

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of October 24, 2007

(unapproved)

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on Wednesday, October 24, 2007, in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall, 567 to discuss the following agenda:

- 1. Approval of the minutes of September 19, 2007**
- 2. Report of the Chair**
- 3. Report of the President/Provost**
- 4. Report of the Academic Planning Committee and Budget Priorities Committee**
- 5. UB Master Plan: Building UB: The Comprehensive Physical Plan**

Robert Shibley

6. Adjournment

Item 1: Approval of the minutes of September 19, 2007

The minutes of September 19, 2007 were unanimously approved.

Item 2: Report of the Chair

The chair reported that:

1. Faculty Senate Committee meetings are quite active:
 - APC/BPC Thursday, OCT 18: representatives are here today to report
 - TLC + DE Subcommittee --- Friday OCT 19: only 5 people present (one of whom was the chair!) Jim Jensen is currently reviewing the committee members and whether they wish to continue; possible that more members are needed....

- BPC Monday, Monday OCT 22
 - Athletics & Recreation, Monday, OCT 22
 - Computer Services Committee, Monday, OCT 22
 - Tuesday, OCT 30 à both the Affirmative Action and Grading committees will meet
2. Information Library Resources Committee (ILRC) about to be reactivated: it now has a Chair, 2 new members, a plate full of issues, and will meet soon
 3. Hopefully there will be time for an Executive Session --- nominations for TLC Director Search Committee are needed
 4. *Heart of the Campus* initiative (available on the web)
 - Occupied the bulk of the BPC meeting
 - Project Committee (Shibley, Director) --- RS and BH will talk to this project today
 - SIX committees in this initiative:
 - North Campus Learning and Services Commons
 - IT Services
 - Integrated Living and Learning Worlds
 - Meeting High Priority North Campus Academic Unit Space Needs
 - South Campus Learning and Library Services Commons
 - The 21 st Century Library
 - Some ctes. w/o [or w/ little] faculty representation --- what will have to be done is have the 6 invite the relevant FS committees

- nothing planned or set, preliminary work

- Faculty input required - à to that end,

- **OPEN MEETING, DEC 7**

- Until then, importance of spreading the word and *familiarizing* yourselves w/ the document, so everyone can come forth with their visions

5. Joint actions/initiatives w/ Professional Staff Senate

- Committees [?] on Wellness, Fitness, Energy & Environment,
- Walter Simpson à proposal to draft a campus-wide policy to use only 100% post-consumer waste-content recycled paper for printers and copiers

6. The chair met with Vice President Marsha Henderson this morning re: SEFA & Planned Parenthood squabble. He invited Constance Holoman, Asst. VP for University Relations, to speak briefly to this matter in the Chair's report.

Constance Holoman explained that there had been a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation concerning the SEFA campaign in relation to Planned Parenthood. She explained that the all employee listserv would probably be used within the next couple of days to reach as many people as possible about the issue. Planned Parenthood had requested and were denied funding by the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County and sent letters to SEFA donors, United Way donors, and combined federal campaign donors claiming that if they had designated Planned Parenthood in the past through their workplace campaign, they should know that PP was denied the funding by the United Way and that donors should consider directing money directly to the agency of their choice. The relationship between the SEFA campaign and the United Way needs to be clarified.

The SEFA campaign has been going on for about 30 years and in the statewide system last year, UB was #1 for an employee base of that size in terms of charitable giving. The

