

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Minutes of October 20, 1999 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on October 20, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the minutes of September 15 and 29, 1999](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Mission Review - What are the next steps?](#)
5. [Report of Senior Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer Voldemar Innus](#)
6. [SUNY Senate meeting in Potsdam](#)
7. [Old/New Business](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

- the principal item on today's agenda is Mission Review
- the President has asked FSEC to go into executive session at 3:15 PM for a report on SUNY's and UB's budget
- he has agreed to cooperate with Vice Provost Fischer in the implementation of the Faculty Senate document Faculty Fellows in Administration; he will make regular reports on their progress
- several members of the Senate, representing faculty, are interviewing candidates for the position of Associate Vice President for Human Resources; the first candidate has excellent experience and a law degree; there are more candidates including UB faculty members
- the Friends of the Center for the Arts will hold a Masquerade Ball on October 30

- the Provost met with the Deans on October 18; Dean Mandell talked about the possibility of active adult housing on campus for seniors who would like to attend campus athletic and cultural events; the 1999/2000 budget and mission review were also discussed
- he has received a proposal for the merger of the Department of Biochemical Pharmacology (School of Pharmacy) and the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences); the Academic Planning Committee will look at the voluminous documentation and make a recommendation to the FSEC; both faculties have voted for the merger after considerable discussion and planning, and the process appears to have been a model one
 - documentation should be made available FSEC and the affected faculties (Professor)
- UB's Sexual Harassment Policy is in the next to final version; copies will be sent to members of the FSEC, and the Policy will be discussed at our October 27 meeting; SUNY Counsel will attend the meeting to help with our discussion
- the Special Interest Housing Group has invited members of FSEC and their families to this Saturday's football game; the Group is interested in interacting informally with faculty
- five committees are currently active and will be bringing reports to the FSEC
- the President has replied to our resolution on Alert To Instructional Faculty; SUNY Counsel suggests removing the word "confidential"; we will discuss the proposed change at the October 27 meeting

**Item 2: Report of Senior Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Voldemar Innus**

The Chair said that he had neglected to invite Senior Associate Vice President Innus to the FSEC's discussion of implementing the Senate's Grade Replacement Policy. Since one of the issues discussed was the difficulty in finding computing resources to support the implementation, the Chair wanted the Senior Associate Vice President to have time to present his views on the matter.

Senior Associate Vice President Innus focused his report on the present situation. Earlier in the year he had imposed a freeze on new projects for CIT based on the resources that were then available and staff reductions. However, during the freeze CIT and the Office of Undergraduate Education discussed interpretation of the Grade Replacement Policy and planning went forward for what is a substantial project that impacts on several systems, primarily DARS and InfoSource. With clarification of the Grade Replacement Policy achieved and confirmation by the Provost that its implementation had the highest priority of new projects, an implementation schedule has been developed. For the Fall '99 Semester there will be a partially computer based and partially manual process to handle grades needing to be replaced. This will allow idiosyncracies of the process to be identified, helping with the development of the computer based system which should be completed during the Spring '00 Semester.

There were questions for the Senior Associate Vice President:

- what is the time cutoff for grades that are eligible to be replaced under the new policy? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- grades earned to 1984 for currently enrolled students (Senior Associate Vice President Innus)
- are there plans to annotate transcripts during a semester to show grades which will be replaced at the end of that semester; it is a student concern that a grade which is in the process of being replaced may influence acceptance into graduate programs, etc. (Professor Malone)
- transcripts don't usually reflect a semester in progress; once the computer program is in place grade replacement will occur promptly (Senior Associate Vice President Innus)
- will students need to request grade replacements during the Fall semester? (Dr. Coles)
- Vice Provost Goodman could more appropriately answer that question (Senior Associate Vice Provost Innus)

Item 3: Approval of the minutes of September 29 and October 5, 1999

The minutes of September 15 and 29, 1999 were approved.

Item 4: SUNY Senate meeting in Potsdam

The Chair reported that Professors Adams-Volpe and Boot attended the SUNY Senate's 123rd Plenary Meeting in Potsdam on October 14-16. Professor Malone, who has been appointed the Parliamentarian for the SUNY Senate, also attended the meeting. Professor Adams-Volpe distributed a written report and orally emphasized the hospitality offered to the Senators. She also noted that there was significant unhappiness on the part of the Faculty Senate at a policy document on the development of graduate academic programs in SUNY promulgated by Provost Salins with no Senate consultation. The policy has serious implications for the Colleges and to a lesser degree for the Centers since it says that graduate programs should be confined to the University Centers, but it also discourages program duplication among the Centers.

