FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of January 15, 1997 (unapproved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

Item 1: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch had circulated prior to the meeting an executive summary of a series of reports on the "Stresses on Research and Education"; UB had been invited to participate in the study by the National Science Board and the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable of the National Academies of Science and of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

Professor Miller announced his retirement from the FSEC, and that Professor Baier would succeed him in representing Dental Medicine. The Chair added that Professor Miller's retirement will necessitate finding replacements for him on several committees.

The Chair announced that the SUNY Task Force on Variable Campus-Based Tuition has issued its report; after lengthy discussions, the Task Force had decided to refer the matter to the State legislature for its examination.

He reported that UB had not met its enrollment target. Since State allocations depend heavily on the number of students, our budget would be cut accordingly. The Chair

reminded the FSEC that the faculty must therefore play a central role in student retention and recruitment.

Item 2: Report on the Governor's Budget

Senior Vice-President Wagner distributed a preliminary analysis of the Governor's proposed budget and summarized the main points:

- An overall $124 million reduction in SUNY's budget. The proposed $400 tuition increase, expected to generate $60 million, would still leave SUNY with a $64 million shortfall.
- An assignment of $24 million for the three teaching hospitals. This left a $25 million reduction, of which UB's share is $2.2 million. Although this is a one-year revenue requirement, the budget assumes this will be met again for fiscal 1997/98.
- The removal of the prohibition on campus-based tuition. However, no other flexibility regulation was proposed in the Executive Budget for SUNY.
- Capital budget funding of only $5 million for graduate and technology equipment.
- TAP reductions for 1997/98 of $175 million.

For UB, these proposals could translate to:

- An undergraduate tuition increase of $400.
- Graduate/professional tuition increases, as yet unspecified.
- Reduced student aid based on TAP reductions.
- Recommended appropriations for the Earthquake Center, equipment replacement, the Minority Fellowship Initiative, tuition scholarships, SUSTA, EOP and EOC, and SPIR.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion. Professor Jameson asked whether, if the expected enrollment targets were not met, the tuition increases would raise less than the projected $60 million. Senior Vice-President Wagner confirmed this, but said he expected no significant decline in enrollment. Professor Welch remarked that it is difficult for students to plan when the costs of tuition are still in flux.

Professor Schuel asked whether the governor's plan contained any provision for the University to retain any extra tuition for out-of-state recruitments, in order to help offset enrollment shortfalls. Senior Vice-President Wagner replied that SUTRA becomes operative only after the campus achieves its aggregate revenue target; thus if the campus falls short of the target but has a number of out-of-state students paying more per head, the campus might still only be making its targeted revenue, in which case SUTRA would not yet be operative.

Professor Nickerson asked whether this budget, compared with those of previous years, represented "the same old thing". Senior Vice-President Wagner affirmed this. One of the main problems is that, during the time period in which students must make enrollments decisions, there are potentially two unknowns -- the tuition level and the amount of aid available.

Professor Schuel asked for an estimate of UB's share of the reductions, and suggested the possibility of contacting legislators and the media on this matter. Senior Vice-President Wagner estimated UB's share to be about $8 million. Professor Schuel wondered where New York State ranked in its support of per capita public education. Senior Vice-President Wagner replied did not have the data available, but that such rankings depended critically on several factors, including TAP, fringe benefits, and the like. When all these are considered, New York State showed a "reasonable level of support"; nevertheless, it would rank in the lower half nationwide, as would all the most populous states.

Item 3: Report of the President

Following up on the immediately preceding discussion, President Greiner said that New York State ranked 35th in per capita support of higher education (adding that California ranked 33rd); since most of the high population states are in the range between 25 and 45, he argued, New York cannot be described as "parsimonious" in comparison with those states.

What the figures do not show, he explained, is the "peculiar way" in which money is spent in this state. Too many small, under-funded institutions, few of which have any national

reputation, bleed away a disproportionately large sum of money, aggravating SUNY's debt burden. He pointed out that New York ranked first or second in nearly every other category, such as in taxes collected and in expenditures; the problem, he claimed, is not what we spend on higher education -- which is about right -- but rather what we spend on everything else.

Professor Welch asked whether there were any surprises in the new budget; President Greiner replied there were none. He explained that a "trick" of the Division of the Budget is to suggest a budget cut which they know the Assembly will not agree to (such as a TAP reduction); the cut will be rejected, the money restored. After that, the State Legislature will feel good about the restoration, but claim that little else is left over for SUNY. UB would not waste much time on "fooling around" with the budget this Spring, since it has a more important agenda, mainly the plans for its future. Thus UB will optimize its invested energies in getting what it can; although it will not win a full restoration, it hopes to restore TAP and limit the tuition increase. As for differential tuition, President Greiner believed it would be "DOA".

Item 4: Approval of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting

The agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of January 28, 1997, subject to the deletion of proposed Item 6, the reconsideration of principles of the resource allocation statement from the Budget Priorities Committee (due to lack of interest), was approved.

