

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of October 24, 1995 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

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

1. [Approval of the minutes of April 25 and May 2, 1995](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President and/or Provost](#)
4. [Report of the Budget Priorities Committee](#)
5. [Report on Admissions](#)
6. [First Reading: Revised Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and the Charter of the Faculty Senate](#)
7. [First Reading: Draft Resolution on Faculty Role in Student Recruitment](#)
8. [Resolution of Thanks to Professor Nickerson](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the minutes of April 25 and May 2, 1995

Being no corrections or additions to the minutes, the minutes were approved unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch welcomed the Senators to the 1995/1996 Faculty Senate year. He discussed the wide-ranging powers and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate focusing on the three major areas of faculty status and activity, academic degree programs and University-wide matters.

In relationship to faculty status and activity, Professor Welch commented on appointments, promotion, tenure, conduct and evaluation of teaching and research, governance and complaints. Elaborating on academic degree programs, Professor Welch

mentioned undergraduate admissions, curriculum, evaluation and graduation and periodic review of professional and graduate degrees. He referred Senators to the recently distributed compendium of Faculty Senate resolutions which reflect the range of responsibilities.

University-wide matters were noted to include plans for the future. Professor Welch commented that the specific information related to Faculty Senate responsibilities was available in the Charter of the Faculty Senate, in the Faculty/Staff Handbook and electronically through WINGS.

Reporting on Presidential action on the resolutions from 1994-1995, Professor Welch stated that the following resolutions had been implemented:

1. The required minimum credit hours for graduation in baccalaureate programs had been reduced to 120.
2. The investigator disclosure policy had been promulgated in full except for the amendment added by the Senate requiring review by non-cognizant deans.
3. The policy on Public Service had been promulgated with Schools/Faculties requested to establish committees and provide basic definitions.
4. Procedures for approving undergraduate liberal arts components had been promulgated with encouragement of all decanal units to include "unique general courses" required of Arts and Sciences undergraduates such as World Civilizations and American Pluralism.
5. The University mission statement had been promulgated.
6. The policy for access to undergraduate majors was in place including faculty advisement. A new handbook was prepared by the Vice Provost's office, with some input from the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Welch reported on several areas in which effective implementation remains to be taken which included:

1. The faculty role in evaluation of Deans.
2. The creation in all Schools/Faculties of budget priorities and public service committees.
3. The initiation of departmental honors programs for undergraduates in addition to the highly successful University-wide program.

4. Clarification of the criteria for undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) which was being reviewed by the Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC) of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty of Arts and Letters.
5. The extension of the tenure clock resolution had been reviewed by an ad hoc joint committee which included members of the Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee and some Deans and recommendations had been made to the Provost. Currently, the issue was under discussion between the Deans and the Provost.

Reporting on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), Professor Welch stated that the FSEC had met seven times and discussed the following issues:

8/30/95 - Examination of State budget reduction in SUNY support and establishment of Faculty Senate committees.

9/6/95 - Report of the President and discussion of intercollegiate athletics. Professor Welch noted that the President and/or Provost interacts with the FSEC at most meetings.

9/13/95 - Data security and access to information which involved the Faculty Senate Computer Services Committee and the role of the Deans' offices in promoting teaching effectiveness following the decision of the Provost's office to abolish the Office of Teaching Effectiveness. Professor Welch noted that a joint Faculty Senate and Deans committee would be established which would include recipients of Distinguished Teaching Professorships and winners of the Chancellor's Award to examine how Schools and Faculties could increase effective teaching and learning. He stated that the committee was to be convened by Vice Provost Fischer.

9/20/95 - "Rethinking SUNY", admissions policy for undergraduates and charging the EPPC regarding undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) and remedial courses. Professor Welch commented that there had been dramatic changes in the SUNY Board of Trustees and that restructuring included consideration of faculty productivity, managerial efficiency and distance learning. He noted that there were continuing financial concerns and that faculty awareness and input was crucial. The Faculty Senate

Admissions and Retention Committee had been charged to examine the criteria for admissions of undergraduates. Professor Welch noted that the current three-pronged criteria of grade point average, standardized tests and rank was a highly mechanical formula and that rank in class was frequently unavailable. The current formula did not allow for inclusion of the maturity level of candidates or the quality or level of challenge of the high school program.