Item 5: Mission Review; What are the next steps?

The Chair asked Professor Welch, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, to describe what went on during the mission review process. The Chair also suggested that the FSEC be considering what kind of focus is needed for the Senate's consideration of issues arising out of mission review.

Professor Welch noted that around the table were Professors Nickerson, Cartwright and Jorgensen and Dr. Coles who had constituted the faculty and staff participation in the mission review process. He urged them to add their comments to his presentation.

The intention of the mission review visit is to foster dialogue both within a campus and between a campus and System Administration. The dialogue is to be specific to a campus, rather than covering a sector of SUNY, e.g. the Colleges or the University Centers. This campus based discussion of mission will help differentiate campus missions and inform the System Administration of the concerns, strengths and weaknesses of the campuses.

The mission review process has been a lengthy one here at UB. Our history of four Provosts in six years, each with strong ideas which were not necessarily in full harmony, has complicated planning. Concurrently System Administration's approaches have also evolved, especially with new Trustees who were concerned about mission creep (the expansion of a campus's mission) within SUNY.

In Albany fifteen SUNY administrators are engaged in the mission review process; a core team of five came to UB (Provost Salins, Senior Associate Provost Poskanzer, Dr. Kraushaar, Dr. Pileggi and Dr. Billie). Since they had already visited 52 campuses, they came with a great deal of experience with the review process. They noted, however, that UB had provided more documentation than the other three Centers combined. UB's core administrative team consisted of President Greiner, Provost Triggler, Senior Vice President Wagner, Senior Vice Provost Levy, Vice President Bernadino, Vice Provost Sullivan and Associate Provost Eckert, joined by the faculty team of five, which was a larger faculty component than most institutions had included. Reviews typically last one day, whereas the UB visit was a two day one. The Academic Planning Committee met alone for 90 minutes with the interlocutors, a meeting unique in all the interlocutors' visits. Clear and candid sets of concerns were exchanged.

The interlocutors were interested in four areas:

1. undergraduate admissions, selectivity, retention and student life
2. research and graduate education, faculty development and scholarship
3. health sciences
4. general education, collaboration with other campuses and distance learning.

Professor Welch moved to the roles that should be played by the Senate and faculty in the ongoing dialogues contemplated by the mission review process. The APC carries out staff work for the Senate, doing detailed analyses of academic issues. It has been involved

in mission review from the time of Provost Headrick, looking at draft documents often under incredible time pressures. The FSEC has the responsibility to examine and discuss the documents at some length. In particular it needs to read the 65 pages of the dialogue points document around which the visit centered and which is available electronically. The Faculty Senate does not have the continuity nor the expertise of the APC and the FSEC, but is charged with reviewing changes and plans. Individual faculty may have the most important role in these dialogues because of the shift of resources and power away from Capen Hall to the academic units under Responsibility Centered Management. The intent is to distribute 90% of resources to the academic units, retaining 10% for the administration. The interlocutors said that within SUNY, UB's will be the largest decentralization of resources. In that environment, significant academic planning must be carried out at the decanal level.

Professor Welch then spoke about specific issues discussed. First, the interlocutors asked hypothetically what UB would do if given \$5M or \$10 M in additional annual appropriations. The Provost responded that it would go to computing (70%) and graduate stipends (30%). The APC enthusiastically supports increasing graduate stipends and is willing to engage in discussion about the distribution of the remainder of the hypothetical money. Second, President Greiner made a direct commitment for a discussion of next steps with faculty, specifically with the APC, in order to deepen faculty understanding of directions the UB should take. Professor Welch commented that it is important that faculty share in setting directions in order to assure their commitment to them. Third, Appendix 3 of UB's mission review response projects 140 additional faculty by 2000/2003, with no department losing faculty. The growth would be accommodated in part by increased enrollment. But also some faculty would be responsible for generating their own funding and others would be funded through research funding. This is a common model in other AAU institutions, but not at UB. There should be careful discussion with faculty before moving to this model. Also discussed were the relations of the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences with Roswell Park Cancer Institute, issues of the faculty practice plan and scores of other topics. He invited the other members of the faculty team to comment.

