

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of January 30, 1996 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. in 100 The Commons to consider the following agenda:

1. Approval of the Minutes of November 14, 1995
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of President/Provost
4. Rethinking SUNY
5. First Reading of the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant Resolution and the Fresh Start Resolution
6. Report of SUNY Senators
7. Old Business
8. New Business

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of November 14, 1995

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes. Professor Sellers stated that Professor Hopkins had asked that quotation marks be added to her statements and that the spelling of her name be corrected in the attendance listing. Professor Metzger moved to approve the minutes as amended. Professor Bennett seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

A moment of silence was observed in memory of Professor Paul Dahmer of the School of Dental Medicine.

Professor Welch reported that:

Faculty Senate resolutions on the appointment and reappointment of Chairs, faculty involvement in the recruitment of students and faculty evaluation of Deans were in the hands of the President and Provost for review.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) had discussed the NCAA Proposal 19 to decrease academic standards for entering freshmen and the fact that UB had voted in favor of the proposal. The proposal was defeated but concerns had been expressed by FSEC members regarding maintenance of high academic standards.

Technological advances had allowed development of a listing of students not in academic good standing in eight minutes via computer programming. Concerns were expressed by FSEC members about the policy and the percentage of students not in academic good standing.

The FSEC, based on the recommendation of the Computer Services Committee of the Faculty Senate, had endorsed the concept of "green computing", the use of energy efficient equipment.

The topic of academic integrity had been discussed at the FSEC with Vice Provost Goodman.

The Faculty Senate Committees on Tenure and Promotion and Public Service were discussing faculty promotion standards.

Professor Robert Hoeing of Modern Languages and Literatures was the Secretary-elect of the Faculty Senate.

Ballots for the election of two Senators to the SUNY-wide University Senate would be distributed with platform statements from the candidates. Professor Welch noted that the University Senate met three times per year and consisted of approximately 50 Senators from the SUNY campuses across the state.

Upcoming topics for the FSEC included a report from the Governance Committee, discussion with the UUP Chapters regarding lobbying, a report from the Environmental Task Force, consideration of issues facing the libraries and acquisitions, the sesquicentennial, the role of Millard Fillmore College and University facilities.

The minutes of the Faculty Senate and the resolutions were available electronically via an HTML browser.

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost and ITEM 4: Rethinking SUNY

Senior Vice President Wagner commented on the Rethinking SUNY document. He noted that the FSEC had endorsed the scope and thrust of the document. Professor Welch remarked that the FSEC functions for the Faculty Senate between meetings. He stated that there had been four committees formed by the Board of Trustees to develop the concepts for presentation to the legislature. He noted that a premium had been placed on speed rather than depth and that time constraints had been in operation. Professor Welch remarked that the proposals were substantial and would be matters of interest to the future of SUNY. He noted that the University Faculty Senate had encouraged discussion and had requested faculty input. Professor Welch reported that on November 15, 1995, the FSEC had voted to endorse the scope and thrust of the Rethinking SUNY document with recognition that substantial questions remained to be resolved. He noted that the FSEC was particularly concerned with sector or campus specific tuition, the significant financial drain from the three SUNY hospitals and the statutory colleges.

Professor Welch stated that the same degree currently cost the same tuition regardless of the institution granting the degree. He stated that there were significant financial losses from the three hospitals at Stony Brook, Syracuse and Brooklyn which approximated \$78 million. He noted that reorganization was necessitated by the fundamental changes imposed by managed health care. He commented that there was a substantial investment in the statutory colleges relative to enrollment.

Professor Welch acknowledged that the FSEC decision to endorse the scope and thrust of the Rethinking SUNY document had carried potential risks and gains. He noted that the Board of Trustees had voted unanimously to adopt the Rethinking SUNY document. He labeled the document a framework for possible action and noted the lack of specifics. He stated that there would be a budget hearing on Wednesday, January 31, 1996 with Senator LaValle at the Center for Tomorrow.

Senior Vice President Wagner summarized the facts related to Rethinking SUNY. He stated that in 1985, *The Challenge and The Choice*, a report requested by Chancellor Wharton, was completed by an outside group and contained information about flexibility legislation.

