

# FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of November 14, 1995 - (approved)

E-MAIL: [ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU](mailto: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 October 24, 1995](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. Report of the President/Provost (none)
4. [Second Reading - Draft resolution on faculty role in recruitment of students](#)
5. [Second Reading - Draft resolutions on revisions of the Bylaws and Charter](#)
6. Old Business (none)
7. New Business (none)

## **ITEM 1: Approval of the minutes of October 24, 1995**

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of October 24, 1995.

Professor Sellers reported corrections from Professor Hopkins as follows: page 7, last paragraph, delete under; page 9, paragraph 8, reword the first sentence to Professor Adams, referring to page 8 of the Charter, Article VI.1.D(1), commented that the Secretary of the Senate, not the Chair-Elect, was the Vice Chair of the Senate and page 9, paragraph 9, add Senate following Faculty. Professor Noble asked that a footnote be added regarding gender distribution since Mr. Durkin had clarified that the female composition of new and continuing undergraduates was 46% rather than 54%. Professor Schuel moved that the minutes be approved as amended and Professor Churchill seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

## **ITEM 2: Report of the Chair**

Professor Welch referred the Faculty Senate to his written report circulated at the start of the meeting, which included the activities of the committees of the Faculty Senate. He updated actions on

Faculty Senate Resolutions. He noted that the resolution on evaluation of Deans had not yet been implemented by Provost Headrick. The resolution on extending the tenure clock was under consideration by the Provost. The transfer of responsibilities for teaching effectiveness from the Office of Teaching Effectiveness to individual Faculties and Schools was under discussion by an ad hoc committee and the Faculty Senate committee was to be reconstituted shortly. The resolution on faculty input on appointments and reappointments of chairs was under consideration by the President and the Provost. Professor Welch commented that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) had discussed the mandate of the legislature to the administration of SUNY and the Board of Trustees to provide a report by December 1, 1995 regarding the organization and productivity of SUNY. He noted that the role of the Board of Trustees was changing towards greater activism. Professor Welch commented that the FSEC had been concerned with "Rethinking SUNY" issues since early in the semester and that the FSEC had acted on the proposals of Vice Chairman of the SUNY Board of Trustees, Thomas F. Egan while the Faculty Senate was not in session. He announced that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had passed a resolution endorsing the scope and thrust of the proposal of Vice Chairman Egan which favored decentralization of SUNY with two abstentions. He reported that the proposals suggested that campuses be more self-sufficient. Professor Welch announced that accurate undergraduate enrollment information revealed the following:

53.7% male

46.3% female

11.3% undergraduate underrepresented minorities

10.1% total underrepresented minorities including African American, Hispanic and Native American

Professor Welch, commenting on the Second Reading of the Draft Revisions of the Bylaws and the Charter, stated that he hoped the Faculty Senate would work effectively on the constitutional principles and put aside the concern for fine editing.

Professor Benenson commented on Principles 3, 5, 6 and 7 regarding the respective roles of central/system office and SUNY Trustees and the SUNY "State-operated" campuses. He particularly noted that Principle 3 named the Trustees to monitor the performance of the campuses and hold campus officers accountable for that performance. Professor Welch replied that the Board of Trustees had become increasingly active and noted that Principle 5 stated that the central office's primary and paramount role was to support the Trustees and Chancellor regarding their respective stewardship and leadership activities. He noted that legal powers resided with the Board of Trustees. Professor Malone agreed that the Board of Trustees was becoming far more involved in the management of SUNY. Professor Welch stated that the Board of Trustees would report to the legislature by December 1, 1995. He stated that the FSEC had been discussing issues since the beginning of the semester and supported the scope and thrust of the proposals of Vice Chairman Egan. Professor Noble questioned if administrative representatives had been present during the vote and Professor Welch replied that he believed there had been no administrative representatives present during the vote. Professor Wooldridge commented that the administration had communicated strong support for the proposals of Vice Chairman Egan. Professor Hyde stated that she believed that Provost Headrick had been present during the voting.

Professor Sulewski discussed petitions being circulated in support of SUNY. She expressed hope for support for the future of SUNY. She mentioned a meeting involving community leaders, a member of the Board of Trustees and Assemblyman Sullivan of the Higher Education Committee and encouraged faculty attendance.

