

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of April 9, 1996 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in the Conference Room of The Commons to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the Minutes of March 12, 1996](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Revised Report of the University Governance Committee](#)
5. [Report of the Grading Committee](#)
6. [Resolution of Information and Library Resources Committee](#)
7. [Resolution of Privacy of Electronic Communication](#)
8. [Old Business](#)
9. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of March 12, 1996

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of March 12, 1996.

There being no comments, Professor Hopkins moved to approve the minutes and Professor Albini seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost

Professor Welch referred Faculty Senators to his written report including actions of committees and responses to Faculty Senate resolutions. He noted that the University was in a "time of great uncertainty" and that the "implications remain unclear" and that the "voices of the faculty were especially crucial". He expressed concern regarding the large number of discouraged colleagues. Professor Welch commented that the Faculty Senate was working in an open, collegial fashion. He noted faculty representation through important

coverage of meetings in the minutes and The Reporter, the careful process of committee discussions and the policy of involving groups outside the Senate in discussions about the University's future. Professor Welch stressed the concern for a truly collegial process and quoted from the preamble to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty, "that it is the norm of the University to consult with the faculty and to rely on advice and assistance from the faculty in the performance of their administrative duties".

President Greiner noted that he was the author of the quote and Professor Welch encouraged President Greiner to implement the concept of consultation with the faculty in the administrative process. He stated that mixed signals had been received and that in general the resolutions had been "pretty well" implemented by the administration. He remarked that there was greater consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) since there were meetings on a weekly basis. He noted that Provost Headrick had met with various Faculty Senate committees and with the FSEC.

Professor Welch stated that compromises would be presented regarding the Academic Good Standing Policy. He commented on areas of concern which include a thorough, fair and timely evaluative process for assessment of the performance of Deans, true faculty consultation on the selection of Chairs and the importance of faculty involvement during a period of "troubled waters".

It was noted that Provost Headrick had indicated yesterday that the letter for appointment or reappointment of Chairs must provide specific information regarding faculty consultation. Provost Headrick stated that no action on appointment/reappointment would occur until this information was provided. Professor Welch stated that he would request the policy in writing and add the terminology "significant consultation".

Professor Welch commented on the organization of the University and the proposal that the current Dean of Arts and Letters act as the interim Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences. He noted that this proposed reorganization would require greater collaboration among units and generally increase the weight of voices in the Arts and Sciences. Professor Welch stated that numerous questions had been raised by faculty members and there was significant opposition. He noted that the Faculty Senate was not directly involved with the proposed reorganization but that there was concern with the academic

planning of such a merger. Professor Welch referred to the 1993-1994 study headed by Vice Provost Trigg on academic organization focused on undergraduate education which stated "Under conditions of expanding disciplinary demands, increasing public expectations, decreasing resources and changed foci of funding, inflexible or narrowly drawn organizational boundaries may impede necessary change. Given these conditions, the importance of change to the institution needs therefore to be explored in detail and explained in full to all concerned individuals".

President Greiner stated that he welcomed the opportunity to discuss issues with the Faculty Senate. He noted that the Faculty Senate had moved to a heavy focus on resolutions. He stated that resolutions should not be the only or dominant way to communicate. President Greiner stressed that it was important to find a way to build in time for discourse. He remarked that the Bylaws should be activated as revised and that the Deans should be brought into the conversations. He reiterated on building collegiality between the faculty and the administration through meaningful dialogue. He stated that it was a "time of great challenge" and that conversations and consultation carried particular significance in such periods.

Professor Malone questioned the community college initiative. President Greiner replied that the community colleges had not been included in the Rethinking SUNY document and had compiled a proposal to the Board of Trustees for a more expansive role in lower division instruction in SUNY. Ideas included in the initiative included community colleges as the preferred point of access to SUNY, assigning all duties and funding for the Educational Opportunity Programs (EOPs) to the community colleges and having workforce training and interaction with high schools for college credit at the community college level. President Greiner stated that the community colleges wanted to carve out a significant role for themselves within SUNY at a cost to the colleges and University centers. He noted that the proposal had caused a tremendous stir, especially with college presidents.