Senior Vice President Wagner stated that in 1995, there was a \$290 million reduction in state support. He noted that there was no system-wide plan to answer questions regarding the amount of savings from each level of SUNY. He stated that streamlining the system administration would not produce enough savings to offset proposed budget reductions. He remarked that the Rethinking SUNY document allowed for a plan or framework for future action. Senior Vice President Wagner labeled Rethinking SUNY as a long range plan providing context for institutional issues. He noted that there had been four committees with the least attention focused on the mission/vision area. The committees which were the most active were those dealing with structure, operations and revenue.

Highlights from the more active committees included suggestions to review degree programs in principle, increases in distance learning, college credit for high school students, graduation within four years, funding for instructional technology, review of the community colleges and flexibility in management of hospitals for increased autonomy. Senior Vice President Wagner noted that enhanced flexibility in the state system was proposed by the legislature for 1996-1997. He stated that the state subsidized the three hospitals in the amount of approximately \$80 million in fringe benefits. He reported that strategic alliances among various SUNY units might be enhanced over time through linkages and investments in distance learning.

In terms of operations, Senior Vice President Wagner reported that downsizing of the System Administration did not save a substantial amount of money. He noted that increased efficiency was a goal of redesigning administrative processes. He noted initiatives for management effectiveness through streamlining. He stated that increased teaching productivity was a sensitive issue requiring greater effort and interaction.

Operating revenue and tuition were key issues of Rethinking SUNY. Senior Vice President Wagner stated that affordable tuition increases on a gradual, predictable basis was an objective. He stated that trustee authority was required to set differential tuition.

Focusing on the future, Senior Vice President Wagner stated that increased revenue would need to be generated through tuition increases and that state tax support would not be restored to previous levels. He noted that legislative change was necessary to give the trustees authority to allow differential tuition. He stated that it would be necessary to increase entrepreneurship to generate as

much non-state tax support funding as possible. He mentioned 500 acres of land on which to develop services and construct graduate housing that would require authority from the legislature to the Board of Trustees.

Professor Cowen, referring to the suggestion of financial penalties for accumulation of credit hours beyond the 120 minimal of approximately 140 credit hours, required for graduation, commented that full cost tuition would hurt the best students such as those with AP credits. Senior Vice President Wagner stated that the intent was not to limit the accumulation of credit hours by honors students but to encourage students to progress efficiently towards graduation. He noted that the penalty was intended for those students choosing not to graduate.

President Greiner addressed the extent of obligation of the state to provide access to higher education. He questioned the number of hours and that the obligation to provide access to higher education was not a prescription. He noted that AP credit might result in greater than 140 credit hours at the time of graduation. He noted that numerous, reasonable questions of this nature had been raised by Rethinking SUNY.

Professor Malone stated that there was confusion at the local level that Rethinking SUNY was the cause of the proposed \$92 million reduction in the Executive Budget for 1996-1997. He emphasized that Rethinking SUNY would allow for coping with the proposed reduction in state funding. He noted that without adoption of the principles of Rethinking SUNY, there would be dire consequences.

President Greiner stated that it was necessary to separate Rethinking SUNY from the 1996-1997 Executive Budget. He commented that regardless of the proposed budget, Rethinking SUNY explored fundamental issues. He noted that the system was now more driven by revenue than tax dollars. He stated that anomalies had been exposed regarding the statutory colleges. He remarked that the legislators had been appalled to discover the amount of the state tax subsidy for the statutory colleges. He compared the cost per FTE at the health sciences centers and the University centers as \$40,000 and \$25,000 respectively. He stated that Rethinking SUNY required a long term effort. He mentioned the Managing Our Future effort by the Provost and the Deans.

Professor Albini stated that Rethinking SUNY was not academically oriented. He questioned whether privatization was more efficient for the hospitals. He noted that community hospitals could not compete in terms of education and service. He stressed that Rethinking SUNY should involve teaching, research and service.

Professor Metzger inquired into the steps necessary to implement Rethinking SUNY. President Greiner replied that Rethinking SUNY required changes in the Policies of the Board of Trustees. He stated that downsizing of the system office would be implemented immediately. He noted that legislation was required to grant the trustees authority for differential tuition through Section 355 of the State Education Law. He stated that the change in management of the hospitals partially required legislation. He referred to the 1985 study, *The Challenge and The Choice*, which had been initiated by Chancellor Wharton and was the blueprint for the Rethinking SUNY document.