#### **ITEM 4: Second Reading - Draft Resolution on Faculty Role in Recruitment of Students**

Professor Jameson moved the resolution on Faculty Role in Recruitment of Students:

WHEREAS the faculty have traditionally played an advisory role in student recruitment, particularly undergraduate recruitment, and

WHEREAS the success of UB's recruitment effort, particularly among first-rate students from across the nation, may necessitate greater faculty involvement,  
THE FACULTY SENATE THEREFORE RECOMMENDS

- that faculty members travelling to conferences or doing research or teaching at other institutions consider meeting with potential UB applicants in the cities they visit and, with the guidance of the undergraduate or graduate Admissions staff, encouraging these students to apply to UB, and
- that, to the extent possible, deans and chairs consider offering additional travel funds to encourage faculty members to engage in recruitment while on official trips, and
- that alumni organizations in these cities be asked to facilitate contact between travelling faculty members and talented local high school students or potential graduate applicants.

The motion was seconded by Professor Churchill and passed unanimously.

**ITEM 5: Second Reading: Draft Resolutions on Revisions to the Bylaws and Charter**

Professor Welch reviewed the procedure for quasi committee of the whole for discussion of the resolutions for revisions to the Bylaws and Charter. Professor Malone clarified the details of the quasi committee of the whole and requested a motion which was moved, seconded and approved.

The Bylaws were presented for discussion.

Article I - No debate

Article II - Discussion on renaming and the role of the Senate.

Article III - Professor Jameson moved to delete "and serving on appointments of more than one year". The motion was not seconded.

Professor Benenson requested discussion about "medical center". Professor Welch replied that "medical center" included the Schools of Medicine and Dental Medicine. He stated that Nursing, Health Related Professions and Pharmacy were not included in the definition. Professor Malone asked if this was the opinion of SUNY counsel. Professor Hopkins stated that a response from SUNY counsel was anticipated. Professor Welch noted that the Policies of the Board of Trustees includes geographic full-time (GFT) faculty as voting faculty. He stated that the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate must be in compliance with the Policies of the Board of Trustees. Professor Malone agreed that voting status for GFT faculty had been in effect and was not a change in policy. Professor Miller stressed that since the University did not have a Medical Center, Nursing should be included in the definition.

Professor Jameson requested clarification regarding membership in the Voting Faculty. Professor Hopkins recommended that this issue was in need of further discussion and should be brought forward to a future new set of Bylaws. Professor Sulewski noted that temporary appointments posed a source of potential unfairness.

No comments were offered regarding (d) and (e) on page 6 dealing with changes in titles.

Professor Jameson offered a counteramendment stating that it was a poor idea for an officer to succeed her/himself in office. Professor Noble seconded the motion.

Professor Adams supported the counteramendment, stating that the Chair of the Faculty Senate was a powerful position and that four years was too long to serve in the position. She cautioned about a possible tendency not to unseat the Chair after the first term. She noted that dealing in two year periods appeared to be functional with the administration and she recommended retaining the current policy.

Professor Nickerson spoke against the counteramendment, supporting continuity and stating that disadvantages existed without the possibility of re-election to the office.

Professor Miller supported Professor Nickerson and stated that the complexity of administration was increasing and that continuity was extremely important. He noted that it was not a guaranteed four year position and that the Chair could be voted out after the first term in office. He stated that ruling out re-election was handicapping to the faculty and that serving two terms was critical for development of potential.

Professor Jameson disagreed with Professors Nickerson and Miller and stated that adoption of a two term position in the office would deter candidates from running. Addressing the issues of experience and familiarity, Professor Jameson argued that individuals should serve on the Senate prior to serving in the position of Chair.

Professor Wooldridge recommended a proviso that candidates have prior experience. He noted that it was most valuable to have served for the two years immediately prior to the election. He noted the prominent role that the Chair of the Faculty Senate plays with the administration.

Professor Noble voiced support for Professors Adams and Jameson. She stated that faculty governance was concentrated in a few hands and that the faculty in general was not necessarily well-represented by faculty governance. She encouraged increased faculty participation and representation.

Professor Welch noted that only one person had ever run two times for Chair of the Faculty Senate within the last twenty years. Professor Malone stated that in 1983 the term of the Chair had been expanded to two years.