President Greiner noted that there had been supportive editorials in Newsday suggesting a flagship campus for SUNY which included the University of Buffalo and Stony Brook. He stated that he would like to explore this agenda which opened an interesting window. He commented that there had never been any definition of the missions of various campuses.

Professor Calkin suggested that high school students and parents might be concerned about the maintenance of quality within SUNY with the current uncertainty. President Greiner agreed but advised faculty members that Pittsburgh also had an 8 to 9% decrease in applications for 1996-1997. He stated that if the decrease was a trend, a problem existed. He noted the uncertainty related to the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) and tuition rates. He stated that the Board of Trustees had identified New York State as a net exporter of students. President Greiner commented that the Board of Trustees questioned the reason for students leaving the state for education and had placed the "braindrain" on its agenda. He stressed the importance of maintaining the quality of SUNY and setting the tuition in a reasonable manner. He noted the significant decreases in transfer applications. President Greiner stated that in his meetings with parents, satisfaction with the quality of education at SUNY was present.

Professor Garverick suggested stressing positive aspects of the University such as the School of Dental Medicine being ranked as the best in the northeast. President Greiner commented that aggressive advertising of UB as a Big Ten alternative was desirable. He mentioned professional image builders and the need for political balance. He noted that outstanding individual units were fine but that there was a need for real quality in the Arts and Sciences at the undergraduate and graduate levels to advance the reputation of the institution.

Professor Uthman inquired into the tuition for out of state students and the number of applications as compared to in state interest. President Greiner stated that the number of applicants to the Dental School from out-of-state could fill the capacity of the program. He noted that increased out of state enrollment would be positive if the University could keep the tuition of undergraduate students.

ITEM 4: Revised Report of the University Governance Committee - Second Reading

Professor Welch commended the committee on the superb reorganization of the report into resolutions. He reminded the Faculty Senators that the report had been on the floor at the time of adjournment of the last meeting. He stated that each resolution could be treated as moved and seconded and that immediate discussion could commence.

Professor Doyno, Chair of the University Governance Committee, stated that he would comment on the resolutions as requested.

Resolution 1

Professor Welch opened discussion on the first resolution dealing with minimum content guidelines for academic and University Libraries unit articles of governance or bylaws. Professor Malone questioned to whom the recommendation was made and Professor Welch answered that the recommendation would be to the legislative arm of the Voting Faculty. The vote was positive on the first resolution.

Resolution 2

Professor Welch introduced the second resolution dealing with review of academic unit governance documents to determine whether or not they meet the minimum content guidelines for such documents. The vote was positive on the second resolution.

Resolution 3

The third resolution, dealing with the immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate being included in the membership of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for one year following the expiration of the term of office and instructions to the Bylaws Committee to prepare appropriate language to amend the Charter of the Faculty Senate was opened for discussion.

Professor Jameson moved an amendment that the resolution include the immediate past Secretary of the Faculty Senate and Professor Schuel seconded the motion. Professor Malone commented on the potential for an individual to serve on the Senate for five years. The votes on the amendment and the main motion were positive.

Resolution 4

The fourth resolution, changing the timing for elections of the Chair, Secretary and the Senators of the Faculty Senate to be completed by the end of the Fall Semester preceding the Fall Semester in which the Senators take office with instructions to the Bylaws

Committee to prepare appropriate language to amend the Standing Orders, was introduced for discussion. Professor Doyno explained that there were two teaching schedules on the computer, the current and the advanced. He elaborated that faculty members had dual obligations to the Faculty Senate and to their professional lives within their disciplines. He stated that the change updated the rules to the computer age. Professor Malone questioned if the change would also apply to elections for the SUNY-wide Senate. Professor Welch replied that the suggestion would need to be phrased in the form of a resolution. Professor Malone moved an amendment that the resolution should include the election of SUNY Senators in the Fall Semester preceding the Fall Semester in which the Senators take office. The vote on the amendment passed. Professor Jameson voiced concern about coordinating the Faculty Senate elections with other decanal elections such as committees within Faculties and Schools. Professor Welch replied that should the resolution pass, there would be an additional semester in which to apply pressure on the units to complete decanal elections. The main resolution was passed.