Professor Cartwright felt that there is a push by Albany to make the University Centers more research oriented. There is also great concern about undergraduate education and confusion about how to proceed. Professor Jorgensen added that she senses a "one size fits all" approach which is unrealistic. For example, some schools will not be able to support themselves through research funding. Dr. Coles suggested that a promised Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.U.) from Albany will be a very important document. Professor Welch believes that the M.O.U. which is being written by Senior Associate Provost Poskanzer and Provost Triggler will contain only things agreed upon or thoroughly discussed by both parties and will be made available to the faculty electronically. Professor Welch cautioned that both UB's mission review response and the M.O.U. should be seen as the basis for continuing discussion rather than authoritative documents. The Chair added that the M.O.U., which will come as a draft, will contain benchmarks requiring annual reports to Albany. It is the Chair's impression that Provost Salins is bringing to SUNY his work at Hunter College in planning and is interested in improving the quality of all things SUNY.

There were comments from the floor:

- still don't have any idea what was discussed during the two day visit; would like to know what issues received attention (Professor Schack)
- one issue was whether UB should become more selective in its undergraduate admissions; what mechanism should the Senate use for discussing this issue; refer it to the Admissions and Retention Committee? it would be helpful if the APC would identify other issues arising from the visit that the Senate Committees should discuss (Professor Nickerson)
- were some of the points of Provost Triggler's Blue Book, like the role of technology and the focus on specific scientific and technological areas, discussed and/or endorsed by the APC or the interlocutors? (Professor Schack)
- the APC discussed but did not take positions on the Provost's points; the discussion was diffuse rather than focused on the nitty-gritty (Professor Welch)
- any nitty-gritty will come in the M.O.U. (Dr. Coles)
- many issues which are central to the faculty did not receive much attention in the discussion points and UB's response (Professor Welch)

- general faculty lack a sense that the mission review process is important enough to take time away from their research and teaching; it looks like a paper shuffling exercise that won't make any difference (Professor Swartz)
- why is Albany pushing selectivity in admissions? (Professor Baumer)
- UB's more aggressive recruitment in the New York City area and increasing retention rate may satisfy Albany's concern about selectivity without forcing UB to cut admissions; Albany is most concerned with undergraduate education and does not frequently deal with issues of graduate education which it finds a little strange (Professor Welch)
- spent time with Senior Associate Provost Poskanzer at the Potsdam meeting and he seemed impressed with UB's response and thought the meeting went well; he was also interested in hearing how SUNY could have improved the process; the move to Responsibility Centered Management makes it important that the decanal units develop committee structures like the Senate's Budget Priorities Committee to ensure faculty understanding of budgetary issues (Professor Malone)
- most public research institutions are faced with calls of accountability in providing quality undergraduate education, so this is not just a SUNY concern; are in an era of reform of higher education, and faculty who are unwilling to become engaged in the conceptualization of that reform do so at their peril; want to emphasize that UB had the most faculty participation in the mission review process of any SUNY institution (Vice Provost Fischer)
- Provost Salins wants to have mission review visits to all the campuses at the same time every five years so as to be able to compare institutions; President Greiner, however, refused to be compared to other institutions (Professor Nickerson)
- to make mission review less confusing faculty have to think in levels, differentiating what is the mission, what are the supporting goals, and what are the objectives; once the mission is agreed to by a representative faculty body, more faculty may find it possible to participate in setting goals and objectives (Professor Jorgensen)
- believe the visit was successful; what happens next is the issue; doubt there is any significant mission review money left, but even if there is no money to be gained, we did ourselves some good with SUNY (Provost Triggler)

Item 6: Report of the President/Provost

There was no report of the President/Provost.

The FSEC went into executive session at 3:30 and adjourned at 4:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Kramer

Secretary of Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: P. Nickerson

Secretary: M. Kramer

Parliamentarian: D. Malone

Arts & Sciences: W. Baumer, C. Fournier, J. Meacham, S. Schack, Charles Smith

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Sridhar

Graduate School of Education: T. Schroeder

Health Related Professions: J. Tamburlin

Information Science: C. Jorgensen

Law: L. Swartz

Management: J. Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Cedric Smith

Nursing: J. Thompson

Pharmacy: N.

SUNY Senators: J. Adams-Volpe, J. Boot

University Officers: W. Greiner, President

D. Trigg, Provost

Guests:

Mara McGinnis, *Reporter*

O. Provost, *The Spectrum*

C. Connelly, Pre-Professional Special Interest Housing

J. Rose, Pre-Professional Special Interest Housing

J. Celock, Red Jacket Hall Council

C. Welch, Chair, Academic Planning Committee

W. Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

K. Levy, Senior Vice Provost

W. Fischer, Vice Provost

A. Cartwright, member Mission Review Faculty Team

Excused:

SUNY Senators: W. Fisher

Absent:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini

SUNY Senators: H. Durand

University Libraries: D. Woodson