The question was called by Professor Schuel and the counteramendment was defeated by a vote of 9 in favor and 34 opposed.

Professor Adams questioned the changes in role of the Secretary as Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. She noted that when the Chair was not available, the Secretary was responsible for running the meetings. She questioned the position of acting Chair. Professor Hopkins explained that the intent was not to make any change in the Secretary serving when the Chair was unavailable. She stated that the

intent was to avoid confusion with the two titles for one individual. She noted that it was valuable to ameliorate confusion.

Professor Welch noted that details could be included in the Standing Orders of the Faculty Senate which were not subject to administrative approval. He noted that it was the practice of the Senate that the Secretary becomes the Chair in the Absence of the Chair. He stated that a Secretary pro tem would be appointed if there was a permanent vacancy in the position of Secretary.

There were no comments on Articles IV and V. Regarding Article VI related to meetings and a quorum, Professor Welch stated that 25% of an approximate 1850 member faculty would be greater than 459. He commented that attendance at the Annual Meeting of the Voting Faculty had been approximately 185 which was closer to the proposed 10%.

Regarding the timetable for referenda, Professor Benenson questioned page 10, 4-5 dealing with amendments. He stated that he was uneasy with the wording of either a two-thirds vote or a majority. He stated that he preferred a straight two-thirds rule. Professor Welch referred the Senators to page 11 which explains the proposed change in number of votes required to amend the Bylaws. Professor Hopkins reported that the FSEC had suggested the 10% minimum in case of low voter turnout. Professor Benenson moved to change the period to following at least 10% of the Voting Faculty in 4-5 on page 10. Professor Noble seconded the motion.

Professor Wooldridge stated that it was unlikely that a large majority of faculty would regularly vote in issues regarding amendments to the Bylaws. He noted that a confrontational issue might divide the faculty and that the Bylaws should require a two-thirds vote assuming a total vote that equals at least 10% of the Voting Faculty.

It was suggested that the minimum proportion of individuals required to approve an amendment to the Bylaws should be 10% of the Voting Faculty. Professor Welch suggested increasing the number to 15%. The vote was against changing the 10% to 15%.

Professor Miller requested the body to rise and report. A motion to approve the Bylaws was seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Moving to consideration of the Charter of the Faculty Senate there were no comments on Articles I and II. Referring to Article III, Membership in the Faculty Senate, Professor Hopkins noted that Deans had been added as ex-officio members. She stated that Chairs of academic departments were members of the Voting Faculty and were eligible to be elected. She stated that the academic deans added an administrative voice to discussions of the Senate and would lessen the "us vs them" approach. Professor Welch clarified that ex-officios did not count in a quorum and that the academic deans would be members without a vote.

Professor Hopkins commented that Senate actions were advisory to the President and that the President and senior administrators were non-voting members of the Senate.

Professor Jameson, in the spirit of transcending the "us vs them" attitude, moved that departmental chairs be added as administrative representatives. She noted that without a vote there was little incentive to attend meetings. There was no second to the motion.

On page 4, Article III, Professor Jameson offered an amendment that there would be one representative per X FTE students where X is equal to  $1/100$  of the total number (rounded to the nearest hundred) of FTE students in the University, (see Article IV, Paragraph 4(B), of this Charter), elected by and from the membership of the Voting Faculty according to election procedures provided in Article V of this Charter and apportioned among the academic units of the University as provided in Article IV of this Charter.

Professor Jameson expressed concern that representation would be dramatically altered by expansion. She suggested recentering apportionment by basing apportionment on students rather than head counts per departments.

Professor Adams argued against the motion, stating that the Faculty Senate was not the Student Senate and to change the representation on the Faculty Senate to student based did not make sense. She stated that GFT faculty would be lost totally.

Professor Jameson clarified that the GFT faculty would be included due to teaching responsibilities. She stated that her amendment was an attempt to proportion the Senate based on teaching. A



question was raised regarding how the School of Medicine allocated departmental representatives to the Faculty Senate. Professor Jameson stated that the Bylaws and the Charter were silent regarding representation per departments in Faculties and Schools.

Professor Welch commented that individual Faculties and Schools have the authority for determining means of representation within the overall assigned numbers. He noted that, for example, within Arts and Letters there were three subdivisions for Senate elections.