Item 5: Complaints and Grievances Procedures

A panel convened to field discussion of three separate procedures for complaints and grievances by the faculty. The members were: Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Senate Bylaws Committee, which had finished a lengthy process of drafting a revision and expansion of the complaints procedure contained in the Standing Orders; Professor Zarembka, representing the UUP and its contract with the faculty; and Senior Vice-Provost Levy, to answer questions about the "Provost's" complaint procedure contained in the Faculty/Professional Staff Handbook.

Senior Vice-Provost Levy began the discussion by noting that formal action on a grievance is very rare; the one instance he knew of concerned only an inquiry, but no action. The Provost's procedure also provides for informal resolution at the departmental or school level, which is somewhat more common than the formal procedure.

Professor Zarembka echoed the fact that formal complaints were extremely rare. On the other hand, the UUP handles several informal complaints, deciding first whether any injustice occurred, and if so, what action could be taken within the scope of the contract. The UUP contract explicitly excludes certain matters, such as discrimination. Professor Zarembka cited from the contract which states that discrimination "shall be subject to review in accordance with state and federal procedures established for that purpose", but shall not be subject to review under the article in the contract concerning grievances. Likewise, he could find no place in the contract which protects junior faculty members from being dismissed in their fifth year of employment, prior to tenure review. Although he considered these wrong, the negotiated language of the contract precludes any complaint procedure on these matters.

Professor Hopkins informed the FSEC of the charge given to the Bylaws Committee by Professor Goodman, then Chair of the Faculty Senate, to draft a revised grievance procedure for the Standing Orders. The Committee had completed the charge by fleshing out the procedure with greater specificity, adding confidentiality statements and stipulating the formation of a Grievance Committee and the selection of its members (no longer at random), among other things. The Committee had determined that a separate procedure was needed: first, because it would be a faculty procedure, as opposed to the administration procedure in the Handbook; secondly, because there were several possible complaints not covered by the UUP contract. The Senate document recognizes the Provost's procedure, and leaves it to the discretion of the complainant which procedure to adopt.

Professor Meacham asked for examples of the categories into which informal complaints fall. Professor Welch cited the non-extension of employment at the fifth year. Professor Zarembka remarked that he approved of the Senate procedure very strongly. Professor

Schuel expressed concern about the non-reappointment of faculty, and asked how often this happened; Professor Zarembka said it occurred about two or three times per year. Professor Schuel warned that this practice could be exploited by the institution in times of duress in order to save money after "working the hell out of them". Professor Albini mentioned that problems are found more often in some schools than in others, and supported the existence of a separate Faculty Senate procedure.

Professor Meacham asked to which parties the grievances applied. Professor Welch replied that the Faculty Senate procedure specified complaints of faculty against other faculty, as well as complaints of faculty against administration; Vice-Provost Levy said the same held for the Provost's procedure; Professor Zarembka said the UUP contract concerned complaints by the faculty against the administration. Vice-Provost Levy asked Professor Hopkins whether the faculty must choose only one procedure, or have access to both if they wish. Professor Hopkins replied that the intent was to have them choose one or the other. Senior Vice-Provost Levy suggested that the Faculty Senate procedure be included in the Handbook as well.

Professor Bruckenstein assumed that if one opted for the faculty procedure and won, that person would have the moral victory, but that there would be no way to implement the decision. He asked what, if anything, would happen if one were to follow the Provost's procedure. Senior Vice-Provost Levy replied that this would depend on the nature of the complaint; what the Provost's office agrees with and what it can actually do are two different things. Professor Bruckenstein then asked where the procedures for personnel and faculty review are described. Professor Welch noted that the procedure is elaborately detailed only for tenure review in the sixth year.

Item 6: Report on Information Technology

Senior Associate Vice-President Innus reported that he had completed the first phase of the assessment process in accordance with the plan he outlined for the FSEC last summer. He had met with the Provost and his staff, all the Vice-Presidents, the deans as a group (twice) and individually, and several others. In order to ascertain the national context, he had

attended two conferences, one sponsored by the Gartner Group, the other a COS conference.

He incorporated all the suggestions from these constituent groups into his Draft Proposal #2, which he presented in a lengthy series of slides and distributed in photocopies at the meeting.

The current global directions in Information Technology (IT) include the following:

- A dominant trend of an increasingly open architecture distributed computing environment, and desktop computing power unimaginable five to ten years ago.
- A dramatic increase in Web use for internal and external processing.
- An increase of 20% per year in user computing expenditures, a figure based on research by the Gartner Group.
- An increase of 2% per year in central IT expenditures. The much slower growth reflects the enormous pressure on the institution's infrastructure and its need to upgrade the rapidly growing distributed computing environment.
- A dramatic change in the role of Information Systems (IS = CIT for UB) organization as a consequence of these changes.