9/27/95 - The recent National Research Council (NRC) report on graduate education, "Rethinking SUNY" and the University Faculty Senate.

10/11/95 - Bylaws and Charter of the Faculty Senate.

10/18/95 - Executive session with Provost Headrick discussing alternative models of University organization and NRC report implications.

Professor Welch commented that upcoming FSEC topics would include the future of the Graduate School, capital and annual giving campaigns, faculty advisement and safety on campus with a special focus on the south campus. He noted that minutes of the FSEC would be sent to Senators upon request. He reminded Senators that minutes would be available electronically on WINGS.

Stating that challenges to higher education were extraordinarily significant, Professor Welch commented that the President of the University of Michigan stated that on a scale of 1 to 10, faculty would measure change at 3 or 4 in the next few years while most campus presidents would select 20. He mentioned a transformation in American higher education comparable to establishment of land-grant colleges and the post World War II expansion. He referred to the fundamental rethinking of SUNY in process which was compounded by activism of the new Trustees, reorientation of State government under Governor Pataki and the rejection of the SUNY budget by the Trustees. Professor Welch stated that the SUNY budget had proposed a 1.1% adjustment for inflation and modest improvements but had been voted down by the Board of Trustees in an unprecedented action.

Professor Welch stated within the next two years he hoped that the Faculty Senate would be viewed throughout the campus as the primary vehicle for expressing faculty opinion on academic matters of general import. He voiced hope that faculty opinion would be

expressed in the adoption and implementation of University policies which would require cooperation from Deans at the School and Faculty levels. He recommended formulation of faculty views based on wide consultation, discussion and study of issues. Professor Welch suggested collegial examination of policies by the administration and faculty and noted that significant changes must involve appropriate reasoning and consultation.

Professor Welch stated that well-informed, fully functioning committees were critical. He remarked that he would collegially check on administrative actions on Faculty Senate resolutions. He noted that as Dean Triggie had mentioned, any questioning of quality of academic leadership must include faculty.

ITEM 3: Report of the Provost

Provost Headrick noted that his remarks of 10/13/95 at the University Convocation would be published in the *Reporter*. He stated that he would like to make three points given the state of politics in New York State and in Washington, D.C., the anticipated changes in health care and the turnover on the Board of Trustees. He noted that the Board of Trustees was very active and anxious to learn, change and improve SUNY while reducing costs. He mentioned the mandate from the legislature for change in SUNY. Provost Headrick's first point was that it was anticipated that the state would further cut tax support for SUNY. He noted that 20% had been lost during the last year and had been made up with one time revenues and an increase in tuition. He stated that an additional 20% cut was anticipated in tax support for the next year. He noted that there would probably be a decrease in state tax support in two years from \$929 million to \$600 million. Provost Headrick remarked on the attempt to make up the cut with higher fees to students, concentration on fund raising and revenue opportunities. He stated that it was difficult to make predictions but that he was hopeful. He noted that the new members of the Board of Trustees were interested in devolving decision-making and responsibility to individual campuses to decrease bureaucracy. The second point expressed by Provost Headrick was the need for a clear long run strategy. He noted that conventional answers would

not help and that the state would not be adding resources. He stated that all segments of the University were pressed financially within the current framework. He noted that tuition increases could only make up tax cuts and that major changes requiring reorganization of programs and cultures would be necessary. He stated that the University administration would attempt to avoid retrenchment. He stressed that it was a two-way street and that faculty would need to change in various ways. He commented that the burden of flexibility might not be equal and across the board but differential in nature.

The third point expressed by Provost Headrick was that the case for short run protection was strengthened by the development of a long run strategy.

Professor Garverick questioned reductions in Pell funding and Provost Headrick replied that there was an effect on funding and that there would be an impact on the cost of education.

Mr. Durkin stated that reduction in Pell grants was only one of several dramatic changes in funding. He expressed concern that a segment of the population would be prevented economically from higher education and cited the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) as an example.