Resolution 5

The fifth resolution, modifying the Standing Orders of the Faculty Senate requiring the to complete the appointment process for members of Senate committees by the beginning of the academic year, was presented for discussion. Vice Provost Goodman stated that this could be a potential problem since the current Chair would be appointing committee members for the Chair-elect. Professor Welch replied that appointments were made through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a whole. Vice Provost Goodman agreed that this was true in theory. Professor Welch stated that he stood corrected. Professor Doyno supported that committee recruitment was effective following the "earlier the better" model. Professor Baumer moved that "by" be changed to "at" in line 3 to read ... "to complete the appointment process for members of Senate committees at the beginning of the academic year" ... Professor Schuel suggested a stipulation that the appointments should be done within one month of the beginning of the academic year. Professor Welch explained that a vote would take place on the Standing Orders early next fall. He suggested recommending to the

Bylaws Committee a redrafting of the Standing Orders. The votes on the amendment and the main resolution were positive.

Resolution 6

Resolution 6, which urged the President to set the temporary salary overrides for Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Senate as a percentage of the UB average for full-professor, according to the AAUP statistics, was introduced by Professor Welch. He stated that the current salaries for the Chair and Secretary were \$3,000 and \$1,000 respectively per academic year. He noted that historically the Chair did not receive a reduction in other responsibilities. He stated that if the resolution was passed, he would refuse the increase in salary during his current term.

It was noted that a 10% salary increase with fringes in a time of funding difficulty might be problematic. Professor Baumer stated that the salary increase was included in the regular paycheck. Professor Malone, regretting that the action could not be retroactive, stated that it was a mistake to mandate compensation and suggested leaving the decision to the Office of the President.

Professor Mattei stated that she appreciated the efforts of the officers of the Faculty Senate but was not certain that the offices should carry monetary advantages. She commented that all faculty members needed to complete service to the University.

Professor Kramer stated that \$7900 would be 10% of an average full professor's salary.

Professor Doyno reminded Faculty Senators that there would never be any questions regarding appropriate compensation for Deans. He stated that insufficient salaries could weaken the role of the Senate.

Professor Wooldridge asked the length of time since the last increment for Senate officers and Professor Welch answered that the salary had been the same in 1985. Professor Wooldridge commented that the effect of the proposed change would be to bring the salary to the current equivalent intended in 1985. He questioned if the proposal had been discussed with the administration. Professor Doyno stated that Provost Headrick had agreed to the concept of a

percentage based on a University-wide average. He doubted that administrative acceptance would be a problem.

Professor Sloan supported the resolution stating that Senate officers should be compensated for their time and effort. Professor Uthman voiced agreement with the resolution. Professor Hopkins shared the regret of Professor Malone that the compensation could not be retroactive and agreed that the figure should be based on a University-wide average.

Professor Trzcinka stated that there was a sense that the administration did not value faculty time. He noted that the resolution afforded an opportunity to emphasize that time was valuable and should be compensated.

Professor Ebert stated that with increased compensation, it was less likely that there would not be interest in candidacy for Senate offices.

Professor Baumer stated that the majority of department chairs had course reductions.

Professor Miller suggested sending a letter to the President to draw attention to the issue with a copy of the discussion to foster understanding of the parameters.

It was noted that the timing might not be good in terms of current financial constraints.

Professor Welch remarked that there were frequent references to do more, to work hard and to develop collegiality. He suggested using the term honorarium rather than compensation. Professor Baumer said honoraria and compensation were not the same thing.

It was noted that it was not possible to have compensation equivalent to the amount of time involved in fulfilling the requirements involved in Senate offices.

Professor Doyno stated that altruism could be construed negatively and that the Faculty Senate needed to have a strong voice.

