

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Executive Committee Minutes of February 14, 1996 (approved)
revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

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

1. Approval of the Minutes of January 24, 1996
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of the President/Provost
4. Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting of February 20, 1996
5. UUP Lobbying
6. Report from the Faculty Senate Information and Library Resources Committee
7. Old Business
8. New Business

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of January 24, 1996 Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of January 24, 1996. There being no corrections or additions, a motion was made by Professor Schuel to approve the minutes which was seconded by Professor Ferry and approved unanimously. ITEM 2: Report of the Chair Professor Welch reported that:

There had been a request for reinstatement of the "Cemetery of Innocents".

A note had been sent to the President and the Provost regarding outstanding resolutions. An additional letter would be sent to encourage action.

The Academic Planning Committee (APC) was working on a draft related to commenting on "Rethinking SUNY".

The FSEC meeting on 2/21/96 would be an Executive Session with Provost Headrick.

Chairman of the Board of Trustees Salerno had resigned and Trustee Cox was the Chair of the Board of Trustees. He noted that this change extended the degree of involvement of more activist trustees. Professor Welch noted that Trustee Cox was an investment banker who planned on visiting campuses. An article in The Chronicle of Higher Education on activist trustees was cited for reference.

Related to comments on classrooms, Professor Danford was reported to be meeting with the Facilities Planning Committee. Items such as conditions of classrooms and upgrades to electronically equipped classrooms were mentioned.

Professor Malone stated that with anticipated larger class sizes, there would be a need for space for larger classrooms. Professor Welch replied that there was a shortage of classrooms with capacities of over 200 students and that remote monitors in a series of classrooms might be a solution. President Greiner commented that the Department of Mathematics and the School of Architecture were needed on the north campus. He noted that no significant expansion was planned and reconfiguration and technological transformation were the current focus. Professor Acara noted that other committees were involved in facilities planning and asked if there was interaction of committees on a University-wide level. Professor Welch replied that the committees were interlocking. Professor Acara stated that in the past, due to a communication problem, it appeared that facilities planning had not been aware of the early starting date of the professional schools. Professor Horvath questioned the future use of Diefendorf Hall. Professor Wetherhold commented that he had completed a questionnaire regarding classrooms and had never received a reply.

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost

President Greiner and Vice President Palmer commented on the requested reappearance of the "Cemetery of Innocents". It was noted that as a public facility, the University was an open forum for expression of opinion. The fact that an analysis of the request was needed was explained and Vice President Palmer stated that the matter was unresolved. President Greiner stated that access cannot be unlimited and that the rules were complicated. He mentioned a set of guidelines including that an event cannot be overtly disruptive of the campus environment or break any laws. President Greiner

noted that the University could not incur extra costs for additional security and that the same principles applied to external and internal groups. He noted that bonds would have to be posted and the time for the event would need to be convenient to the University community.

President Greiner and Vice President Palmer stated that the information in the Buffalo News had been incomplete and that the scheduling of the event was under review. President Greiner emphasized the importance of the First Amendment. Professor Wetherhold questioned the possibility of civil disobedience and President Greiner replied that the laws of New York State must be observed on campus. He noted that civil disobedience was a defensible principle with a price to be paid which could include requests to leave, issuance of appearance tickets, arrest and physical removal. President Greiner stressed that the First Amendment was alive and well within appropriate limits.

Vice Provost Levy commented that the scale of an event was an issue, comparing a bulletin board display with wrapping of a building. He inquired as to the size of the anticipated event. President Greiner replied that 4,000 crosses were planned for the outskirts of the campus. Vice President Palmer stated that the proper procedure requires a request statement including a description of the event and discussion of liability and safety issues. He noted that open ended requests would not receive approval. He stated that it was necessary to bring together Public Safety, the faculty and the Office of Student Life. It was noted that all reasonable precautions must be taken for success. Vice President Palmer stated that the student group requesting the "Cemetery of Innocents" was meeting to clarify issues and could resubmit an agreeable plan.