Professor Nickerson inquired as to how Provost Headrick would communicate with faculty and solicit opinions. Provost Headrick stated that he was speaking with faculty, meeting with various groups, attending Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee and FSEC meetings and talking with the Deans. He commented that the Reporter would publish reports of meetings and topics and serve as a forum to express ideas. He noted that although he would attempt to keep up communication, difficulties were present based on the size of the University.

Professor Metzger questioned the possibility of conflicts due to cultural changes and values and statutes. He specifically mentioned the union (UUP) contract. Provost Headrick responded that he had to exercise caution in commenting about the union but noted that the environment impinged on solutions to problems. He stated that the structure of relationships was part collegial and part union. He noted that similar issues also concerned the new SUNY Board of Trustees. He mentioned a disconnect between SUNY and the academic units and the union over long term arrangements.

Professor Lawler noted that he was aware of limits to tuition increases and questioned declining enrollment due to tuition increases. He noted the major challenge to the mission of the University as a public institution of higher education. Provost Headrick replied that the impact of increased tuition was being assessed and that expansion of TAP was being considered as a source of assistance. He noted that additional revenue generated by tuition might be used for additional financial aid. He stated that the situation was complex and that tuition increases were not the total answer.

Professor Ebert noted the important responsibility of the faculty to offer advice. Voicing opposition to increases in tuition, he suggested that faculty members with salaries in excess of \$65,000 annually, voluntarily freeze their salaries. He recommended elimination of duplication in administrative positions. Provost Headrick replied that there might be an involuntary salary freeze. He noted that comparative data revealed UB to be 28th of 29 AAU public institutions for allocation for administrative support. He noted that administration, maintenance and support personnel had been previously cut. He stated that technological advances might save money but that there were no easy answers.

Professor Doyno suggested an effort to educate the people of New York State about the positive contributions of SUNY over the last twenty years. Provost Headrick agreed that informing the public was a good point.

ITEM 4: Report of the Budget Priorities Committee

Professor Gates, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee, stated that the committee had been meeting regularly. He mentioned key topics which included revenue, fees, summer sessions, financial policies and the state budget.

Regarding revenue, Professor Gates remarked on increased interest in differential tuition. He noted the importance of taking advantage of market possibilities.

Fees being considered, according to Professor Gates, included technology and parking fees.

Increased flexibility in budgeting and implementation of summer

sessions was mentioned by Professor Gates with advantages from the changes becoming apparent in 1996 and 1997.

Professor Gates stated that decentralization of financial control and increased flexibility were important to successful administration in the future. He noted that the Chancellor was opposed to complete decentralization of financial control to the campuses and that the UUP President had testified to the Higher Education Committee of the Assembly regarding centralization of power. Professor Gates stated that it would be necessary to tap the reserves in order to make selective investments in the future. He mentioned all funds accounting and reporting that any department Chair could use to meet obligations. He stated that this concept had not been used on the campus but had potential benefit for the long term. He noted the December 1, 1995 deadline for the Board of Trustees restructuring report.

Commenting on the state budget, Professor Gates mentioned a mid-year reduction of \$2.2 million for UB. Regarding a campus policy, Professor Gates noted that 95% of this year's base budget could be used to meet future obligations, a decrease from last year. He predicted that deep cuts in state tax support were anticipated in the future.

Professor Gates summarized faculty viewpoints on the effects of current budget reductions. Morale was reported as low and cynicism high among faculty and staff. Larger classes, fewer advisers and less senior hires were reported. It was noted that resources shifted to fund administration were low, that there was less OTPS money available and that library acquisitions were reduced. Professor Gates stressed the need for long range planning. He noted that increases were needed in class sizes and general education offerings. He stated that increased efficiency at a reduced cost was necessary. Professor Doyno inquired into the effect of the budgetary problems on decanal and unit head searches. Professor Gates replied that the better candidates were not applying and that there was a negative impact.