Professor Kramer commented on total numbers vs apportionment. Professor Noble stated that she was concerned with head counting. She noted dramatic changes in the present climate related to reassessment and reapportionment. She stated that it would be unpleasant to have faculty representation based on fluctuating factors such as student enrollment.

Professor Hopkins stated that she was against the amendment since a Faculty Senate based on the character of the student body rather than the composition of the faculty was not sensible and that the number of representatives based on the proposed formula would be unwieldy. Professor Jameson reviewed the proposed formula and stated that the Senate would be composed of approximately the same 100 members.

Professor Adams stated that there were currently areas of representation in the Faculty Senate without a student body and that these areas would be disenfranchised. Professor Hopkins commented on setting the size of the Senate rather than the apportionment. Professor Miller stated that although he would vote against the amendment, there was merit to the idea. He noted that responsibility for teaching students was at the academic center of the University. He suggested that the idea be given careful consideration in the future.

The question was called and the amendment failed.

Professor Jameson moved that faculty members shall be assigned to electoral units through the academic unit in which they hold their primary appointment. Members of the Voting Faculty whose primary appointment is not in an academic unit, such as Librarians, shall choose an academic electoral unit with which they wish to be affiliated. Faculty members holding joint appointments in two or more

academic units located in different electoral units may choose the single electoral unit to which they will be assigned. If such faculty do not make this choice, the Elections Committee will make the assignment. She noted that this amendment would bring the librarians into the teaching mission. There was no second to the motion.

There was no discussion on Articles V and VI. Professor Hopkins mentioned pages 7 and 8 and stated that in Article VI, B.(2), the word four should be deleted in reference to the composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee since the number of Senators is subject to change and so should not be specified. She noted the wording in D.(1), The Chair and Chair-elect of the Senate shall be Chair and Chair-elect of the Executive Committee respectively.

There were no comments on Articles VII and VIII. Professor Hopkins noted that Article IX was being deleted since it dealt with the effective date and transitional rules of the original Charter and was now moot. She stated that Article X was being renumbered as Article IX.

A motion was made to rise and report. Professor Hopkins moved for approval of the Charter and the motion was seconded by Professor Ludwig and approved. Professor Welch announced that the Charter would be forwarded to President Greiner and that a mail ballot would be distributed for the Bylaws and the Charter.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture: S. Danford

Arts & Letters: B. Bono, J. Bunn, J. Fradin, R. Hoeing, M. Hyde

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, G. Ferry, C. Garverick, R. Hall, T. Thines  
Educational Studies: J. Hoot, L. Malave, T. Schroeder  
Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson, D. Benenson, W. Bialas, R. Wetherhold  
Health Related Professions: A. Awad, S. Kuo  
Information and Library Studies: G. D'Elia  
Law: S. Mangold  
Management: S. Kellogg, P. Perry  
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, D. Amsterdam, C. Bloomfield, H. Douglass, B. Noble, F. Schimpfhauser, H. Schuel, M. Spaulding, J. Sulewski, A. Vladutiu, J. Wactawski  
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein, J. Faran, T. Hennessey, M. Sachs, R. Vesley  
Nursing: M. Ludwig, M. Werner, P. Wooldridge  
Pharmacy: N. , W. Conway  
Social Sciences: V. Ebert, P. Hare, L. Mattei, N. Revankar  
University Libraries: J. Adams, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer, M. Zubrow  
SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson

Those excused:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: J. Hassett

Those absent:

Architecture: M. Hadighi  
Arts & Letters: A. Henderson, M. Long, M. Metzger, P. O'Toole, J. Pappas  
Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett, G. Deshaies  
Educational Studies: L. Ilon, R. Stevenson  
Engineering & Applied Sciences: M. Ryan, W. Thomas  
Health Related Professions: P. Horvath  
Law: E. Meidinger, L. Swartz  
Management: R. Ramesh, C. Trzcinka  
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini, J. Richert, B. Willer  
Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Calkin, M. Cowen, J. King, R. Shortridge

Social Sciences: V. Eagles, C. Frake, M. Harwitz, D. Henderson, J. Lawker, E. Segal, D. Zubin, M. Farrell

Social Work: L. Sloan

University Libraries: D. Woodson

SUNY Senators: J. Boot