

Faculty Senate

Minutes, May 1, 2012

SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Edward Herman (Acting Chair)

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING

Stratigakos, Despina

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Aldstadt, Jared

Baumer, William (Parliamentarian)

Churchill, Melvyn

Dyson, Stephen

Lyons, Arabella

Metcalfe, Sara

Zarembka, Paul

SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

Bush, Mary

Miller, Ray

Tezal, Mine

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Chiu, Ming Ming

Miller, Suzanne

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Mollendorf, Joseph (Alternate-Paul Desjardin) (Excused)

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Sanders, Larry

Smith, Sanjukta

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

Bradford, Peter

Feng, Jian

Fine, Edward

Gelfond, Daniel

Lyndaker, Anne Marie

Mastrandrea, Lucy

Quattrin, Teresa

Shucard, David

Singh, Ranjit

Tumiel-Berhalter, Laurene (Excused)

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Kiviniemi, Marc

SUNY SENATORS

Gottdiener, Jennifer

Nickerson, Peter

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Belford, Rebecca (Acting Secretary)

Walsh, Tiffany

GUESTS

Christian, Diane—English

Finley, Lucinda—Faculty Affairs

Holstun, Jim—English
Kelley, Robin—Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
Lanier, Kesha--Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
Shucard, Janet—Neuropsychology
Welch, Claude—Political Science
Wood, Troy—Chemistry
1 illegible signatur

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm.

Ed Herman, Acting Chair

The minutes of the April 3, 2012 minutes were approved.

Report of the Chair

E. Zubrow not present; no report.

Report of the President (Satish Tripathi)

President Tripathi expressed his thanks to those who attended the campus conversation with the president.

A question was asked about whether the administration consulted the Faculty Senate in the course of the formation of the Shale Resources and Society Institute, and whether the university will make financial involvements in the Institute clear.

Tripathi outlined the standard procedures for establishing any research center or institute, which do not include the Faculty Senate. The process of publication and peer review takes place regardless of the type of research or connection with industry. Any dollar amounts that are required to be public will be made public.

Report of the Interim Provost (Bruce McCombe)

No report.

Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE)

Discussion continued from the Faculty Senate meeting of April 3, 2012.
Commission chair Athena Mutua was present and available for questions.
Commenters expressed thanks to the Mutua and the CAEE.

Question: What happens next?

Mutua: Last week was the last in a series of reports made to deans and VPs. The reporting process is complete. Regarding implementation: the initial report with the Provost includes short/easy/no-cost recommendations. It calls for the administration to report annually to the Faculty Senate on tenure that is disaggregated by race and gender; the provost agreed. At the Deans meeting a panel will be formed to act on or recommend implementation. Several groups as well as the administration will be involved. The UB women full professors group was approached about how they might participate.

McCombe: will send a letter to all faculty and staff about the Commission report. The letter will address what the administration will do about recommendations. The implementation team will involve the administration, commission representatives, and perhaps others. This will happen before June 1 when McCombe leaves office.

Comment: The main recommendations are similar to earlier reports. Establishment of a VP for Equity and Diversity was recommended earlier and seems to be a key to implementing the recommendations.

Mutua: A majority of the commission preferred a Vice President for Equity and Diversity while others prefer a Provost-level person; the effect would be establishing a centralized person in an office that has power to attend deans meetings and coordinate, and investigate at all levels. A discussion of resources and finances is needed especially regarding the existing EDI office. Currently all discussions are preliminary.

McCombe: The implementation team will focus heavily on this recommendation. The team will be in place and charged by him. It will proceed under auspices of the new provost.

A motion was made that the Senate, through the chair of the Faculty Senate, establish a seven-person implementation committee to oversee the recommendations of the commission and that the implementation committee include two persons from the task force; one person from the ad hoc [group]; one from UUP; and three faculty, at least one of whom is a woman and one of whom is a minority.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion followed, with various commenters:

The proposed committee would be a Senate committee rather than a university committee, which has implications. There are pros and cons of a university versus a Senate committee.

A committee as moved could foster better decision making because all members would have different information. Even if it is primarily a Senate body, it would help to have members of the administration.

In response to a request for clarification on implementation committee plans, McCombe stated that the committee in mind included people who could both implement and advise.

The difference between the implementation committee as moved and the provost's proposed committee is that the first would not be administrative or have implementation power; the two committees could work together or simultaneously.

Two groups could be ineffective.

A pro for two committees would be to make sure the issue is kept alive, citing previous reports with recommendations not fully implemented.

Question: Would the provost's intended committee include a UUP-nominated representative?

- McCombe: The Provost hasn't gotten as far as determining the exact composition but is not sure why that would be necessary.

A reason to include UUP would be the union's statewide lead in equity issues since the 1980s, its record of taking action toward salary equity and diversity, and its ability to provide additional information.

One committee would be more efficient although the second as moved could function as an oversight committee. If there is a single committee, it should include representation from the union, the Senate, and all parts of the university, and it should itself be diverse. One committee made of the right people would not be just an administrative committee. The important thing for implementing the recommendations is support from the administration.

Question: When previous committees issued their reports, was there any sort of oversight panel for implementations?

- J. Holstun: 1970 report, no; 1996, outcomes included a daycare center and possibly salary adjustment with the main recommendation not instituted.

If the concern of the Faculty Senate is to see that recommendations are implemented and there is a commitment by the provost to an implementation committee, would it be more fruitful to request periodic reports from the committee rather than setting up a second implementation committee?

Further discussion:

Mutua: Why not set up a single committee with many perspectives that works with the Provost? No matter what, there will be reporting issues. This Faculty Senate can focus on this as an opportunity for contribution, not merely oversight

A possibility is to create a Faculty Senate committee that disbands once the Senate determines that the provostial Committee is sufficient.