Professor Lawler commented on parking fees and noted that the contract "permits" negotiation of fees. Professor Gates remarked that revenue could be generated if adequate parking was provided. Provost Headrick concurred that Professor Lawler was correct regarding the need to negotiate increases in parking fees. Vice

President Palmer stated that maintenance of parking areas was not supported by state funds and that the institution would need to raise funds through negotiations with the bargaining units. Professor Bono requested Professor Gates to elaborate on the positive aspects he had mentioned in the interim report on restructuring of SUNY. Professor Gates replied that the interest in financial flexibility was encouraging to UB. He stated that regional approaches, clear identification of missions and decentralization of financial control were positive concepts for UB. Provost Headrick remarked that downloading of SUNY functions such as processing of applications and controlling application fees would increase efficiency and be cost effective. He noted that SUNY approval of payroll, purchasing and normal business operations was not effective. He mentioned the possibility of regional provision of services through cooperation among UB, Buffalo State, Fredonia, Brockport and Geneseo as a concept of interest to the Board of Trustees.

ITEM 5: Report on Admissions

Referring to pages 9 and 10 of the Resolutions of the Faculty Senate, Professor Welch noted that an annual report on freshmen admissions was required and he encouraged Senators to raise questions related to policies and statistics.

Professor Noble inquired into gender and race figures and Mr. Durkin, Director of Admissions, replied that an analysis of new and continuing undergraduates revealed a 54% female composition. Professor Welch requested a written report from Mr. Durkin that would be inserted into the minutes.

Professor Schuel asked if there were plans to increase recruitment into neighboring states. He noted the substantial increase in revenue from out-of-state tuition. Professor Welch commented that differential tuition was not currently retained on campus. Vice President Palmer stated that there were plans to expand out-of-state recruitment into New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. He voiced optimism regarding keeping the additional resources and remarked that recruitment of out-of-state students was a sound policy.

Professor Garverick inquired if financial guidelines were available to parents and commented on looking to the Office of Admissions for leadership.

Professor Bono expressed congratulations at maintaining the undergraduate admission targets and asked if there had been a decline in graduate enrollment. Provost Headrick replied that there had been a slight decrease in graduate enrollment and that the undergraduate enrollment had overshot the target. He noted that there had been an adjustment in the target due to the increase in graduate tuition and he remarked that there had not been as great an effect as anticipated. He commented that UB had fared better than the other centers.

Professor Bennett inquired into future plans to change the three-pronged admissions policy. Professor Welch commented that the admissions policy had been implemented according to the Senate resolution, including development by the Office of Admissions of appropriate procedures in the absence of class rank information. Mr. Durkin stated that he was appreciative of the faculty comments and that approximately 300,000 informational brochures had been available which noted financial and admissions data including the use of the three of three criteria. He referred to the 1982 Faculty Senate resolution of two of three criteria. He noted that if one of the criteria such as the SAT or ACT scores, grade point average or rank were low, one score was dropped. He stated that in 1985, a three of three criteria standard had been adopted and he explained that the t-score was a method of ranking complex and varied grounds related to the rigor of the high school program. He commented that the letter and spirit of the resolution had been maintained and he asked for advice regarding maintaining the three of three criteria. He remarked that applicants were reviewed in a fair, sensitive and personal manner.

ITEM 6: First Reading of the Revised Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and Charter of the Faculty Senate

Professor Welch explained the two readings system and that the first reading provided a discussion of general policy issues rather than specific details. He noted that the Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee had been hard at work for the past three years revising

the documents. Professor Welch stated that, in consideration of time constraints and to increase efficiency, the focus of the discussion would be on substantive issues.

Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee, noted that the proposals included changes in terminology, organization of the document and changes to reflect current realities. She stated that in an effort to save time, she would concentrate on the changes of substance.

She referred to Article III.1(c) of the Bylaws dealing with the definition of Voting Faculty. She noted that the Policies of the Board of Trustees (Policies) included geographic full-time (GFT) faculty as members of the Voting Faculty and that this was not open to change. She stated that the intent of the proposal was an explicit inclusion of GFTs in the article specifying the membership of the Voting Faculty. She noted that previously GFTs had only been included as part of the definition of under "academic rank" and confusion had resulted regarding inclusion as Voting Faculty members. She noted that the category of GFT was dependent on the definition of "medical center" and that the committee was checking with SUNY counsel. She stated that the requirement of appointments of more than one year applied only to qualified ranks. She cited the example of a visiting professor on successive one-year appointments being excluded from membership in the Voting Faculty.