The resolution on the salaries of the Senate officers was passed.

Resolution 7

Resolution 7, urging that the President and/or the Provost be invited to attend a meeting of each decanal or School Faculty at least once each academic year, was introduced for discussion.

Professor Malone asked if this was a current practice. Professor Doyno noted that "trouble" could be caused by the meeting process. Professor Welch suggested that the resolution should be addressed to the Deans of the respective Schools and Faculties who would issue the invitations to attend the meeting.

The resolution was passed.

Resolution 8

Resolution 8, stating that each academic dean be invited to meet with each department faculty at least once each academic year, was passed.

Resolution 9

Resolution 9, stating that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should routinely appoint relevant administrators to Faculty Senate committees, was introduced for discussion.

Professor Malone supported the "thrust and scope" of the resolution and added that he also supported the administration appointing faculty members to University committees.

The resolution was passed.

Resolution 10

Resolution 10, asking for amendment of the Charter of the Faculty Senate to include the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate and the Bylaws Committee be instructed to prepare appropriate language to so amend the Charter, was introduced for discussion and was passed.

Resolution 11

Resolution 11, urging the Chair of the Faculty Senate to schedule regular meetings with the President, the Provost, and the Senior Vice President, was introduced for discussion.

Professor Welch reported that all meetings had been scheduled at his request. He stressed the importance of regular meetings as an avenue of communication and noted that the interaction should be a two way process.

The resolution was passed.

Resolution 12

Resolution 12, stating that the Faculty Senate should urge the President and the Provost to include the Chair of the Faculty Senate as a member of decision-making Presidential and Provostal groups, was introduced for discussion.

Professor Welch stated that he was invited to observe the UB Council and the Council of Deans meetings.

Professor Malone asked if the intent was to include participation in Executive Sessions. Professor Doyno replied that behavior cannot be legislated but that the Board of Trustees Policy indicated that consultation was necessary.

Professor Nickerson stated that he supported the resolution, especially at the level of the Vice Presidents.

Professor Jameson stated that Resolution 10 dealt with the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education serving as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate and she asked for the sense of the body regarding an official status for the Chair as a non-voting, ex-officio member of decision-making Presidential and Provostal groups. Professor Baumer urged ex-officio, non-voting status and moved an amendment to the resolution which was seconded by Professor Douglas.

Professor Kramer requested specific information about the voting status of the Deans in the Faculty Senate. Professor Welch replied that the Deans were non-voting members.

Professor Adams noted that the resolution did not stipulate specific groups and that doing so might be inappropriate. Professor Noble stated that she doubted that administrative power would be diluted. The amendment to request ex-officio, non-voting status for the Chair or Presidential and Provostal decision-making groups failed.

Returning to discussion on the main resolution, Professor Malone moved an amendment that the UB Council be excluded from the resolution. The amendment was seconded by Professor Ebert. Professor Malone elaborated that the constitution of the UB Council spelled out governance regulations.

Professor Albin remarked that the resolution only "urges" inclusion of the Chair of the Faculty Senate as a member of decision-making groups which leaves the possibility for the administration to decline the inclusion. Professor Noble questioned whether the UB Council was a Presidential/Provostal group and Professor Welch responded that the UB Council was not a Presidential or Provostal group.

Professor Malone stated that he would be happier if the amendment did not pass. Professor Douglas asked if the issue had been raised with the President. Professor Malone replied that the issue had been discussed in the past. The amendment was not passed. The main resolution did pass.

Resolution 13

Resolution 13, urging the Chair of the Faculty Senate to schedule biennial meetings with the Provost and Senior Vice President to review the administrative and programmatic committee structure and membership to ensure faculty inclusion was presented for discussion. It was noted that the word biennial should be changed to annual and an amendment was moved by Professor Baumer and was passed. The resolution as a whole was passed.

Resolution 14

Resolution 14, having the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charge the Committee on University Governance to annually poll Faculty Senators on their perception of the effectiveness of the consultative process at varying governance levels, was presented for discussion.

