

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of March 12, 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 February 20, 1996
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of the President/Provost
4. Budget Update
5. Report of the Academic Planning Committee
6. Second Reading of the Governance Report
7. Old Business
8. New Business

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of February 20, 1996

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of February 20, 1996. There being no revisions, Professor Hopkins moved to approve the minutes and Professor Bennett seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved by voice vote.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch thanked Faculty Senate members for their messages of condolence following the death of his father.

Commenting on Faculty Senate committee activities since the last meeting, Professor Welch referred to his handout of committee updates and asked Senators to widely share the information with colleagues.

Referring to activities of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) since the last Senate meeting, Professor Welch commented on anticipated revisions of the Academic Good Standing Policy and reconstitution of the Teaching Quality Committee in light of a report from the Ad Hoc Committee of Deans and faculty.

Professor Welch noted that the Resolution on the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and Charter of the Faculty Senate had been forwarded to the President who had requested further information about the provisions "concerning consultation with faculty" that may be subject to specific Presidential approval. The Resolution on Evaluation of Deans had been referred to Provost Headrick by President Greiner. Provost Headrick had requested information from decanal units as to formal procedures used to elicit faculty opinion related to the Faculty Senate Resolution on the Appointment and Reappointment of Chairs. The Fresh Start Resolution and the Resolution on Undergraduate Teaching Assistants had been fully implemented. The Resolution on the Faculty Role in Recruitment of Students was being viewed by the Provost in relationship to development of a recruitment strategy.

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost

Professor Welch commented on the "Managing UB's Academic Future" document and noted that the FSEC believed that it was important for the Provost to engage in an open discussion with the faculty regarding planning for the future.

Provost Headrick stated the highlights of the "Managing UB's Academic Future" which included:

1. UB is primarily an academic institution and the future should be determined in view of academic goals with consideration of economic realities.
2. There are more than 1300 tenured/tenure track faculty for 24,000 students with "talent stretched thinly". Sharing with colleagues and using creative imaginations should improve the quality of UB and allow for coping with change as current beliefs are under scrutiny.
3. The "chicken little" response should be resisted and creativity should be appropriate.

4. The administration appreciates faculty members and hopes to encourage faculty members to perform and accomplish to its maximal potential.

Professor Benenson questioned the identity of comparable AAU institutions and the results of the National Research Council (NRC) evaluations of graduate programs. He inquired into the suggested methods to increase the standing of UB. Provost Headrick replied that the NRC was not the sole measure used for evaluation of graduate programs. He noted that Vice Provost Triggles was working on more complex measures of strengths and weaknesses of graduate programs. Provost Headrick stated that with modest investment of resources, programs with strengths should be maintained, strengths should be built in other programs and smaller departments should be encouraged to increase collaborative efforts. He commented that some programs might need to be dropped. He noted that UB had the largest number of rated graduate programs as compared to similar size universities except for Pittsburgh in the NRC report. He stated that UB must focus its efforts. He remarked that the NRC report covered less than half of the Ph.D. programs at UB.

Professor Benenson questioned how UB could get ahead of peer institutions as these institutions continued advancing. Provost Headrick stated that UB must keep its eyes on the competition and believe in itself as an institution.

Professor Welch questioned Provost Headrick's remark on "leisurely committee reflection" and noted that committee structure was crucial in governance decisions of the Faculty Senate. Provost Headrick stated that it was important for the committees to complete necessary tasks in a reasonable amount of time. Professor Welch stated that increased collaboration was desirable and necessary.

Provost Headrick stated that progress towards a long term plan was anticipated for the next seven to eight months. He emphasized that long term goals must be sorted out prior to another budget cycle. He noted that decisions regarding appointments should be

collaborative in nature and involve departments, Deans and the Provost. He noted that appointments were precious decisions and must serve the widest interests of the institution.

Professor Bunn commented positively on the proposed academic goals. Opposition was voiced to the concept that the Arts and Sciences faculty be used as support faculty for the graduate and professional schools. Feelings of fear and anger experienced by faculty members was reported by Professor Bunn. Provost Headrick stated that a hard and fast, clear differentiation between education in the Arts and Sciences and the professional schools should be resisted and that a goal should be set to be a special place. He stated that the University might change and be different over time but that it should strive to be special and good.