university has raised about \$12.2 million over the last decade or so, about \$10 million of which has stayed in WNY. We are an extremely generous campus and the campaign offers an opportunity to contribute to a large # of organizations and programs. Everyone can do it through payroll deduction, which allows people to contribute more than they otherwise would. Constance Holoman stressed that SEFA and United Way are indeed separate entities. In every SEFA region (defined by the State), the local SEFA committee (which includes representation from UB, DMV, etc.) contracts with an organization to provide administrative services to the campaign. In our SEFA region, that agency of contract is the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County . When we raise money and each of us contributes to several organizations, we cannot administer that locally. It would be too large a task for UB's payroll people to take care of, so locally the SEFA campaign contracts with UW to provide those services. That contract is not a money-making contract, it is a cost recovery contract which is equivalent to 8% of the money raised. This is a very low fundraising cost compared to other organizations. 8% supports the SEFA campaign only and does not go into any discretionary funds as long as the dollars are designated. If you designate money to an organization, that organization is going to get all that money minus the small administrative fee. Non-designated funds get reallocated to all the organizations where money was designated in the exact same percentage that was designated. If PP received 5% of the local SEFA designation, and 100 000 got left undesignated, they would get 5% of that undesignated money. For people concerned about their agency of choice, working through SEFA would allow that agency to get more than they might get if you give them directly. Some people do not designate their money but are encouraged to do so because then as donors they know exactly where their money is going. The UW does not receive any share for its own discretionary use of any designated gifts for the SEFA campaign or any benefits, unless they are designated. There are a number of organizations that are controversial for one reason or another but the benefit of the campaign is that people can designate their funds. The communication that went out to the PP donors conflates many of these things and UB has been in communication with Laura Meyers, the executive director of PP, who called yesterday to get a statement from SEFA to put in their November newsletter to clarify

this. Meyers agreed that this confusion was generated and that SEFA remains a very viable option for people who would choose to give money to PP or any other campaign.

Barbara raised the issue that things were more complicated: She explained that we are by far the largest donor in this region and a large percentage of us do not hold the same views as the United Way about whether or not, based on religious beliefs, an agency is worthy of receiving money or not: Why isn't the university, a powerful member of the committee, not saying that this policy of the UW is unacceptable? The other issue is that the separation between the two is a lot fuzzier. Money is taken out of paychecks throughout the year but the money is distributed annually. In that period of time between when we give and they distribute, isn't the money sitting somewhere in an interest-bearing account? Don't they receive benefits from holding the money? Where is the percentage? The third issue is when the UW talks about the cumulated amounts of money, our money is in there. They record \$900 000 or more as part of the UW campaign that occurs in this community. Barbara said that she has no objection with the UW being the fiduciary receiver of this money. The problem is when an organization that is heavily supported by people on this campus is not a worthy organization to distribute the non-designated funds. Why aren't we being more proactive to change that policy or to make a statement saying this is not ok. Why isn't UW being equitable about how legitimate agencies that are funded and are on the list can receive funds? Even money passing through has the potential for having a political clout. The issue isn't that the UW has a separate identity, but that it is where we are putting our money. It may be appropriate for UB to take a proactive stance before the next year.

Constance Holoman explained that for the university to take a position on a social issue and to do that in one voice is a significant challenge, and she was not sure what the mechanism would be for doing that. If the FS was the body where this agenda were to start, that may make sense, but it is hard to think where else that could emanate and be representative of the voice of the institution since even within the institution, there would undoubtedly be divisiveness about this issue (which is clearly a divisive issue). Regarding the investment or benefit of undistributed funds, the university issues periodic checks to the UW from payroll deduction. A gift of \$1000 is not issued in one lump sum; it goes to UW in installments over

the course of the year. Ms. Holoman did not know whether or not there was any investment taking place with that, but she said that she would certainly look into that.

As to reporting our numbers with their results, in the past UB had aligned its campaign more closely with the UW because throughout the community at Wegman's and Top's and everywhere, the UW campaign was taking place at the same time as UB's campaign was and UB was trying to piggy- on that to help people understand it is charitable giving time. Now, however, UB is realizing more and more that it has to keep the distinctive SEFA identity and is suffering from that somewhat. Without maligning the UW (it is doing valuable work in the community), it is important to keep the two distinct.

In response to another question, Constance Holoman explained that checks are cut on a quarterly basis to UW but that she did not know why. This was an issue she would have to take up with the payroll department. She concluded by encouraging people to contact her with any additional questions. The chair suggested that maybe a committee should be formed to look into this issue.

Item 3: Report of the President/Provost

The provost had one piece of good news to share and one progress report to make. Every other year, the freshmen are surveyed about why they choose to come to UB, how prepared they are in their own mind, etc. One was done in 2003, one in 2005, and one was done again this year. 2600 out of 3262 responded among the freshmen, and some drastic changes were noted in the last two years:

One of the questions: what influenced you to come to UB? They had between 12 to 15 factors to choose from: the two things that jumped out were:

- national ranking 47% rather than 15% last year said that the national ranking was important in their decision making. In other words, our ranking has not changed but the perception has. It was 10% in 2003.

