

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of December 6, 1995 (approved) (revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting of the FSEC was called to order at 2:00 p.m. on December 6, 1995 in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
3. ["Streamlining general education" - approval of prescribed liberal arts components](#)
4. [Academic Good Standing for Students](#)
5. [Williamsville Proposal](#)
6. [Old Business](#)
7. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that:

- Senior Vice President Wagner would discuss "Rethinking SUNY" at 3:00 p.m. .A report would be made at the Faculty Senate meeting of January 30, 1996 regarding the document circulated by the Board of Trustees and the FSEC resolution. He stated that it was important to share the reasoning for the "scope and thrust" statement in the resolution with the full Senate.
- Professor Chatov would be sharing the draft report from the Faculty Senate Athletics and Recreation Committee at 3:15 p.m.
- The 1996-1997 University Calendar was completed.

- Candidates for the position of Secretary of the Faculty Senate were being sought and names should be submitted to the Senate office.
- He would be attending a UB Council meeting during the next week as an observer.
- UUP was strongly opposed to "Rethinking SUNY".
- Updates on Faculty Senate committees included a draft report in mid-January from the Governance Committee and tentative approval of "green computing" from the Faculty Senate Committee on Computing Services.
- The policy on Academic Good Standing had been promulgated by President Greiner during the summer but had not been widely publicized to the University community.

ITEM 2: "Streamlining General Education"

Vice Provost Goodman stated that the curriculum was in place in Arts and Sciences and was "working well". He noted that Professor Stinger chairs the committee to maintain and review the curriculum. He stated that the Arts and Sciences encompasses half of the undergraduate student body. He mentioned that general education for the rest of the University was a very complicated matter. He stated that the knowledge areas of the undergraduate curriculum had been modified to meet the needs of various programs and that overall the knowledge areas were not working well. He noted that questionable rationales existed for courses being approved as meeting the general education criteria. He stated that it was difficult to fit the knowledge areas with the present departmental structure. Vice Provost Goodman commented that Provost Headrick desired to move all undergraduate education to the direction of the Arts and Sciences curriculum and he acknowledged that there were serious resource issues. He mentioned the mandate of the Faculty Senate to reconstitute the DUAS Curriculum Committee. He noted that the committee was working and its membership had been approved by the Deans and the FSEC. He stated that the committee was involved in discussions with various Faculties and Schools to consider the interim problem of changing general education. He commented that there was "not a workable curriculum in place" currently. He noted that a proposal had been submitted by the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

Referring to the list of courses approved for general education, he stated that there was no rationale for the list and therefore all undergraduate courses would be accepted with obvious exceptions. He noted that this action would turn the knowledge areas curriculum to distribution curriculum and move towards the Arts and Sciences curriculum. He reiterated that the knowledge areas did not correspond to departmental courses and therefore suggested that the standard list should be appended and that DARS should be used for exceptions. Professor Welch stated that this proposal would end general education and move towards a distribution requirement. Professor Adams requested clarification of the proposal.

Vice Provost Goodman replied that the Faculty Senate had adopted the policy that particular students entering as freshmen were subject to the Arts and Sciences curriculum. He noted that the remainder of the students had been left in the knowledge areas curriculum which had been modified in various schools over time. Professor Adams voiced concern that students registered in upper level courses within their majors could attempt to use the courses in fulfillment of the general education requirements. Vice Provost Goodman replied that there were six knowledge areas and each major was in one area. He stated that there were seven courses required outside of the knowledge areas of the major. Professor Adams stated that she was not concerned about specialization but about courses in one's specialization being applied to fulfill knowledge areas. Vice Provost Goodman responded that the proposal was trying to patch an existing program that had not been maintained.