Professor Mattei questioned the specific criteria for decisions regarding elimination of particular graduate programs. Provost Headrick, referring to Item 4 in the third column of the fourth page of the document, stated that cooperation and integration could add strength without adding faculty. He stated that information was being gathered by the Deans and a compendium would be shared which would include descriptions and analyses of programs. Provost Headrick stated that discussions would result in a tentative set of proposals to openly debate in the fall, 1996. He noted that the University did not have the resources to do all it was doing and that a focus was needed for what could be done.

Professor Doyno voiced concern regarding the future and the past. He noted that programs and courses had been lost and initiatives had not been taken during the period of budget reductions over the last seven years. He stressed that it was important to note that cuts have consequences.

Provost Headrick remarked on a complex of political decision-making bodies including the legislature and noted that adverse publicity should be reduced so as not to discourage students. He stated that core faculty had been lost since 1990. He noted that realism was necessary and that success in attracting resources was crucial. He stressed that cooperation was necessary to do a better job.

Professor Sen stated that the Physics Department had been badly covered in the NRC ratings. He noted that complaints had not been attended to and that faculty numbers had been misrepresented. He stated that there had been "gross errors" and hazy NRC guidelines. He stated that there were potential problems with the NRC evaluation. Provost Headrick agreed with Professor Sen. Professor Sen added that there were problems with graduate admissions involving inadequate stipends. He urged the University to increase graduate stipends and introduce graduate fellowships to attract top-notch applicants.

Professor Malone remarked that there would not be a state budget on time and that the federal budget questions affected the budget at the state level. He stated that it was possible that there would not be a state budget until next fall. He commended the process initiated by Provost Headrick and asked if changes would be implemented during fall, 1996. Provost Headrick replied that long term planning was anticipated through this calendar year with changes in place prior to the next budget cycle. He stated that this year, the University would have to "make do". He mentioned a small tuition increase and substantial decreases in funding of the System Administration, the hospitals operated by SUNY medical centers at Syracuse, Stony Brook and Brooklyn and other centrally controlled budget items. He stated that the University was looking to alleviate problems by reviewing all possibilities for revenue generation.

Professor Welch commented that it was important to continue detailed questioning of the administration regarding management of the future of the University.

ITEM 4: Budget Update

Senior Vice President Wagner and Professor Gates presented information regarding the budget process. Professor Gates, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee, discussed faculty consultation and the budget process in the units. He noted that he had received responses from 12 of 15 units and that 10 units used an administrative process related to budgeting. Professor Gates reported that 5 of 10 units stated that there was almost no faculty consultation. There were reported to be two elected advisory groups. His message was for the faculty to be more involved in the

budgetary process. Professor Gates mentioned the "steep learning curve" necessary to become conversant with the details of budget implementation and the fact that the units needed to focus on the calendar of decisions and the fact that proposals must be developed while being open to questions. He mentioned all funds accounting and all budgeting accounting. Professor Gates stated that any educational plan, especially changes involving the addition or replacement of faculty, had budgetary implications. He noted that all business of the Budget Priorities Committee was on the margin and that discussions were on the fringes of the core where changes occurred.

Senior Vice President Wagner presented an update on budget concerns since the February 20, 1996 Faculty Senate meeting. Referring to his nine point handout, Senior Vice President Wagner stated that:

SUNY advocacy for system restoration of the proposed budget reduction was now underway.

Undergraduate student applications continued to lag behind last year, particularly transfer applications. He mentioned the need to pay greater attention to enrollment management due to the fierce competition. He noted that SUNY was no longer simply the best buy on price.

The uncertainty of reductions proposed for TAP, a SUNY tuition increase and the impact of budget reductions was making recruitment efforts more difficult.

The passage of the state budget would likely follow passage of the federal budget and that great uncertainty on the timing for passing the budget existed.

It was likely that there would be an early retirement bill which would be a state-wide program rather than a SUNY only bill.