Professor Jameson urged the Bylaws Committee to include qualified appointments of one-year as members of the Voting Faculty. She stated that it was not appropriate to disenfranchise this segment of the faculty.

Professor Welch commented that qualified rank included a specific adjective such as clinical, research or visiting. He noted instances of non-qualified lines changing into qualified lines.

Turning to Article III.1(d) of the Bylaws, Professor Hopkins said the proposed change would add the Provost and Vice Provosts as members of the Voting Faculty.

Referring to Article III.2 of the Bylaws, Professor Hopkins said that the revisions proposed that officers of the Faculty Senate be allowed to serve two consecutive terms. She noted that currently there was a one-term limit.

Article VI.2 of the Bylaws proposed to lower the quorum for a

meeting of the Voting Faculty from 25% to 10% of the Voting Faculty. Professor Hopkins noted that there had been approximately 100 Voting Faculty members at the last meeting and that 10% of the estimated total Voting Faculty of 1855 would have required 186 members for a quorum.

Article VII.5 of the Bylaws changed the requirements for approving amendments to the Bylaws by raising the percentage approving the change from a majority to a two-thirds vote and set a floor for voter turnout equal to 10% of the Voting Faculty. Professor Hopkins noted that a higher threshold for approving amendments would be a safer approach since the Bylaws were the major governance document of the Voting Faculty. She stated that the threshold of a total vote of 10% of the Voting Faculty had been added by the FSEC.

Professor Lawler agreed that the percentage voting should not be lower than 10%.

Professor Jameson inquired into procedures for offering changes to the proposals. Professor Hopkins stated that the Bylaws Committee desired to review proposed modifications as soon as possible prior to the second reading. Professor Welch replied that suggested changes and rationale should be provided. Professor Jameson stated that she was suggesting disagreement with a proposed change, specifically the two-term limit for elected Senate officers. Professor Welch asked Professor Garver, the parliamentarian, for advice.

Professor Garver replied that specific wording was necessary for any proposed amendments to the draft of the Bylaws Committee.

Professor Adams recommended thinking carefully about a four-year term for the Chair of the Faculty Senate. She commented on the fact that the Chairmanship was a powerful position.

Professor Wooldridge stated that achieving a 10% vote of the Voting Faculty might be difficult since the GFTs seldom attended meetings or voted but were required to be included in the Voting Faculty.

Professor Lawler questioned representation of Senate members and Professor Hopkins replied that allocation by Schools/Faculty was addressed in the Charter.

Professor Boot stated that extension of the term of the officers of the Senate was fundamentally not democratic and that an officer should "make a mark" within the current one-term period.

Regarding the Charter of the Faculty Senate, Professor Hopkins concentrated on changes in substance after noting changes that

were being proposed to reflect current conditions or practice. Professor Hopkins, referring to Article II.2.B(1).(b)(i), noted that deletions of "general" on page 2 in relationship to undergraduate education were intended as clarifications to remove any possible misunderstanding about whether the Senate's responsibility was limited to the so-called "general education" curriculum rather than to the entire undergraduate curriculum.

Article III on pages 3 and 4 expanded membership of the UB Faculty Senate to include academic deans as non-voting members to foster collegiality.

Changes in Article IV on pages 4 and 5 redefined the institutional/general electoral unit, provided for Senate re-apportionment every five years and provided for the starting date for Senatorial terms to be July 1.

Article VI.1 on pages 7 to 9 proposed that the Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Senate could serve two consecutive terms and made explicit the duties of the FSEC.

Article VI.2 on pages 9 to 11 moved the majority of Standing Committees from the Charter to the Standing Orders of the Senate and made more explicit the composition of the Elections and the Bylaws committees. Professor Hopkins noted that changes in the Standing Orders, which set up procedures for the Senate, did not require Presidential approval.