Professor Schuel reiterated that the essence of the University was dialogue and suggested that the University sponsor dialogue between groups with opposing views. Vice President Palmer noted that the Student Association had sponsored such forums in the past.

Professor Malone commented on the problems occurring in the University Heights neighborhood. President Greiner replied that he had requested governmental flexibility regarding on campus housing. Vice President Palmer mentioned the University Heights Advisory Group which discusses a variety of issues. He stated that students were encouraged to work with community leadership and block clubs. He stated that the problems were ongoing. President Greiner stated that the fundamental problem was that undergraduate students were not compatible with the family environment of the University

Heights neighborhood. He noted that 14,000 students of the 25,000 students were located on or near the south campus. He advocated for private development of the north campus on a Parcel B basis for apartment style student housing. He noted that approval of the Board of Trustees was necessary to allow management flexibility.

Professor Jameson commented on a Spectrum article addressing articulation agreements between local community colleges and UB. She voiced confusion regarding a proposal for Erie Community College students to be guaranteed admission to UB. She questioned if faculty development of general education was purposeful in view of this proposal and she noted that the effort to foster alumni loyalty to the University would not be served through this procedure. President Greiner replied that the scenario was interesting but unfounded in truth. He suggested a smaller, more select, better prepared freshmen class of approximately 2,000 to 2,500 students. He envisioned expansion of transfer applications and emphasis on development as an upper division University center. President Greiner stated that there was no reason not to have multiple points of access to the University.

Professor Eberlein inquired as to the University ownership of homes in the University Heights area and President Greiner replied that the housing had been sold.

ITEM 4: Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 20, 1996

The agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 20, 1996 was approved as presented by Professor Welch.

ITEM 5: UUP Lobbying >/h3> Ms Dickson, Professor Sulewski and Professor Johnstone were encouraged by Professor Welch to comment on UUP lobbying, joint UUP-University Faculty Senate efforts and faculty productivity measures.

Ms Dickson stated that she would not be commenting on faculty productivity issues. Professor Schuel noted that the Board of Trustees was not lobbying the legislature this year as in the past.

Provost Headrick disagreed stating that SUNY did have a legislative package but did not have a strong position against cuts.

Professor Johnstone, addressing the issue of faculty productivity, stated that historically the faculty position had been defensive in nature and that no "real faculty" had been included in discussions. He stated that the SUNY University-wide Senate and the California State Senate were sensitively developing a draft statement of principles related to faculty productivity. He noted that productivity was an important issue during the current economic climate and the accompanying demands for public accountability. Professor Johnstone acknowledged that the public was uneducated regarding workload issues and the insufficiency of state tax support. He noted that in the future, it would be necessary to do more with less public funding. Issues to be addressed included reallocation of resources, differentiation of workload and tenure. Professor Johnstone noted that the real problem with small, unproductive units was ineptitude in management. He stated that enhanced, shared governance, academic freedom, seniority and fair rewards should not be compromised.

Professor Welch stated that dialogue was occurring between UUP and the University-wide Faculty Senate. He noted the internal desire for professional excellence and stated that the process was evolving. Professor Jameson noted that the draft was to be discussed at the University-wide Faculty Senate and inquired into discussion on this campus. Professor Johnstone replied that he would share the document and encourage dialogue. He stated that the outside world was convinced that faculty could not effectively discuss productivity. Professor Malone stated that a consensus should be reached regarding measurement of faculty productivity. Professor Johnstone stated that the issue with the public seemed to be to "do more" rather than the actual measures. He noted that California State was not a comprehensive research university.

Professor Nickerson stated that the project was a good example of the cooperation between the unions and the University-wide Faculty Senate. Professor Johnstone stated that it was important for the University-wide Senate and the unions to work together and also retain their separate roles.

Ms Dickson stated that diminishing SUNY was equivalent to diminishing New York State. She reported that the union legislative program aimed to keep SUNY afloat and that it had a different emphasis than the Board of Trustees. She mentioned Mr. Scheuerman's crisis bulletin which stated that the SUNY trustees inactions and actions were destabilizing the University.