Campus contingency planning was underway, using 5% to 7% as the planning range for possible reductions.

Differential tuition for SUNY appeared to have a limited possibility of passage.

There would be an increase in some fees and perhaps the introduction of new fees.

SUNY's legislative initiatives in health care, management effectiveness and early retirement would, in all likelihood, be modified before passage.

Professor Malone asked if the 5% to 7% reduction included a reduction based on decreased enrollment. Senior Vice President Wagner replied that he was not expecting enrollment to decrease and the figures reflected this belief.

Professor Doyno stated that the future value of a degree from SUNY was uncertain.

Professor Baumer asked if a number could be identified at this time regarding fees.

Senior Vice President Wagner replied that he was working on a fee plan and that it would be based on the amount of tuition increase. He mentioned that it might be necessary to start to charge laboratory fees in the sciences.

ITEM 5: Report of the Academic Planning Committee

Professor Welch commented on the parliamentary complexities of committee reports. Professor Malone, the Faculty Senate parliamentarian, discussed the difference between a committee reporting to the body in a regular fashion and hearing a report from a committee when an issue has been referred to the committee by an action of the body. In regard to a regular committee report such as from a standing committee or an ad hoc committee, the committee rises and reports and according to Professor Malone, there are three options regarding the report:

1. Adopt or accept the report. This option is powerful in that adopting or accepting the report means that all implications are accepted and this action is similar to the effect of a resolution.
2. Reject the report.

3. Receive the report. Little effect is produced with this option according to Robert's Rules. According to Sturgis, receiving and filing a report implies that the report will be filed by the Secretary and will be available as a reference.

Professor Malone noted that a committee report cannot be amended by the body. Comments by the body can be added to the report in italics with references. Suggestions or actions can be summarized at the end of the report. Motions can be made to create resolutions or suggest actions.

Professor Baumer stated that the information seemed contradictory.

Regarding the report of the Academic Planning Committee, Professor Welch asked for a motion. Professor Baumer moved that the report of the Academic Planning Committee be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Professor Metzger and passed by voice vote with one abstention.

ITEM 6: Second Reading of the Governance Report

Professor Welch commented on the changes in wording noted in the handout. Professor Baumer moved that the report of the Governance Committee be received and filed. Professor Jameson seconded the motion.

Professor Albini stated that receiving and filing the report was as good as a death sentence. He noted that the report was not just a document but that several issues of substance were included and it was preferable to reject or adopt each of the sections individually.

Professor Baumer stated that receiving and filing a report does not prohibit the body from adopting any or all of the recommendations. Professor Malone stated that a separate resolution would be necessary on each item. He noted that the motion had been to receive and file the report, not to bury or reject the report. A vote was taken and the motion to receive and file the report was passed.

Professor Baumer made a motion that the Governance Committee should bring in specific motions to the Faculty Senate for implementation in relationship to the report. Professor Jameson seconded the motion. Professor Baumer stated that amendments might have to be made to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty as appropriate. Professor Welch suggested that the Governance Committee revise the report to standard parliamentary motions. Professor Doyno, Chair of the Governance Committee, stated that he favored discussion of the five separate topics. He noted that it was important to avoid weakening the faculty role on campus. He stated that he believed that it was important for the body to discuss the issues since the opinions would not be biased by historical knowledge available to committee members.

Professor Welch commented that the committee had been working for several years and that the report had been "massaged extensively" and was close to parliamentary language. He stated that portions of the report had been written similarly to the revisions of the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty. He noted that it was a delicate matter as to the best way to approach the same goals. He stated that Professor Doyno had expressed concern regarding loss of dynamism among committee members. Professor Welch commented that it was easier to act if the report was in parliamentary language.

Professor Baumer stated that approval of various recommendations in the report would require amendments to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty. He remarked that drafting amendments for Senate action did not prevent consideration of the other recommendations of the committee. Professor Boot suggested that Professor Baumer write the amendments.