Professor Mattei asked if the polling would be anonymous and Professor Doyno stated that there would be an anonymous questionnaire.

Professor Spaulding questioned how the information would be utilized and Professor Doyno stated that the Faculty Senate could publicize the results.

Professor Welch referred to a prior University-wide questionnaire completed under the direction of Professor Doyno and Professor Milbrath and a Stony Brook evaluation of senior administrators through a questionnaire.

Professor Uthman questioned publication of the data if there was less than a twenty percent response rate. Professor Welch replied that parameters could be recommended and it would be desirable to charge the committee to design a poll and return to the Faculty Senate with the details.

Professor Ebert voiced appreciation for the work of Professor Milbrath and Professor Doyno. He expressed skepticism regarding the resolution, stating that it could cause paranoia and divisiveness. He stated that he was uncomfortable with the resolution and that it had the potential to cause fear.

Professor Cowen stated that the resolution seemed to put the "cart before the horse" and that the committee should return with a plan.

Professor Welch suggested an amendment to design a poll of faculty members with the committee returning with a method in the fall. Professor Albini raised the suggestion as a amendment which was seconded by Professor Schuel. Professor Malone suggested including a statement of action and moved to the refer the issue to the committee. Professor Baumer stated that the amendment should be voted upon and the amendment passed. Professor Malone moved to refer the issue to the committee and Professor Baumer added the wording "and report thereon to the Faculty Senate". The motion was seconded by Professor Albini. Professor Jameson suggested the wording "periodically". The resolution was reworded "That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charge the Committee on University Governance to design a method in order to poll Faculty Senators periodically on their perceptions on the effectiveness of the consultative processes within their own Departmental unit, within their own

Decanal unit, within the Faculty Senate and within the University". The motion as amended was passed.

Resolution 15

Professor Welch presented Resolution 15 which provided a framework for involvement of the Faculty Senate when the governance structure of a unit breaks down.

Professor Benenson moved to amend part (b) by changing the ; to a . and deleting the last line.

Professor Albini seconded the motion. Professor Welch questioned the reasoning behind the amendment. Professor Benenson replied that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee could speak to the matter which might involve semi-legal statements.

Professor Hopkins stated that the Bylaws Committee was working on a grievance/complaints procedure which would require information being presented to the Faculty Senate Chair and that consultation would be with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and not the Faculty Senate. She stated that the Bylaws Committee's current draft proposed that the FSEC decision not be appealable. Professor Hopkins voiced opposition to the amendment.

Professor Malone stated that he was in agreement with Professor Hopkins. He asked if grievances were part of the Standing Orders of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Welch replied that the term used was complaint and that the Standing Orders were under revision.

Professor Albini stated that a gag rule was being imposed if the decision of the FSEC was non-appealable. He noted that it was useful to have "transparency" in dealings and that consultations should provide a forum for open discussion. He stated that he was puzzled regarding the reluctance to have an open process.

Professor Doyno stated that the original charge to the University Governance Committee had been related to cooptation. He reported that the vote in the committee had been 5 to 2 against bringing issues of complaint to the full Faculty Senate.

Professor Baumer advised that complaints did not belong on the floor of the Senate. He commented that numerous allegations could be "irrelevant and strange" and should not be encouraged. He noted that in the past, innocent people had been erroneously charged.

Professor Jameson suggested referring the matter to the Governance and Bylaws Committees for discussion in view of the evolving ambivalences within the Governance Committee and the possible incompatibilities.

Professor Wooldridge suggested a motion to table which was criticized by Professor Malone and no second was received. The amendment to delete the final line of part (b) was defeated.

Returning to the main motion, Professor Jameson offered an amendment to refer the resolution to the Governance Committee for further consultation with the Bylaws Committee. The motion was seconded by Professor Wooldridge.

Professor Baumer stated that he was against the amendment since complaints were serious issues that should be decided by the Senate rather than committees. He stated that if the Bylaws Committee needed guidance, it should simply say so.