- family advice is another major factor: 6% in 2003, 10% in 2005, and 43% now. So more and more family members are advising students to come here. In terms of the teachers and advisors, that jumped from 12% to 37%, more than doubled. The good news is that in terms of the people who help make the decisions, it shows movement in the right direction.

- Academic reputation jumped from 65% to 75% as one of the reasons to come to UB.

- The cost of attendance was already very high from 62% to 65% but not the #1 reason (even though it is usually considered the #1 reason why state universities are chosen). At UB, other factors are taking a more proactive role.

The second set of questions concerned student self evaluation about their own skills, how they feel about themselves: this class is much more self-confident. The creativity has jumped from 55% to 65%. They are better mathematically prepared (7% jump). In all aspects, there has been improvement.

The third set of questions showed greater engagement at UB: their satisfaction with UB has jumped from 50% to 80%. At the same time, the transfer before graduation has gone down from 5% to 2% (small to begin with). They are going to communicate more with professors: from 35% to 55%; they are going to be more active working with professors, more interested in study abroad, they want to play more intercollegial sports. In short, this class is not only more academically competent but also more self-confident.

How did it differ from region to region? Were local students, out of state students, eastern NY, metro NY, or central NY students responding differently? The provost explained that in many of these factors, the Central NY is on the lower edge. In fact, UB is better perceived in metro NY than central NY. For example, for advice from family, out of state was 51%, WNY 46%, centrally 38%, the rest 45 to 49%. The differences are not very dramatic, so this is not a phenomenon that is peculiar to WNY. The academic reputation is in the 70% across the board. The national ranking is about the same except in Central NY where it is somewhat lower. We don't have the data for each of these geographic regions in the past two years but we have it for this year so it can serve as a benchmark.

The Provost also discussed the International Strategy Task Group to look at the globalization of UB as well as what our role should be in terms of international education, collaboration, research. The group came up with some good recommendations that will be put on the website with UB2020. There were recommendations in 3 categories: 1/student experience 2/ faculty and 3/ UB as a whole.

1/ The group wants to see a global perspective across the length and breath of the curriculum. We can talk about being global but what does it mean for the average student here? We have international students, how does the learning environment change as a result? What influence do they have? We are close to Canada , what does it mean? How can we think about internationalization in the first year the students are here? More and more students want to do study abroad, how can we bring that right in the beginning? How can we be globalize graduate education? What kind of language training is needed? What should be done at the level of language requirements?

2/ On the Faculty side: how do we integrate the faculty with the institutional internationalization effort? Many faculty are already doing that but how do we coordinate that? what kind of incentives are needed? At the very least, faculty should not be penalized for it. Many publish articles in foreign languages and some other people don't give them their due credit.

3/ On the Institutional level: whether UB has a lot of international programs, should that be an identity for UB? Should we look at an institutional infrastructure for area studies? What kind of strategies should we have for international enrollment and planning in the future? Should we have a more targeted strategy so that it is more balanced in terms of our international students than just a few countries?

The provost is working with the Undergraduate Studies office to see how we can take some of these recommendations and start to implement them.

Lois Weiss commented that with all the competing agenda that are being discussed in every college and university, it is important for someone to begin to think about how we can

support kids who come from families without the means to send their children abroad. The provost responded that the Study abroad budget was increased this year. In some cases it is travel money, so some funds are available. He emphasized that he is very much aware of this problem and working on it.

Item 4: Report of the Joint Meeting of the Academic Planning Committee and Budget Priorities Committee

The Chair welcomed the members of the Academic Planning Committee: Diane Christian (chair), Mary Bisson, Lois Weis, Peter Nickerson, Carl Granger. The Joint meeting of APC and BPC took place last Thursday. This was the first one and was mainly an exploratory committee meeting to try and identify overlapping committee interests in the ongoing realization of UB2020, the overall plan. At first the provost and Sean Sullivan presented a budget process update, and a free-form Q&A period followed with no particular focus (to be expected for a first meeting). Among the things that came out was the setting up of a BPC/APC discussion board on UBlerns so that all committee members could contribute. Unclear if the two committees will be meeting once or twice a semester. The purpose of this board is to have a free forum for the exchange of ideas to identify the most important items we want to focus on.