Professor Hare commented that in the early 80s, knowledge areas requirements had been established that were not now compatible with current Arts and Sciences curricula.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that the general education courses had been abandoned in favor of the Arts and Sciences curriculum. He noted that the knowledge areas curriculum had not been maintained and was not compatible with the current Arts and Sciences curriculum. Professor Welch questioned the criteria for selection of entities to fulfill the knowledge areas requirements. Vice Provost Goodman replied that the selection of entities had resulted from discussion in the DUAS Curriculum Committee. Professor Welch referred

to Cora P. Maloney College in the catalogue as an example of a course with a title that appeared to be a good general education course. Vice Provost Goodman stated that he preferred not to discuss Cora P. Maloney College which he believed was valuable but that the courses were not appropriate for general education.

Professor Jameson inquired as to how safeguards would be maintained regarding the quality of instruction. She expressed concern that a single course could satisfy two general education requirements and that central supervision was necessary. Vice Provost Goodman replied that the discussion centered on simplification of an existing broken program. He noted that Engineering and Architecture had developed proposals related to the Arts and Sciences curriculum. He reiterated that currently all courses were accepted that had been previously approved. He stressed that this was a proposal to allow for administration of a program in transition. He stated that he would be reluctant to accept a single course to fulfill two knowledge areas. He explained that the faculty must support general education for it to work.

Professor Welch stated that this was an "historical moment". He noted that the knowledge areas of general education had not been maintained and that the Vice Provost believed that the current proposal was a necessary step as part of a longer effort to develop a program embodying the newer ideas of general education. He noted that the action was in line with the Faculty Senate resolution regarding DUAS and the Arts and Sciences requirements.

[ITEM 4: Academic Good Standing](#)

Professor Welch noted the Faculty Senate resolution followed extensive discussion with the Grading Committee related to Academic Good Standing. He mentioned the series of restrictions in the Faculty Senate legislation including completion of less than 75% of courses and less than a 2.0 average in the prior semester which had resulted in unforeseen negative consequences for students.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that letters had been sent to students based on the Faculty Senate resolution related to Academic Good Standing. He noted that a serious systematic attempt had been made to check credentials. He stated that there were approximately 3400 students with a G.P.A. of less than 2.0 out of 15,000 to 16,000 undergraduates. He cited the magnitude of the issue in that over one-fourth of the students were affected by the criteria. He stated that the University did not have a tradition of serious academic standards and had allowed students to "drift" in the past. He stated that a firm line had been lacking and that a few years were needed to take the standards seriously to change the culture. He noted that the new standards complied with academic integrity and he suggested that with the numbers involved and the serious nature of the problem the criteria remain in place.

Professor Adams stated that the FSEC was not worried about the policies but was concerned about possible exceptions. She commented that she desired a policy of appeal or review when appropriate. She cited an obvious example of a student involved in an auto accident who completed less than 75% of courses within a semester with a previous high G.P.A. She noted that this student was an active participant in extracurricular activities and that it was essential to have an appeal process.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that the problem involved significant workload and staffing problems and that standards would be lost if not taken seriously. He stated that it was necessary to emphasize the priority of academic pursuits over extracurricular activities. He noted that probation was not permanently entered on one's record and that progress was not impeded. Professor Adams replied that it was necessary to view the negative consequences from the student perspective.

Professor Schroeder stated that there were a small number of exceptional cases and that the number would not be difficult to resolve in an appeal or review process. He stated that 2100 students only had a G.P.A. of under 2.0 for one semester. He suggested fixing the standard by considering an acceptable cumulative G.P.A. He cited an example of a bad semester but an acceptable G.P.A. overall. Ms Cornwall stated that it appeared that the FSEC was assuming that a student was "slacking" if the G.P.A. was under a 2.0. Professor

Schroeder denied the assumption, citing a rough course causing the average to decrease. Ms Cornwall stated that illness or an accident could cause a student to unfairly be penalized. She stressed that students were aware that academics were a priority and were generally responsible.

Professor Nickerson stated that the letter of probation should urge an expedited talk with an advisor. Vice Provost Goodman stated that the letter could encourage students to speak with an advisor and that a possible checkstop could prevent registration without advisement. Professor Nickerson stated that he wanted to ensure discussion with an advisor but was not advocating a registration checkstop. Vice Provost Goodman reported that students "at risk" were hesitant to seek advice and frequently denied problems.