Article VIII.1 on page 13 dealing with the procedure for proposing amendments to the Charter, contains a suggestion to raise the requirements. Article VIII.3-5 on pages 13 to 14 provided alternative methods for adopting amendments and the conditions under which each method was to be used. Professor Hopkins inquired as to the opinion of the Senate regarding these proposals. Professor Adams, referring to page 8 of the Charter, Article VI.1.D(1), commented that the Vice Chair of the Senate should be the Secretary, not the Chair-Elect. Professor Hopkins thanked Professor Adams for the correction.

Professor Hopkins elaborated on Article VIII.3-5 related to the procedure for adopting amendments to the Charter. She reviewed that amendments could be proposed by a petition of 10% of the UB Faculty, a petition of 10% of the Voting Faculty or the Bylaws Committee of the UB Faculty Senate. It was suggested that the Senate could decide which procedure to follow regarding approval of

amendments. Professor Welch commented that the criteria governing choice of approval methods needed to be included in the Charter.

Professor Lawler inquired if electoral units had been considered and noted that some departments might not have representation on the Senate. Professor Hopkins replied that Senators represent Schools/Faculties, not departments, and that it was up to each School or Faculty to determine its methods for elections.

Professor Welch complimented Professor Hopkins and the Bylaws Committee for the great care and patience which had been taken with the revisions.

ITEM 7: First Reading of the Draft Resolution on Faculty Role in Student Recruitment

Professor Welch announced that the draft resolution by Professor Jameson on the Faculty Role in Student Recruitment had been forwarded to the Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions and Retention.

Professor Harwitz, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions and Retention, discussed the advisory role of the faculty regarding undergraduate recruitment. He noted that increased faculty involvement might be necessary to facilitate the success of recruitment. He stated that faculty might meet with potential applicants while traveling and offer information and encouragement regarding application to the University. Professor Harwitz stated that the resolution suggested that Deans and Chairs offer funding for this purpose. He stated that the committee had offered no amendments to the draft resolution but had suggested that faculty members involved in recruitment be well-informed.

ITEM 8: Resolution of Thanks to Professor Nickerson

Professor Welch presented the Resolution of Thanks to Professor Nickerson which stated:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Peter A. Nickerson for his leadership as Chair of the Faculty Senate from 1993 to 1995. His term was especially noted for a

revitalization of the Senate committee structure, the passage of a number of resolutions in support of undergraduate education and the ethical conduct of research, as well as Dr. Nickerson's collegial and open communication with the University administration.

Professor Adams moved the resolution which was seconded by Professor Bennett and passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary/Faculty Senate

THOSE PRESENT:

University Officers: T. Headrick, R. Palmer

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Arts & Letters: B. Bono, J. Bunn, V. Doyno, J. Fradin, A. Henderson, R. Hoeing, M. Hyde, M. Metzger

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

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Educational Studies: L. Ilon, L. Malave, T. Schroeder, S. Stevenson

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

Bialas, M. Ryan, W. Thomas

Health Related Professions: A. Awad, P. Horvath, S. Kuo

Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elia

Law: S. Mangold, L. Swartz

Management: S. Kellogg, R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albin, D. Amsterdam, M. Wetzler, J. Smith, B. Noble, J. Richert, H. Schuel, A. Vladutiu, J. Wactawski-Wende

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Calkin, M. Churchill, M. Cowen, P. Eberlein, J. Farran, T. Hennessey, M. Sachs, R. Vesley

Nursing: M. Ludwig, M. Werner, P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N. Bach

Social Sciences: V. Eagles, V. Ebert, M. Farrell, C. Frake, P. Hare, M. Harwitz, D. Henderson, J. Lawler, L. Mattei, D. Pollock, N. Revankar, E. Segal

Social Work: L. Sloan

SUNY Senators: J. Boot, M. Jameson, P. Nickerson

University Libraries: J. Adams, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer, E. Herman

Guest(s): K. Durkin, S. Cox

THOSE EXCUSED:

S. Danford, D. Malone, M. Spaulding

THOSE ABSENT:

M. Hadighi, M. Long, P. O'Toole, J. Pappas, R. Hall, G. Deshaies, J. Hoot, E. Meidinger, P. Perry, C. Trzcinka, F. Schimpfhauser, J. Sulewski, B. Willer, J. King, R. Shortridge, W. Conway, D. Zubin, M. Zubrow