There was a couple of issues relating to information being shared with faculty and faculty governance in general: people in the administration have been very good about posting most information about things that are going on at UB, keeping faculty updated on almost everything. If 90% of the faculty seem unaware, it is their fault because maybe they don't check ub wings or the posted items. Secondly, Provost said regarding faculty involvement that we always express the opinion that we want to be involved and if something happens without our involvement, we complain about it. If we use the Faculty Senate as an indication of our will for involvement, it is a poor reflection of our interest. Faculty Senate attendance has been dropping a lot lately so the chair emphasized the importance of attending and of encouraging colleagues to do the same. The chair also commented that in UB2020, a lot of us will not be around, so it is important to get people involved who will be

there to enjoy it. An idea that was circulated was to bring a junior faculty to a FSEC meeting or to the Faculty Senate meeting. It is time that those involved in the Senate get others involved.

The chair then gave the floor to Diane Christian, chair of ACP: Diane Christian emphasized the importance of rethinking our ideas of meetings. She said that faculty members are under such stress for time, they don't want to just come to perfunctory meetings when they can read summaries. One of the things discussed in this joint meeting is to try and focus and see what is worth our attention and how to communicate to the larger faculty community. It cannot be just business as usual. A lot can be done on the web about what is going on. Diane Christian also addressed the issue of how to get better attendance at FS. She suggested that getting more proactive might be the answer. The FS should survey the faculty in general to see what UB should be doing. Dr. Christian urged the Senate to do that kind of self examination necessary and not be afraid of making big changes in terms of structure and procedures. The chair added that he has been trying to find issues that lend themselves to discussion that people care about.

Peter Nickerson reported that one of things they heard about was the division of Student Affairs. What was going to be happening probably starting the second semester was an examination of their budget. This had been already happening on the academic side. The other thing they learnt about was how we do living and learning, and how we do it right, i.e. connecting Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. This is all the more important, since there is an emphasis on Living Learning Space in the new physical master plan.

Lois Weis commented that she learnt more about this university in 2 hours than she had known. There has to be a way of getting the information out to faculty who are incredibly busy. As a faculty member, it is frustrating not to know how rumors start, if they are coming out of the Provost's office, and lack of information often leads to misinformation.

The Chair commented that even though everyone has a very busy schedule, it still was not asking a lot to attend once a month even though the senate meeting may take a different format.

Item 5: UB Master Plan: Building UB: The Comprehensive Physical Plan

Robert Shibley

The chair introduced Professor Bob Shibley who is attending to receive feedback from the members of the Academic Planning Committee. He explained that the Physical Master Plan is to reflect changes in our academic planning and how we envision changes at UB, so this is the best first place to start offering ideas.

Professor Shibley began by emphasizing that he had done 110 presentations on this issue and that the presentation is also available online at [UB2020/plan](#). He therefore wants to use his presence at the FSEC meeting to do a lot more listening than talking. To set it up, he gave a little bit of context: he is an architect and planner and has been a faculty member in the School of Architecture and Planning for 25 years. Although in foreign territory on the 5th floor of Capen, he is immensely impressed with the change, the level of intensity, activity, dialogue and capacity he has been witnessing among the various actors in Capen and across the campus. Dr. Shibley set the context for what it was like before: it was possible to arrive on campus, see a hoe digging and for the President or Provost to wonder who had approved that, how it came to be, where the money was coming from (usually from a lot of different places). As an architect and planner, this was unacceptable. Today, the hoes and capital construction are no longer surprising to the leadership. What people are charged to do is informed by a really broad cross-section of interests that take into account the whole campus and not just one thing. Understanding projects in campus terms is essential. So what has occurred is a maturing group that has been around for 3 years and that is called "Space Management and Facilities Planning Committee," i.e. a planning group that is intended to do the intake on a project (is it worthy of financial expenditure, of faculty, staff, student support, alumni and donor participation? will it improve what it is intended for but also those around it may affect?). This means a real dialogue across the campus. The Faculty Senate is represented on that board. Every single capital project that comes forward has a project committee and a technical committee base to it, and the PC asks the question vetted in this committee: whose ox is gored with this project? Who is

invested in this project who should be heard from and is the committee representative of kind of interest. So that every capital project that comes forward should never surprise anyone again.