Professor Schuel expressed concern with the 75% completion criterion. Professor Welch responded that the Faculty Senate had not allowed for exceptions to the criteria or for appeal or review. Professor mentioned illnesses, accidents and the necessity for outside work to afford increased tuition and costs as crucial factors. Professor Hyde mentioned other negative repercussions for students from academic probation which included loss teaching assistantships and scholarships.

Vice Provost Goodman agreed that financial aid was complicated. He stated that TAP and other federal programs had their own regulations independent of the University which were listed in the undergraduate catalog. He noted that the requirements were less demanding than the University. He stated that probation does not affect financial aid but the grades did count.

Dean Black stated other implications related to fraternities and sororities, the University Council, student governance, student athletics and residence hall governance.

Professor Hyde voiced concern about the lack of an appeal process and the negative consequences. Professor Eberlein asked if administrative resignation was still in existence. She explained that this process removed the courses from one's record. Vice Provost Goodman replied positively and stated that administrative resignation wiped out the

semester. Professor Eberlein stated that she believed it was possible to delete two of four or five courses within a semester through administrative resignation. Vice Provost Goodman stated that administrative resignation occurred through an advisor and was a centralized procedure. Professor Malone stated that a form was necessary to be completed by the instructor.

Ms Cornwall stated that she opposed the academic good standing policy and noted that the admissions policies should allow that a supplemental application should be available to explain extenuating circumstances. Vice Provost Goodman stated that the Individualized Admissions Program was available for this purpose. Ms Cornwall stressed the lack of consistency citing consideration of exceptions in the admissions process but not during actual enrollment. Vice Provost Goodman responded that the penalty was not severe and that students were removed from probation once grades were improved.

Professor Adams stated that the Senate had been told that it would be necessary to consider individual cases and that Senators had voted with good faith understanding. Vice Provost Goodman stated that students would not be dismissed automatically and emphasized that the criteria were an objective system of determining if students were in academic good standing. Professor Welch, referring to the minutes of the FSEC of March 8, 1995, noted that President Greiner was supposed to respond to the issue. Vice Provost Goodman reiterated that the mandate had been to produce an objective determination of academic good standing. He noted that there was no appeal to academic good standing determinations.

Ms Butkas stated that academic good standing also had implications for students involved in student publications. Dean Black stated that participation in publications was not affected by standing. Removal or replacement procedures required students to address excessive incompletes or particularly poor grades in a course. He noted that appeals could be used to improve academic good standing.

Mr. Stokes questioned enforcement of the policy and Vice Provost Goodman stated that the policy was in effect currently. Vice Provost Goodman stated that not many students were

dismissed. He stated that a typical case would involve a three semester probation period before ever considering dismissal.

Professor Churchill inquired about official resignation with the approval of the instructor. He stated that an official resignation could end the problem.

Professor Henderson stated that the current policy was not sensible and that two separate letters could be sent to students with one containing a warning about dropping behind and the need to be careful.

Vice Provost Goodman answered that he was not certain about the existence of an official resignation. He stated that he had not considered administrative withdrawal procedures.

Professor Jameson, commenting on the small number of students with an overall G.P.A. of less than 2.0, questioned if the number was due to attrition or reform. Vice Provost Goodman replied that he suspected reform or changes in the curriculum.

(ITEM 4 is [continued below](#))

[ITEM 5: "Rethinking SUNY"](#)

Senior Vice President Wagner stated that specific authorization would be required for differential tuition. He noted that issues had been raised regarding the statutory colleges and the community colleges. With regard to operation and structure, he stated that specific reference had been made to graduate education and research and credited President Greiner and Provost Headrick for their successful work. He mentioned that allocation of differential tuition was at the discretion of the trustees and that there was no requirement to allocate the tuition to the campuses. He noted that the legislature would be discussing the issue of differential tuition.

ITEM 4: Academic Good Standing (Continued)

Professor Eberlein noted that a possible reason the number of students with G.P.A.s of less than 2.0 had dropped was due to transfer students "catching up". Professor Jameson requested elaboration on the topic and Professor Welch mentioned "transfer shock". He noted that with the number of 2100 students who met all other requirements for academic good standing except for a 2.0 in the prior semester, the administrative workload would be feasible. He recommended asking the Grading Committee to consider sending a letter of warning rather than an automatic loss of academic good standing.