Among the first set of key issues Vice-President Innus presented were the IT technical directions for UB. He proposed

1. a three-tiered open architecture distributed client server environment (consistent with the general trend in the IT arena). This consists of an institutional database on the third tier, rules and regulations working with that database on the second tier, and the user at the desktop computer on the first tier -- with easy access between any two immediate tiers;
2. using the Internet/Intranet as a strategic tool;
3. building on instead of discarding the current IT infrastructure;
4. putting emphasis on following the mainstream IT directions.

Senior Associate Vice-President Innus demonstrated on the next slide the growing gap between current funding at UB for IT technology and the total user demand. The impact of the global trends on UB is an exploding investment demand for IT, without the ability to reallocate sources from CIT to the user community to address this demand. This creates significant pressure to define the centralized and decentralized responsibilities of IT on the UB campus. Senior Associate Vice-President Innus emphasized that these issues are not unique for UB.

At the core of his IT planning is the assumption that information technology at UB is "mission critical", first because of the dramatic changes in the delivery of education (such as distance learning), and secondly because of the changes in New York State. The latter included (1) a greater self-reliance of educational institutions, (2) increasing competition among campuses in terms of their IT capabilities and in student recruitment, and (3) the goal (presented in the document Rethinking SUNY) of becoming more efficient more cheaply through the use of technology. Senior Associate Vice-President Innus' current proposed IT plans include an educational technology plan, a digital library plan, an administrative systems development plan, and a few others. In his proposed organizational structure, an IT Coordination Committee and IT implementation teams would be responsible for implementation, monitoring and adjustment of the plan; the Chief Information Officer, in conjunction with the Provost and Senior Associate Vice-President for Informational Technology, would be responsible for the vision, strategic planning, and priority setting. In addition, an IT Steering Committee would establish the principles for the IT Development Plan (ITDP), make recommendations regarding the scope and strategies for its implementation, approves project plans, budgets, deliverables and schedules, and provide advice and guidelines to the IT Coordination Committee.

He then proposed memberships for both the Steering and Coordination Committees, and mentioned objections he had heard concerning these -- namely, that there was not enough faculty and student representation. Professor Meacham though he should include a number of people who deal intimately with IT and who are not overloaded with several other (primarily administrative) responsibilities. Professor Meacham believed that several of the

proposed members would most likely send representatives instead of attending themselves. Senior Associate Vice-President Innus did not believe this would be the case, and assured Professor Meacham that the members listed were very willing to be on those committees. Professor Cowen objected that some of the committee members were rather ignorant of IT, which could shake the faith of the constituents they would be serving.

The IT communication plan would require regular meetings with deans and associate deans, the Faculty and Professional Staff Senates, the Department Computing Consultants, and student governments. In addition, it would establish faculty, staff, and student focus groups, and facilitate information flow through the establishment of a web-site for IT which contains all planning and information documents and by providing an e-mail address to which members of the university community can send documents.

The immediate next step for IT development is to determine centralized vs. decentralized responsibilities. As currently proposed, the centralized responsibilities are:

1. To set campus IT directions and standards.
2. To maintain and upgrade the campus IT infrastructure.
3. To manage mainframe and major time-sharing systems.
4. To develop institutional administrative and management information systems.
5. To provide level two (and above) technical support to distributed IT staff.
6. To provide training and certification programs for distributed IT staff.
7. To develop and maintain public computing facilities.

The decentralized responsibilities include:

1. The design of technologically based instruction and learning.
2. Providing support for faculty IT development and training.
3. The development and maintenance of departmental computing facilities (ETEC classrooms and labs).
4. The set-up, operation, repair, and end user training/support for PC, LAN, and UNIX stations.

5. The maintenance of departmentally developed applications.

After brief discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing

Secretary, UB Faculty Senate

THOSE PRESENT:

University Officers: W. Greiner, V. Innus, K. Levy, S. Sullivan

Chair: Claude Welch

Secretary: Robert G. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: Michael Frisch, Nathan Grant

Dental Medicine: William Miller, Robert Baier

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Robert Wetherhold

Health-Related Professions: Atif Awad

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albini, Bernice Noble, Herbert Schuel

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: Stanley Bruckenstein, James Faran

Nursing: Mattie Rhodes

Pharmacy: Nathan

Social Sciences: Jack Meacham

SUNY Senators: Maureen Jameson, Peter Nickerson, Claude Welch

University Libraries: Marilyn Kramer

Guests:

REPORTER: Sue Wuetcher

Other Guests:

Judith Hopkins, Chair, Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee

Paul Zarembka, UUP Representative

Hinrich Martens, Associate Vice-President, CIT

Barbara von Wahlde, Associate Vice-President, University Libraries

Richard Lee, Library Committee

Judy Adams, Library Committee

Michael Cowen, Computing Committee

Dorothy Tao, News Services

Laura Bushallow-Wilbur, Undergraduate Libraries

Excused:

Architecture: G. Scott Danford

SUNY Senator: Dennis Malone

Absent:

Graduate School of Education: James Hoot

Law: Errol Meidinger

Management: Ramaswamy Ramesh

Social Sciences: Peter Hare