Lobbying dates and the affiliation of UUP with NYSUT were noted. Ms Dickson mentioned the public hearing scheduled at Buffalo State College on Friday, the 16th of February.

Professor Nickerson reported that SUNY Faculty Senate President Aceto encouraged the University-wide Faculty Senate to cooperate with the union, especially since the trustees were not lobbying for restoration of funding. He noted that the trustees were engaging in selective lobbying. Ms Dickson commented that the Board of Trustees had urged against restoration.

The Minnesota Plan, which advocates use of public school funding for University level AP courses, use of the consolidated fund, spinning off the hospitals and increased tuition were mentioned as methods to increase revenue. Ms Dickson stated that UUP was opposing further tax cuts. She mentioned management flexibility for the hospitals with employee protection and campus competition as issues.

Professor Sulewski reported that 35,000 signatures had been collected for presentation at the budget hearings. She commended President Greiner for requesting restoration and noted that he had the best interests of the University at heart. She stated that the \$98 million proposed cut in state tax support followed a \$161 million reduction from last year. Professor Welch added that the proposed \$100 million reduction in TAP would cause a disproportionate hardship for the public sector.

Professor Schuel suggested that Professor Welch, as Chair of the Faculty Senate, should write to the Chair of the Board of Trustees requesting restoration of state funding. Professor Welch replied that the restoration should be coupled with flexibility management and the possibility of well-planned and effective restructuring. Professor Schuel stated that he was not opposed to differential tuition but was in favor of restoration.

Professor Nickerson, referring to the Minnesota Plan, stated that the governor's budget was too optimistic regarding this option for revenue enhancement.

Professor Albini remarked that there were no data regarding faculty productivity. He quoted Provost Headrick as stating that the University was primarily an academic institution and added that to simply accept funding reductions without requiring a rationale was unacceptable.

It was noted that the government cared deeply about tax cuts and was not necessarily anti-SUNY. The necessity of New York State to shed expenditures was mentioned and it was stressed that the legislature should realize that a \$100 million support reduction would result in serious problems.

Ms Dickson mentioned local lobbying teams and a March 15th meeting with legislators. She recommended sharing concrete information with legislators related to loss of jobs and students without programs and courses.

Professor Malone stated that the governor and the legislature had a mandate to decrease the tax rate "at any cost" including reduced access to SUNY. He urged Professor Welch to develop a clear message in support of students and the community to avoid the misconception that the concern was self-serving.

Professor Wetherhold stated that the election had been won on a platform committed to downsizing government. He commented that it was necessary to make people care and realize that SUNY is special and not just another public utility.

Provost Headrick stated that he disagreed with the UUP position opposing differential tuition. He remarked that the Board of Trustees was being asked to grant power to the campuses regarding differential tuition. He reminded FSEC members that the trustees had stewardship responsibilities and that the campuses would be accountable for all decisions under a flexible management plan.

ITEM 6: Report from the Faculty Senate Information and Library Resources Committee

Professor Welch referred the FSEC to the handout on digital libraries. He commented that there were two documents for review, the digital library and the information on budgetary reductions. He stressed the importance of the libraries to the accomplishment of the academic mission of the University.

Associate Vice President von Wahlde thanked the Faculty Senate for its support. She noted that ten years ago there had been no on-line service and no electronic data bases. She noted the incongruity of the investment plan for the future mixed with the current budgetary constraints. She noted the need to move forward to the electronic age and preserve the traditional environment.

Addressing infrastructure and content, Associate Vice President von Wahlde remarked that the library must have access to a vast network of resources. She noted that it was important to improve the variety of content available digitally via the Internet and locally across networks. She referred to the proposed 5% budget cut for the libraries and the \$150,000 in salary savings from maintaining vacant positions. The effects of staff reduction was noted as impeding basic services to faculty and students during a period of rapid change in both information services and media. She noted that without additional funding, reallocation would be necessary. She stated that users were experiencing a disservice due to the cuts.