Professor Ramesh noted that the data were only representative of the Spring, 1995 semester. Vice Provost Goodman stated that he could review the data from Fall, 1995 and report in January, 1996.

Professor Schroeder expressed interest in the number of freshmen with only one semester within the 2100. He requested figures breaking down the 2100 to the number of years in the program.

Professor Jameson cited a hypothetical case of a transfer student with 90 hours and a high G.P.A. without a 2.0 for courses taken at U.B. Professor Welch replied that a minimum of 2.0 at U.B. was required for graduation. Vice Provost Goodman agreed that additional analysis was necessary and suggested that the Grading Committee study the issue.

Professor Welch recommended that the issue should be resolved prior to the Spring, 1996 semester with a report at the January 17, 1996 FSEC meeting. He suggested asking the Provost for a one semester suspension of the policy. Vice Provost Goodman advised against the action. Professor Welch asked for options. Professor Jameson stated that the catalog was issued yearly and that the issue should be analyzed slowly to avoid being revisited. Professor Adams stated that the parameters had not been recognized at first and asked the Grading Committee to review the stipulations. Professor Eberlein recommended use of an administrative withdrawal as a solution.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that students were allowed to be on "indefinite" probation and that it was rare to be dismissed prior to being on probation for three semesters. He noted that probation was not well defined. Professor Malone stated that probation was different in different Schools and Faculties. He noted that in Engineering, a student could be dropped after greater than one semester on probation.

Mr. Stokes asked if the policy applied to MFC and part-time students. Vice Provost Goodman responded that these were different categories and that the academic supervision of MFC was in transition. He noted that it was appropriate for the Senate to think about the locus of academic oversight. He commented that the part-time population was not a large group. Professor Welch stated that part-time students were not eligible for elected office in student organization because they were not full-time. He noted that elected officers of student organizations had to be full-time in good standing except in MFC where part-time students were eligible to serve as officers.

Professor Fournier stated that he was pleased that the academic good standing clause was in effect. He noted that the policy might be important for student athletes who might be ineligible to play in Spring, 1996 if below a 2.0 for the Fall, 1995. He stressed that athletes cannot be considered differently from other students according to an NCAA policy. He stated that whatever the Senate decided, would apply to athletes as any other student. Professor Welch stated that Professor Fournier was responsible for ensuring academic standards as the Faculty Athletic representative to the NCAA appointed by President Greiner.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that Professor Fournier's interpretation of NCAA regulations was not universally shared and that the FSEC was not the place to resolve the meaning of the NCAA rules.

Professor Fournier stated that he had contacted the NCAA and that his opinion was supported. Vice Provost Goodman stated that he had another interpretation in writing. Professor Malone agreed that the FSEC was not the appropriate body to discuss the NCAA rules. He stated that President Greiner had asked Vice Provost Goodman to initiate codification of the rules due to dissatisfaction with previous appeals mechanism.

Dean Black stated that the effort was not to look at the academic status of athletes but the implications for certification under NCAA rules to participate in athletics.

Professor Welch requested a motion to charge the Grading Committee to report to the FSEC in mid January. Professor Churchill stated that the time frame was unrealistic. Professor Jameson suggested that the EPPC might be an appropriate committee. Vice Provost Goodman suggested that the Grading Committee would be most suitable. Professor Schroeder stated that more time would be needed.

Professor Adams moved that the Grading Committee be asked to reevaluate the Academic Good Standing policy within the next semester, especially looking at the effects of implementation during the first semester. Professor Wetherhold seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

[ITEM 6: Williamsville Proposal](#)

Vice Provost Goodman stated that high school students with advanced college credit finished degrees more quickly. He mentioned the 3 1 1 program at Fredonia. He commented that interest in advanced college credits had been decreasing and that SUNY was concerned with continuing this potential funding source. He commented on the Minnesota Plan, an extensive program allowing high school juniors and seniors to opt for courses at the University level. He explained that the funding mechanism allowed the state to support college rather than high school hours. He stated that active discussion was ongoing with the Williamsville School District and Vice President Innus whereby a small number of high school seniors would take courses at U.B. rather than in district high schools. He mentioned a target date of Fall, 1997 with an enrollment of 100 to 200 students.