Professor Doyno commented that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had charged the two committees, the Governance Committee and the Bylaws Committee, to work in a parallel fashion. He noted that there was overlap between the committees and several inconsistencies regarding issues such as the possibility reelection of the Faculty Senate Chair. He stressed that a few inconsistencies should not be used to "submarine" the entire effort of the Governance Committee.

Professor Welch suggested revising the report into parliamentary language. Professor Baumer suggested that the Governance Committee take the recommendations that require amendments to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and propose specific motions dealing with these items. Professor Hopkins stated that proposals to change the Bylaws should include the Bylaws Committee. Professor Jameson stated that the Governance Committee could note under recommendations that changes suggested in the revisions of the Bylaws have been passed by the Voting Faculty. Professor Benenson questioned whether it was allowable to discuss the rest of the report. Professor Baumer replied that the rest of the report was "wide-open".

Professor Malone suggested a motion to refer to the Governance Committee the items that required changes in the Bylaws. Professor Sellers requested identification of the specific sections that required changes in the Bylaws. Professor Malone commented that the Bylaws Committee should be involved if there were to be changes in the Bylaws. He suggested disposing of the rest of the report in a different manner. He mentioned voting on each component of the report.

Professor Welch suggested voting on Professor Baumer's motion. Professor Segal stated that the motion was too vague and Professor Sellers requested clarification of the specifics of the motion. Professor Benenson suggested returning the report to the Governance Committee to produce resolution on specific items.

Professor Baumer offered to withdraw his motion and consider the report ad seriatim. Professor Bennett raised a point of information. Professor Welch asked if there were objections to withdrawal of the motion and Professor Jameson objected to withdrawal of the motion. Professor Malone stated that a vote should be taken regarding withdrawal of the motion. The vote was in favor of withdrawing the motion.

Professor Baumer moved that the report be considered ad seriatim and Professor Doyno seconded the motion. Professor Welch stated that a quorum was no longer present and consideration of the report of the Governance Committee was postponed to the next meeting.

ITEM 7: Old Business

There was no discussion of old business at the meeting.

ITEM 8: New Business

There was no discussion of new business at the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: T. Headrick, R. Wagner

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Arts and Letters: C. Braemen, J. Bunn, V. Doyno, A. Henderson, M. Metzger

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

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Educational Studies: J. Hoot, L. Ilon, L. Malave, R. Stevenson

Engineering and Applied Sciences: D. Benenson, W. Bialas, R. Wetherhold

Health Related Professions: A. Awad, S. Kuo

Information and Library Studies: G. D'Elia

Law: L. Swartz

Management: S. Kellogg, P. Perry, R. Ramesh, C. Trzcinka

Medicine and Biomedical Sciences: B. Albin, D. Amsterdam, M. Wetzler, H. Douglass, J. Richert, H. Schuel, M. Spaulding, A. Vladutiu

Natural Sciences and Mathematics: P. Calkin, M. Cowen, P. Eberlein, J. Faran, S. Sen, R. Vesley

Nursing: M. Werner

Pharmacy: W. Conway

Social Sciences: V. Ebert, W. Baumer, M. Harwitz, L. Mattei, N.

Revankar, E. Segal
Social Work: L. Sloan
SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson
University Libraries: J. Adams, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer, M. Zubrow

Those excused:

Pharmacy: N.

Those absent:

Architecture: M. Hadighi
Arts and Letters: A. Henderson, R. Hoeing, M. Hyde, M. Long, P. O'Toole, J. Pappas
Dental Medicine: R. Hall
Educational Opportunity Center: G. Deshaies
Educational Studies: T. Schroeder
Engineering and Applied Sciences: M. Ryan, W. Thomas
Health Related Professions: P. Horvath
Law: S. Mangold, E. Meidinger
Medicine and Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, J. Hassett, B. Noble, F. Schimpfhauser, J. Sulewski, J. Wactawski-Wende, B. Willer
Natural Sciences and Mathematics: M. Churchill, H. King, C. Loretz
Nursing: M. Ludwig, P. Wooldridge
Social Sciences: V. Eagles, C. Frake, D. Henderson, L. Lawler, D. Pollock, D. Zubin
University Libraries: D. Woodson