Associate Vice President von Wahlde stated that the proposed 5% cut was primarily from the acquisitions budget. The significant decrease to the acquisitions budget would have a negative effect in all units with a greater problem occurring in disciplines with more expensive journals such as Science and Engineering. Budget categories for possible reductions included salaries through maintenance of vacant lines, an acquisitions base reduction and an OTPS base reduction. Input was requested from faculty regarding the acquisitions cutting process. It was noted that purchases had decreased as well as buying power.

Professor Welch suggested that individual faculty member adopt particular journals, by underwriting the costs of subscriptions. Associate Vice President von Wahlde commended

Professor Welch for his previous donations and noted that there would be a faculty appeal through the development office during the spring.

The possibility of faculty fines as related to equity was mentioned by Associate Vice President von Wahlde. Savings from cessation of late notices was estimated at approximately \$30 to \$40,000. Charging corporate borrowers, public institutions and community members was another option to raise revenue. Collaboration was stressed to provide resources in a timely manner.

The digital library plan was noted to incorporate the distributed computing applications. Limits to the mainframe and the necessity of a new platform to interrelate applications which were currently separate were mentioned as issues.

Over the next three years, it was estimated that the computational work station approach would be operational. The fall of 1996 was the target date for Internet access in the libraries. Increases in number of work stations and replacements for work stations and a new search engine to access scientific databases were noted. The need for continual changes and updating was emphasized.

Future technology fees, reallocation of existing bases and personnel were listed as means of coping with state support reductions. The need for an investment and renewal plan was noted.

Professor Welch stated that the Faculty Senate was on record in support of distributed technology.

Professor Eberlein asked if electronic journals were available and it was noted that Wings had the structure to cope with proliferation. Charging for access was mentioned and Johns Hopkins Press was cited as an example.

Professor Horvath stated that there was a poor interface between Academic Computing and Hubnet. Moving to Unix was mentioned to stabilize access.

Professor Farrell stated that CARL uncover was a useful resource. Citation searches, increased numbers of indexes and full text data were reported to be available through CARL uncover.

Professor Nickerson voiced concern regarding the depths of the cuts to the libraries and urged a resolution from the Faculty Senate regarding the importance of the libraries to the academic mission of the University.

Professor Jameson related that texts were due at Princeton only when requested by another faculty member. She also disagreed with the "equity" argument for assessing fines against faculty borrowers, since faculty and students were in quite different financial relationships to the University.

Professor Adams informed FSEC members that texts could be renewed via e-mail. Professor Jameson stated that the texts had to be brought to the library with the third renewal. Professor Adams mentioned that there was a need for the texts to be more available in the library and noted that students needed to find books on the shelves. Professor Jameson commented that recalls could serve a useful purpose. Professor Welch remarked that browsing was enjoyable and suggested notification via e-mail for overdue notices.

Professor Schuel voiced concern with the decreases in the acquisitions budget. He noted that the Health Sciences had sustained cuts of up to 20% per year and that there were deficits in the collections. He emphasized that at a research institution, immediate access to information was a basic tool. He remarked that the decimation of the libraries must be stopped immediately.

ITEM 7: Old Business

There was no discussion of old business.

ITEM 8: New Business

There was no discussion of new business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: W. Greiner, T. Headrick, K. Levy, R. Palmer

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: M. Acara, B. Albin, H. Schuel

Natural Sciences and Mathematics: P. Eberlein

Social Sciences: M. Farrell

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

University Libraries: J. Adams

Guests:

University Libraries: B. Vonwahlde, R. Lee

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

Professional Staff Senate: M. Stokes

Those excused:

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Management: R. Ramesh

Natural Sciences and Mathematics: M. Churchill

Pharmacy: N.

Social Sciences: D. Henderson

SUNY Senators: J. Boot

Those absent:

Architecture and Planning: S. Danford

Arts and Letters: M. Hyde

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Law: E. Meidinger

Nursing: P. Wooldridge