[ITEM 7: Athletics and Recreation Committee](#)

Professor Chatov, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation, requested that information distributed at the meeting be kept confidential. He stated that the status of the committee was not conducive to achieving the charges of the Faculty Senate. He noted that the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation had no formal input to decisions made by the President and the Intercollegiate Athletics Board (I.A.B.) appointed by the President. He questioned if the Faculty Senate desired representation on the I.A.B. and oversight responsibilities.

Relative to costs, Professor Chatov stated that calculation of costs included only direct costs and that he was certain that the cost in the five year plan included only part of the actual costs. He noted the zero sum situation and the increase in football expenditures.

Professor Chatov discussed three alternatives for faculty involvement with Athletics and Recreation:

1. Disband the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation
2. Participate in the decision-making process
3. Continue the current format

Concerns were expressed about Women's sports which were far from the Title IX requirements. Professor Chatov reported that the Department of Athletics was proposing increases in Women's scholarships. He questioned state increases in funding and stated that it was impossible to achieve gender equality with the presence of football.

Professor Chatov reported that the deficits were increasing and that easily generated income should not be expected in the foreseeable future. He mentioned that television contracts resulted in profitability. He stated that the committee needed help in defining its relationship to departments involved in the management of athletics. He noted that to be effective, greater contact was needed with the Department of Athletics. He stated that although Professor Fournier was helpful as the faculty NCAA representative, Professor

Fourtner was not given financial information to share with the Senate committee. He added that Professor Malone had been cordial with the committee.

Professor Welch commented that a draft of the report should be sent to President Greiner and the I.A.B. He noted that the report opened avenues in need of further discussion and suggested a date early in the Spring, 1996 semester.

Professor Fourtner stated that equity work was needed in the five year draft plan.

Professor Malone stated that discussion was ongoing about the certification review. He noted that compliance with Title IX was extremely complicated and that although dollars were not equal, the spending was equitable. He mentioned increases in grants in aid and scholarships.

Professor Jameson commented that the focus had been on Athletics while her concerns focused on Recreation. She mentioned an interest in wellness and faculty access to recreational facilities. Professor Eberlein stated that she was pleased with increased attention to Women's sports.

Professor Chatov stated that the deficit in 1995 was \$900,000. Professor Schuel stated that it appeared that football and basketball were losing propositions.

[ITEM 8: New Business](#)

Professor Welch requested input regarding future Senate discussion on "Rethinking SUNY". He questioned the format of a report or a recommendation. He noted that the APC could review "Rethinking SUNY" and report to the FSEC in mid-January, 1996. Professor Malone stated that he would be happy to take up the issue and that the APC would be meeting on December 14, 1995 to focus on the Graduate School.

It was noted that Provost Headrick had distributed a document to the Deans about future management.

Professor Welch reminded the FSEC that the meeting next week would be hosted by the Provost.

Professor Jameson requested that the Budget Priorities Committee share information in an ongoing discussion. Professor Malone stated that it was difficult for the Budget Priorities Committee to "nail down numbers".

Professor Welch commented that the major responsibility of the FSEC was to provide suggestions to the Senate as a whole. He stated that he would advise the Budget Priorities Committee, the Academic Planning Committee and a possible Ad Hoc Committee of the need to review "Rethinking SUNY".

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: D. Black, N. Goodman

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: M. Hadighi

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin, M. Hyde

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Management: R. Ramesh

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

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein

Pharmacy: N.

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, P. Hare, Donald Henderson

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

University Libraries: J. Adams

Guests:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

Professional Staff Senate: M. Stokes

REPORTER: S. Cox

SPECTRUM: B. Butkas

Those excused:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini

Those absent:

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidnger

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

SUNY Senator: J. Boot