIT. He questioned the source for growth money. He noted that the mainframe was "dying from the load". He stated that it would cost less money to switch to UNIX than upgrade the IBM platform. He stated that technology and support were not robust enough to take over the mainframe. He remarked that the cost savings attributed to DIT had been overexaggerated. He noted that technology and change in use of the mainframe had not resulted in significant savings.

Provost Headrick stated that a byproduct of the proposals from the units for the educational technology initiative was to get a concrete sense of the demand for different uses of personnel. He noted that priorities would need to be set and choices made regarding the total academic infrastructure.

Professor Jameson commented on censorship of the Internet and invasion of privacy. It was noted that the system was monitored for usage and abuse. She asked how long tapes were maintained.

Associate Vice President Martens replied that e-mail was confidential and there was no access since it was not encrypted and was password protected. He stated that external law enforcement agencies with subpoenas would be necessary to check accounts. He stated that e-mail was normally protected as confidential. He stated that the longevity for information on tape was six to twelve months.

Associate Vice President Martens stated that accounts were monitored for activity and not content. He noted that security breaks by hackers would be improper use of University facilities and that campus security would be notified for the possible need for investigation. He stated that criminal consequences were possible.

Professor Wetherhold commented about the recycling of computers and the process for requests. It was noted that a certain percentage of the available computers were earmarked for college-wide computing.

Professor Albini commented that the New York Times had noted that e-mail belongs to those owning the hardware. Associate Vice President Martens replied that the University community would not condone infringement of employee rights.

ITEM 7: Approval of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 12, 1996

Professor Welch suggested adding discussion of the Managing the Academic Future of UB document with the President and the Provost. He suggested distributing the text with the call to the meeting. The agenda as amended was approved by voice vote.

ITEM 8: Old Business

Professor Malone commented on parliamentary procedure regarding reports. He clarified the options available for reports. He mentioned adopting a report as having the effect of a resolution. He noted that rejecting a report meant non-acceptance. Filing a report suggested the potential of formation of resolutions in the future and did not necessarily indicate oblivion for the ideas. Professor Malone noted

that there was the option of the drafting committee developing resolutions. Professor Albini noted that it was possible to vote on each portion of a report separately.

ITEM 9: New Business

It was noted that Provost Headrick would not be available for the March 13, 1996 Executive Session with the FSEC. Professor Malone suggested that the meeting be canceled and the FSEC agreed with the idea.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: T. Headrick, W. Fischer
Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers
Arts and Letters: J. Fradin
Dental Medicine: G. Ferry
Engineering and Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold
Health Related Professions: P. Horvath
Medicine and Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini
Natural Sciences and Mathematics: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein
Nursing: P. Wooldridge
Social Sciences: D. Henderson
SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson
University Libraries: J. Adams
Guests: V. Innus, M. Cowen, H. Martens, G. Lopos, J. Sheffer

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall
Reporter: S. Cox

Those absent:

Arts and Letters: M. Hyde
Graduate School of Education; R. Stevenson
Law: E. Meidinger
SUNY Senator: J. Boot

Those excused:

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett
Management: R. Ramesh
Medicine and Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, H. Schuel
Pharmacy: N.
Social Sciences: M. Farrell