Professor Kramer, who serves as a member of both the Bylaws and the Governance Committees, voiced agreement with Professor Baumer that guidance of the Senate was needed.

The amendment to refer the issue to the committees failed.

Returning to the main motion, Professor Wetherhold requested clarification regarding the word unit. It was noted that unit referred to any entity on campus that functioned as an academic unit and included departments and the libraries.

Professor Adams, referring to part (d), suggested changing the word "will" to "may" resulting in "The Faculty Senate Executive Committee may appoint a committee to investigate and make recommendations to the Executive Committee". Professor Doyno stated that as a matter of normalcy, the FSEC appointed committees.

Professor Hopkins stated that current complaints were handled by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and/or the FSEC, if informal means of resolving governance breakdown were unsuccessful. An investigative committee could be appointed to hear the complaint.

Professor Wetherhold asked who could make a request in writing and Professor Hopkins replied that anyone could make a written request provided that one party to the dispute was a member of the Voting Faculty. Professor Doyno stressed the fact that the complaint must be in writing and referred to past situations where allegations were changed during the complaint process.

Professor Welch advised that principles could be suggested and the issue could be further analyzed in the revisions of the Standing Orders. In the interest of time, he attempted to move the discussion to a conclusion.

Professor Hopkins stated that she interpreted Resolution 15 as a set of steps and that an investigative committee would only follow the use of the informal good offices of the Chair as the first recourse for resolution.

The vote on the resolution was positive.

Professor Baumer moved to receive and file the University Governance Committee report. Professor Welch stated that he would substitute the amended report in toto and the motion was passed.

ITEM 5: Report of the Grading Committee - First Reading

Professor Schroeder, Chair of the Grading Committee, reported that the Academic Good Standing Policy had been implemented during the fall 1995 semester with unfortunate results. He stated that the changes in implementation of the policy had not taken into account good students with one poor semester or those students not meeting one item of the policy such as acceptance into a major or completion of 75% of coursework. He noted that the resolution, which his committee had brought for a first reading, which incorporated changes to the Academic Good Standing Policy, was a consensus resolution. Using language from the previous policy, the current form of the policy separated Academic Good Standing and satisfactory and timely progress toward a degree. Professor

Schroeder stated that the proposed Academic Good Standing Policy included only cumulative grades and that the satisfactory progress toward a degree included a 2.0 grade point average in the current semester, completion of 75% of courses or 12 credit hours in each semester and acceptance into a major. He reported that the revised policy was a compromise.

Elaborating on the revised policy, Professor Schroeder cited hypothetical cases which illustrated the merits of the proposed revised policy. An example of a case mentioned was a student injured in an auto accident with an acceptable cumulative grade point average who was physically unable to complete coursework for the semester.

Professor Malone expressed concern regarding the requirement to be in a major after completion of 60 credit hours. He stated that by removing this criterion from the Academic Good Standing Policy, the impetus to be accepted into a major was weakened. Professor Schroeder stated that the committee leaned toward a more lenient resolution that trod the middle ground.

Professor Schroeder was asked if the requirement to have a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or above interfered with the Fresh Start Policy and he replied that Fresh Start was entirely different.

Professor Cowen asked if financial aid could be denied if without a major after attaining 60 credit hours and Professor Welch replied positively. Professor Cowen hypothesized about a student signing up for courses and then dropping below full time to continue eligibility for athletic activities and student governance. Vice Provost Goodman stated that TAP would be lost if a student were not accepted in a major. He commented that NCAA regulations require full-time status at the actual time of participation in an athletic event.

ITEM 6: Resolution of Information and Library Resources Committee

Professor Nickerson emphasized that the libraries were essential to the maintenance of a quality research University. He commented on digital and print collections and noted that investment was necessary for the digital future.

The need for an infrastructure for current demands and anticipated demands of the future was noted. Difficulties in response to budget reductions to SUNY were expressed and the inability to stretch the budget to cover the proliferation of information was stated by Associate Vice President von Wahlde. The goals of safeguarding the future and serving the present were established as well as the coexistence of digital and print media.