Professor Albini stressed that public higher education was cost effective. He advised extensive participation of the campuses in implementation of Rethinking SUNY. He emphasized that the interests of the academy and society must be served. He stated that open thinking should be encouraged and a basic principle should be that there are no questions that cannot be asked. He recommended releasing biases and exploring all options.

Professor Dickson stated that the original mission-vision of SUNY was access to higher education for all economic groups in New York State. She questioned the responsible party for oversight for the legislature over the proposed consolidated fund.

Senior Vice President Wagner stated that the proposed consolidated fund for 1996-1997 was an extension of lump sum budgeting in relationship to increased flexibility. He noted that allocations were made by the Board of Trustees to the system from state tax support and tuition. He stated that the consolidated fund was not a dramatic change and was merely the placement of three or four lump sums into a single lump sum. He stated that the comptroller maintained responsibility for accountability.

It was noted that there was no substitute for face-to-face learning. President Greiner mentioned the need for graduate housing on campus, open communication and increased quality of the learning

environment. He noted access to computers and networks. He stated that SUNY wanted efficiency and quality. Professor Welch requested continued updates on Rethinking SUNY in the future. President Greiner stated that the administration would supply information to The Reporter.

President Greiner announced that he would be testifying before Senator LaValle regarding the budget. He stated that he would be emphasizing the restoration of TAP. He reported that he would point out the sense of peril if the proposed \$92 million reduction in state tax support was adopted without ways to make up the difference. He stated that the consolidated fund was an excellent first step to rationale resource allocation and keeping revenues on campus. He commented that the community colleges had campus-based tuition policies with 19 separate tuition levels. He suggested a policy of placing the state tax support into a bank account to which revenue could be added and which would be available for auditing.

ITEM 5: First Reading of Undergraduate Teaching Assistant Resolution and the Fresh Start Resolution

Professor Metzger, Chair of the Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC), explained that the first reading of resolutions was intended to allow for debate over the general principles.

Focusing on the Faculty Senate Resolution on Undergraduate Teaching Assistants, Professor Metzger stated that the resolution had been passed by the Faculty Senate in May, 1995 and been returned by the Provost and President due to their beliefs that the standards were not stringent enough and the policy was too inclusive. He commented that the EPPC, in consultation with Provost Headrick, had added a plan for implementation in the authorization section of the resolution.

Professor Adams expressed concern that students not in good academic standing would attempt to become UTAs in the future to elevate their grade point averages. She voiced specific concern regarding student athletes. She asked whether the proposals for the use of UTAs would be accessible to faculty from other programs, since she was concerned about possible abuses by athletes. Professor Metzger stated that he agreed that this was a concern. Vice Provost Goodman stated that he would consider the question of whether the proposals would be accessible to other faculty. It was noted that this issue would be addressed at the second reading of the resolution.

Professor Hoeing questioned the section dealing with UTAs not regularly conducting scheduled classes. He stated that the wording appeared open to interpretation and might have an undesirable result.

Professor Jameson stated that the resolution seemed to preclude transfer students from participating as UTAs. Professor Metzger stated that he would raise the issues with the EPPC. He noted that the term used was "should" regarding having taken the course prior to application as a UTA.

Professor Segal suggested changing the wording to include the term "an equivalent course".

Professor Benenson questioned why the resolution had been put up originally. He noted that the authorization section was imposing a layer of approvals. Professor Metzger replied that there was no University-wide policy on UTAs which had been the initial impetus for the resolution. He stated that the deliberate authorization process was in response to the return of the original resolution by the administration as being unacceptable.

Professor Schroeder commented on the process of teaching. He noted that solicitation of examples from students, faculty initiated discussions and clarification of discussions were all important components of successful teaching. He stressed that there was more to teaching than class presentations.

Professor Metzger replied that "conduct" had been used in a generic sense and meant that the UTA should not have independent responsibility for conducting class.

Professor Welch stated that assisting in customary duties sets the context for grading, presentations and leading discussions.

Professor Schroeder reiterated that the wording included to not regularly conduct classes. Professor Metzger stressed that "not" was the operative word.

Professor Lawler questioned if representatives from all departments using UTAs had been consulted and Professor Metzger replied that all departments had been queried and no responses had been received by EPPC.

A question was raised regarding how UTAs were different from graduate teaching assistants. Professor Metzger replied that UTAs required more rigorous supervision and that graduate teaching assistants could teach courses. Professor Welch stated that the rules and regulations for graduate teaching assistants were set within the Graduate Faculty. He noted that the major responsibility of the Faculty Senate was with undergraduate education.