A very different discipline of design development has consequently ensued. UB is very close to putting into place something called the Presidential Design Commission. The Commission is devoted to peer review on all of UB's capital projects from a design, planning and environmental perspective, so the university can get the very best national expertise and local regional expertise looking over its shoulder with a dispassionate, disinterested look (the "critique"). Although embedded in project teams, they don't report to the project. They report to one another and to the President, the Provost and the leadership team. In other words, there is an effort to elevate the conversation on the quality of place as a structural and mechanical device. Bureaucratically and mechanically, this means no more surprises. Instead, things are coordinated so that the right kinds of inclusions and exclusions are out there for everyone to look at, and secondly, in terms of physical design and planning, the emphasis is on doing it right. All of that means that UB is looking at alternate ways of financing capital construction, and alternate ways to think about doing the best possible campus making we can. UB has a contract with Beyer Blinder Belle Architects a NY city planning and architecture firm, and sub-consultants ranging from VFA doing facilities conditions audits to DGEW, a group devoted to this concept of learning landscape. These folks represent a small army that is spread out across campus trying to come to grips with our current status and condition. The conversation over the next ½ hour or more is about trying to get what is at the top of the faculty's understanding about where UB is physically and where it needs to go. It fits in context as follows: we have essentially 4 cycles over two years of contract work to do. The end of the first cycle ends at the end of the first semester, somewhere between Dec 4-7, 2007 . There will be a large open house with a presentation of Dr. Shibley's first 3.5 months of intense work. That focus will be on vision discussion, on problem framing. What are the strategic considerations that we are going to have to pay a lot of attention to throughout all this? What is the guiding principle, the moral compass that will drive action on this campus? Dr. Shibley emphasized that he was going to put it out there as draft, put it on boards, up on the wall, speak to it, have small open house sessions

where people can approach tables, talk directly to consultants or the staff to try and open the conversation about the vision for North, South, and downtown. The questions for which input will be sought will be: "are we defining the problem properly? Are these the right strategic considerations to wrestle with?"

That conversation will roll over to the end of the next semester when the consideration will be UB's expansion from 25,000 to 35,000 students and adding 750 new faculty and 600 new staff , a growth which will involve major capital construction on 3 sites and some dramatically different ways of understanding transportation and environmental support for all 3 sites. This is where the Urban Design proposal comes forward with another big event where faculty, staff and students + community can again have a conversation. In between these, Professor Shibley explained that they had just finished a cycle of over 100 presentations and in-depth interviews, and would probably have another cycle of about 100 in between, so informing people will continue to happen as they go. They will also be revisiting the Strategic Considerations, so through each additional reviewing, everyone will be better informed.

By the third semester, the plan will be out there as an open book that the public can consult (where UB is with recreation, with academic program strategic strengths, support for research, etc.). It will still be a draft plan that can be changed however. There will then be one more semester to revisit all this and bring it into the working document that should forever more drive the way UB thinks about building on its 3 campuses even as the plan gets revisited every 4 or 5 years as an update process. So it is a tool.

Briefly, 15% of the 110 meetings Professor Shibley has organized have been exclusively with faculty; 10% have been deans, VPs and some chairs; another 25% have been general faculty, staff, students, collections and special interests groups; 10% have been exclusively students, student leaderships, clubs, etc.; and another 40% have been external to the campus in Amherst, downtown with the county, with the city, the alumni, the development community. UB is out there fairly broadly with an explicit recognition that the University is part of the community. Dr. Shibley then asked 5 questions of the attending faculty as a way

of aiming or shaping the attention of the consultants in this very first phase of work. He emphasized that there would be more chances to reflect on this since the committee will write up what was said at the meeting, give it to the Faculty Senate, ask Faculty to mark it up and change it before returning it to Dr. Shibley.

1/ North Campus,

2/ South Campus,

3/ Downtown,

4/ UB's institutional capacity,

5/ what else bubbles to the top that is relatively more important.

Dr. Shibley asked to discuss each on a scale of 1 (bad) to 10 (great).