Associate Vice President von Wahlde stated that the libraries looked to the Faculty Senate for support and recognition of the distress of the libraries.

It was acknowledged that the administration would be impressed by the resolution that the faculty cares to keep the libraries as healthy as possible under the current economic constraints.

Professor Nickerson stated that it was necessary to coordinate plans for the future for the libraries with the Faculty Senate Computer Services Committee, audio-visual requirements and Computing and Instructional Technology.

Professor Welch stated that the resolution of the Faculty Senate Committee on Computer Services on DIT (Distributed Information Technology) had called for increased funding. He noted that the Faculty Senate does act to support budgetary needs and that it was now time to be an ally of the libraries.

Professor Doyno stated that two surveys of faculty quality of life had listed the libraries as the most important asset at the University.

Professor Cowen stated that training of faculty in computer literacy was not the role of the libraries.

Professor Welch stated that analysis of budget allocations for the libraries could be made available to interested faculty members.

ITEM 7: Resolution of Privacy of Electronic Communication - First Reading

Professor Jameson stated that the University had no policy on users' rights to privacy and security of the mainframes as opposed to various commercial servers such as America On Line with a delineated policy of rights and responsibilities. She related that the

FSEC had expressed concern regarding the lack of a University policy on privacy of electronic communication.

Professor Nickerson stated that consistency in privacy should exist across the University servers.

ITEM 8: Old Business

Professor Douglas introduced the problems of fees and regulation at individual campuses. He reported on an ad from Brockport stating that there would be no increase in tuition until the year 2000. He questioned if other SUNY units had greater control over tuition than UB.

Vice Provost Goodman replied that a particular number was multiplied by a factor to determine the yearly tuition. He stated that Brockport was asking the consumers to take a gamble that they would not pay an amount greater than the established SUNY tuition. He stated that the legality of the process was not clear. He stressed that it was not the case that Brockport had more control over tuition rates. He stated that it was a strange scheme to guarantee tuition.

ITEM 9: New Business

There was no discussion of new business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University officers: W. Greiner

Senate officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Arts and Letters: V. Doyno, R. Hoeing

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, G. Ferry, C. Garverick, A. Uthman

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Education: L. Iton, L. Malave, T. Schroeder, R. Stevenson

Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson, D. Benenson, W.

Bialas, W. Thomas, R. Wetherhold
Health Related Professions: A. Awad, S. Kuo
Law: L. Swartz
Management: S. Kellogg, P. Perry, R. Ramesh, C. Trzcinka
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albini, D. Amsterdam,
C. Bloomfield, H. Douglass, B. Noble, J. Richert, H. Schuel, M.
Spaulding, J. Wactawski-Wende, B. Willer
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill, M. Cowen, P.
Eberlein, J. Faran, H. King, C. Loretz, R. Vesley, F. Gasparini
Nursing: M. Ludwig, P. Wooldridge
Pharmacy; W. Conway
Social Sciences: V. Ebert, W. Baumer, J. Lawler, L. Mattei, D.
Banks, D. Pollock
Social Work: L. Sloan
SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson
University Libraries: J. Adams, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer, E. Herman,
M. Zubrow

Those excused:

Arts & Letters: M. Metzger
Pharmacy; N.

Those absent:

Architecture: M. Hadighi
Arts & Letters: A. Henderson, M. Hyde, M. Long, P. O'Toole, J.
Pappas, C. Braemen
Dental Medicine: R. Hall
Educational Opportunity Center: G. Deshaies
Education: J. Hoot
Engineering & Applied Sciences: M. Ryan
Health Related Professions: P. Horvath
Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elia
Law: S. Mangold, E. Meidinger
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: J. Hassett, F. Schimpfhauser, J.
Sulewski, A. Vladutiu
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Calkin, R. Shortridge
Nursing: M. Werner

Social Sciences: V. Eagles, D. Zubin, M. Farrell
SUNY Senators: J. Boot