Regarding the Fresh Start Resolution, Professor Metzger stated that the idea had been conceived by the former Dean of Millard Fillmore College, Eric Streiff. He stated that the policies had been designed in consultation with the Undergraduate College, the Educational Opportunities Program, Millard Fillmore College and EPPC. He stated that a few dozen students would be anticipated to be involved in the policy each year.

Professor Baumer questioned the administrative handling of an academic problem rather than a direct educational policy and the method of determining the deficiency.

Professor Ebert stated that the policy seemed to open a "Pandora's Box" and expressed concern about possible selective removal of grades from one or a number of semesters.

Professor Cowen stated that Professor Ebert's concern would be covered by the fact that it was difficult to "spread out" the policy and that the grades had to be granted at least five years prior to the petition.

It was noted that the policy was long overdue. Professor Benenson asked for the rationale for the five year time period for eligibility and the age of at least 25 years. Professor Metzger replied that the EPPC had attempted to avoid abuse of the policy. Professor Benenson cited an example of a freshman with poor grades resulting in dismissal from the University with improved grades at a junior college desiring to return to the University. Professor Metzger responded that the resolution was not a modification in the readmission policy but was strictly a policy to recompute the grade point average deficiency. The policy provided for exclusion of part of the record from calculations. A question was raised regarding the recalculation and whether it applied to meeting graduation criteria, applications to graduate schools and information for prospective employers. Professor Metzger replied that the recalculation would apply in all situations.

Professor Garverick stated that the effect on graduate schools would be dependent on the individual standards of the particular school. He noted that the Dental School considered overall grades in relevant courses, aptitude tests and an overall summary rating.

ITEM 6: Report of SUNY Senators

The report of the SUNY Senators was postponed until the next Faculty Senate meeting on February 20, 1996.

ITEM 7: Old Business

Professor Welch commented on the implementation of a modification of the Faculty Senate Resolution on Extension of the Tenure Clock. He reported that the Provost had agreed to stopping the tenure clock for one semester due to pregnancy and allowing ad hoc negotiations for other situations. Professor Welch requested Senators to note the contrast between the Faculty Senate resolution and the endorsed University policy.

ITEM 8: New Business

There was no new business for consideration at the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: W. Greiner, R. Wagner

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Arts & Letters: J. Bunn, A. Henderson, R. HOeing, M. Metzger

Dental Medicine: A. Aguiree, G. Ferry, C. Garverick, T. Thines

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Educational Studies: J. Hoot, L. Ilon, L. Malave, T. Schroeder

Engineering & Applied Sciences; J. Atkinson, D. Benenson, W. Bialas, M. Ryan, W. Thomas, R. Wetherhold
Health Related Professions: A. Awad, S. Kuo
Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elias
Law: S. Mangold, L. Swartz
Management: S. Kellogg, P. Perry, R. Ramesh
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albin, M. Wetzler, H. Douglass, B. Noble, J. Richert, M. Spaulding, A. Vladutiu, J. Wactawski-Wende
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Calkin, M. Churchill, M. Cowen, J. Faran, R. Vesley
Nursing: M. Werner, P. Wooldridge
Pharmacy: W. Conway
Social Sciences: V. Ebert, W. Baumer, J. Lawler, L. Mattei, N. Revankar, E. Segal, D. Banks, M. Farrell
Social Work: L. Sloan
University Libraries: J. Adams, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer, D. Woodson
SUNY Senators: J. Boot, M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson

Those excused:

Pharmacy: N.

Those absent:

Architecture: M. Hadighi
Arts & Letters: B. Bono, J. Fradin, M. Hyde, M. Long, P. O'Toole, J. Pappas
Dental Medicine: R. Hall
Educational Opportunity Center: G. Deshaies
Educational Studies: S. Stevenson
Health Related Professions: P. Horvath
Law: E. Meidinger
Management: C. Trzcinka
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, D. Amsterdam, J. Hassett, F. Schimpfhauser, H. Schuel, J. Sulewski, B. Willer
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Eberlein, J. King, C. Loretz, M. Sachs, R. Shortridge
Nursing: M. Ludwig
Social Sciences: V. Eagles, M. Farrell, C. Frake, M. Harwitz, D.

Henderson, D. Pollock, D. Zubin
University Libraries: M. Zubrow