1/ In response to the question concerning North Campus, the faculty present placed the campus on the lower end of the continuum (because of isolation; the difficulty of getting from one side to another; the Brick wall; the difficulty of getting to campus on cold days; the lack of anything whimsical, colorful; the poor acoustics in classrooms; dingy, poorly lit, unpleasant place to be at; a lack of connection with the surrounding community) with a few ranking it as a 5. Dr. Shibley asked that those who had ranked it in the middle explain what they saw as positive. Some answered the CFA, especially compared to what it used to be; maintenance, the variety between open and compact.

When it comes to the connection to the surrounding community, Dr. Shibley suggested not accepting defeat before taking on the challenge. There is limited choice, limited energy, but the provost and the president have given the directive to try and take our best shot and that is what the Master Plan is all about.

Dr Shibley also explained that the IT gang has been visiting other campuses looking at the future of computing in the classroom and has come with a host of state of the art

configurations that are physically very different as well. The expert that UB has hired from DEGW also brings a ground of experience of the range and types of educational classroom facilities that seem to be state of the art. This will be part of our configuration.

2/ South Campus: The faculty asked which side of South Campus Dr. Shibley had in mind. Professor Shibley asked to imagine it as a campus center and to give him an average. The group evaluated South Campus as better than North Campus for the following reasons: the historic architecture, landscaping, a human scale, proximity to the community, walkability on campus, good access to subway/transit, the EB Green quad configuration. On the negative side, someone mentioned that the buildings were run down, the gym was decrepit, the systems were run down, the pipes were corroded. Interestingly, the professional staff senate had these reversed. Also, the administrative staff at Capen gave the North Campus a 5.5 and South Campus a 4. Dr. Shibley commented that the piping was getting replaced as we speak.

3/ Downtown: UB teamed with The Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus to buy the Trico Complex and is in the process of closing for its sole ownership of two more lots, one with M. Wile Co., the former textile facility and adjacent to it, a large parking lot which will house the \$26 million Educational Opportunity Center. Spatially, it is the Center of Excellence , Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Center , Trico, the two sites, coming right off the 33, coming up Ellicott from downtown, off Main from the North. UB has ground zero signature property to wrestle with here right on the corner of campus. The University has also acquired a very large parking lot linking the Center of Excellence to the M. Wile facility. This will help develop the presence of the University downtown. Dr. Shibley then asked the faculty whether they thought this was a good site for UB to have an outpost, or a bad site?

The faculty response was largely positive, ranging from 8 to 10 because of access, the theater district, the Squeaky Wheel documentary project, the access to culture, proximity to the community.

A question was asked about the Trico Building and the impossibility of cleaning it up (determined to be level 2 by EPA). Dr. Shibley said "never say never" in restoration and

better UB controls it. The State gave UB a kick in the teeth by not approving historic landmark tax credit but the University still has federal (0.25 cents on a dollar). The good news is that UB does not own it or its liability so that is in the hands of its colleagues at the BNMC and since UB sits on their board, there is some control over that property.

Dr. Shibley commented that he needed value positions clearly stated from the faculty, staff, students and the community. What is going to decide what the North Campus is, what the South Campus is, what downtown is. There has to be a logic that holds up to scrutiny so a transportation system and a host of other things can be designed that make sense for the University. Come May, there will be a proposal about where the law school ought to be to which the faculty can then react and a conversation can ensue. Right now, Dr. Shibley and the consultants are looking very seriously at where the academic core is; what to do with the professional schools; are they consolidated with the academic core; do we divorce them. There are 3 campus centers; what is South campus really about especially if there is a medical facility downtown. Where do we cut the baby and still have one UB? Right now, the South Campus is supposed to be the Science campus (medical educational school) and with the clinical/ clinical research based relegated to downtown. But this is a kind of bifurcation too, Dr. Shibley stated. If the professional schools are pulled away from their academic home, then one has dual degree programs and collaborative constructions and all kinds of consequences.

Dr. Shibley explained that UB has 7 buildings downtown, only two of which are on the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus. The others are spread all over right now. The goal would be to eventually consolidate what we can that makes senses. The Research Center on Addiction is on the edge of the campus and could arguably be said to be in the campus for instance. Meanwhile, UB also has the Jacob Mansion on Delaware Ave which has been donated to UB and has lots of development potential. Professor Shibley did emphasize that the building is only 4 blocks from the BNMC.

4/ Dr. Shibley explained that the signs were good that UB does indeed have the institutional capacity, the will to grow by 10,000. Based on all the indications so far, Dr. Shibley said

that the Commission on Higher Education is going in fact to be very good to UB. The governor is extraordinarily supportive of all the range and possibility partly because of the downtown presence but also recognizing more broadly what an economic and reputational impact a major public university can have on the state and particularly on the WNY economy. A number of conditions from the UB leadership to the state-level once-in-a-lifetime budgeting possibilities to the kind of willingness on the part of the local delegation to help UB with the legislative acts that are going to have to be part of this package are in play that might lead us to think we can do this. A set of things including our own inertia may make us conclude that there is no way. Dr. Shibley asked the faculty to comment on where they stood concerning the feasibility of all this.

The faculty was split in terms of the level of optimism and the sense of possibility. Dr. Shibley raised the question of how the faculty position may be factored in to the real capacity to actually do this or not. Is this merely another Academic Plan? Dr. Shibley said that over half of the faculty are engaged in the Planning Process, a kind of maturity is emerging in terms of the intellectual intentions of it, the President is literally on the road all over the country and all over the world marketing and selling an idea for the university that is significantly different from what UB has had in the past. For the first time in 25 years, UB has had a big jump growth agenda (there were small jumps before but never big ones). Dr. Shibley is absolutely persuaded that faculty attitude is going to have a lot to do with whether this happens or not. This simply cannot happen without faculty, and skepticism and negative attitudes have huge effects. A fair number of people are going to invest a huge amount of energy including the committees of the FS, and faculty need to decide what, if nothing else, is the most important they are going to get out of the whole process. The chair commented that the more buildings we build we are going to be spending a lot more on maintenance and energy, and we are going to have to decide who really needs more space, how much, etc.

Dr. Shibley emphasized that the discussion today was not about setting policy. He repeated that the comments made in this meeting were going to be assembled, put into some sort of order and resubmitted to the FSEC for further comment and reflection. He urged that the FS

use its active committees as well as its representatives on the Space, Management and Facilities Planning Committee to make sure the Faculty are represented in capital projects going forward today, such as the Heart of the Campus for example.

Considering the time, the Chair postponed the remaining items until next week.

Item 6: Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 PM .

Respectfully submitted,

Carine Mardorossian, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attendance

(P = present; E = excused; A = absent)

Chair:

Robert Hoeing (P)

Secretary:

Carine Mardorossian (P)

Arts & Sciences:

Joseph Woelfel (P)

Melvyn Churchill (P)

Sharmistah Bagchi-Sen (P)

Stanley Bruckenstein (P)

Debra Street (P)

Architecture & Planning:

Scott Danford (P)

Dental Medicine:

Peter Bradford (P)

Educational Opportunity Center:

TBA

Engineering & Applied Sciences:

Stella Batalama (P)

Rohini Srihari (P)

Graduate School of Education:

Thomas Schroeder (A)

School of Law:

TBA

Management:

Hodan Isse (P)

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences:

David Ellis (A)

James Hassett (A)

Charles Hershey (P)

Peter Ostrow (E)

Nursing:

Cynthia Curran (A)

Pharmacy:

Gayle Brazeau (E)

School of Public Health and Health Professions:

Peter Horvath (E)

Social Work:

Barbara Rittner (P)

SUNY Senators:

William H. Baumer (P)

Peter Bradford (P)

Henry Durand (E)

Marilyn McMann Kramer (P)

Parliamentarian:

William H. Baumer (P)

Ex-officio:

Peter Nickerson (P)

University Libraries:

Dorothy Tao (E)

Guests:

Satish Tripathi (Provost)

Barbara Burke (EDAAA)

David Bray (EDAAA)

Gay Lynne Samsonoff (Graduate Student Association)

Jayne Wortley (Undergraduate Student Association)

Rezwanul Islam (Undergraduate Student Association)

Janiece Kiedrowski (Professional Staff Senate)

Cheng Cheong (The Spectrum)

Mary Cochrane (The Reporter)

Diane Christian (APC, Chair)

Carl Granger (APC)

Mary Bisson (APC)

Lois Weis (APC)

Robert Shibley (Senior Advisor to the President for Campus Planning & Design)