A commenter on the FSEC and the diversity commission noted that everyone is invested in the work of the commission.

Notes from the Parliamentarian (Baumer):

There is no quorum at this meeting.

Committees need to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC); an option would be to ask the executive committee to address the issues after getting a sense of the house regarding its feeling.

Herman noted that the Executive Committee would be meeting the next day and the issues could be added to the agenda.

A motion was made to refer the issue to the Executive Committee and was carried. However, the lack of quorum means the only action is a vote to provide a sense of the group to inform the Executive Committee. Reflecting that, a motion was made and seconded to vote if the house is interested in having the FSEC consider formation of a CAEE review/implementation committee and determine how the committee would be constituted. In other words, is there support for the idea of having the FSEC create a committee as originally moved?

Noting the lack of quorum, the question was called with 1 opposed and 1 for. The Acting Chair broke the tie, voting in favor of calling the question.

A vote was taken on the sense of the house to endorse an oversight committee as proposed.

Ten were in favor, 10 opposed; the Acting Chair broke the tie by opposing the motion. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will still have a sense of what the body would like because FSEC members were in attendance. The FSEC minutes regarding these issues will be public.

A new motion was made and seconded to request that the committee or committees that are formed to deal with implementation make a progress report to the Faculty Senate every six months. The question was called. The motion was carried with none opposed and 1 abstention.

Faculty Senate Committee Reports

Budget Priorities (Claude Welch) (Appendix A)

The report has been issued electronically.

Welch answered questions:

The most important role of the committee is advancing good ideas from faculty and creating a dialogue and atmosphere for discussion.

The intention is that ideas will come from larger groups of faculty; the committee members can represent a number of constituencies.

Welch thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to serve on the committee.

Herman thanked Welch on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Academic Planning (Diane Christian) (Appendix B)

The report has been issued electronically.

Bylaws (William Baumer) (Appendix C)

The report has been issued electronically.

The committee reviewed the assignment of senators. The proposed correction will be effective as of Fall 2012.

Grading (William Baumer) (Appendix D)

The report has been issued electronically.

Comments regarding a proposal for January intersession are invited and should be directed to the VP of Undergraduate Education or to Baumer.

Computing Services: (Troy Wood) (Appendix E)

The report has been issued electronically.

Highlights and additional points not included in the appended report:

The blog is publically available. The URL is in the report.

The first priority is server capacity.

Faculty are concerned that within classroom space, wireless access is excellent, but spotty or unusable outside class space including research space and part of Clemens. UB does not compare well to other AAU institutions in terms of wireless access; UB needs to make wireless access a priority.

A commenter expressed dissatisfaction with the HUB. Wood noted that Tom Furlani was receptive and responsive once complaints were made, but the committee was not informed throughout implementation.

Noting the report's mention of law enforcement and library materials, a questioner asked what library information law enforcement can legally request. Wood answered that there have been instances of in-person requests without a warrant for printed lists of materials individual(s) have checked out. Law enforcement can request anything, but we do not need to oblige without a warrant with a specific request. We need to train students about this situation, hence the recommendation for a policy.

Facilities Planning (Robert Wetherhold) (Appendix F)

Wetherhold not present.

The report has been issued electronically.

Tenure & Privileges (Joseph Woelfel) (Appendix G)

Woelfel not present.

The report has been issued electronically.

Libraries (Steve Dyson) (Appendix H)

The report has been issued electronically.

Dyson delivered highlights from the report.

A commenter noted that students, particularly undergraduates, do not understand the nature of libraries today and may underestimate their usage of library resources.

Teaching and learning (Peter Nickerson) (Appendix I)

The report has been issued electronically.

Highlights from report:

The committee is developing a list for the Middle States Academic Goals. The difficulty is assessment.

Elections Committee (Edward Herman) (Appendix J)

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

There was no new business.

There was a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Appendix A

Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee

Report to the full Faculty Senate, May 1, 2012

Claude Welch, chair

Introduction and purpose: The Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) was established by the Senate around a quarter-century back, in tandem with the Academic Planning Committee. Each examines important facets of changes in UB's educational offerings and their support.

Issues during current academic year: During 2011-12, similar to the past several years, the BPC gave primary attention at its monthly meetings to UB's strategies and means to meet mandated reductions in State funding. Many other issues came before the Committee, however, in the past several months. These include, in no particular order:

Funding and criteria for the three E fund

The annual capital budget

Proposed new budget models, both for UB and for SUNY as a whole. (Note: the current formulas appear much better geared to the needs of SUNY's comprehensive colleges, as contrasted with its major research universities. UB has recommended several changes, which are under consideration by Central Administration.)

Implications for the campus flowing from the Governor's Executive Budget and legislative action, including special member bills

Implementation of NYSUNY2020

The master plan for facilities, 2013-2023

Other issues considered since 2007 (illustrative): Since its inception, the Budget Priorities Committee has examined how changing sources of funding have impacted on campus operations, in both broad and specific terms. Examples of the latter include athletics, cleanliness on campus, plans for and impact of retirement incentives, development reorganization, or the UB Foundation.

Distinctive features: The Budget Priorities Committee has some features differentiating it from other Senate committees:

Its members are appointed for non-renewable five-year terms, in order to build up their expertise. (Most Senate Committee members serve for three years, with reappointment possible. The Budget Priorities Committee differs, since it follows a principle of rotation, so that “new blood” is regularly brought in.)

Their appointment is carried out with mutual consultation and agreement between the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC, as the Senate’s Committee on Committees) and the Office of the Provost.

BPC meetings and its minutes are confidential, in order to encourage direct expression of opinion by all participants.

In addition to the faculty members named as just indicated, the following persons serve as ex officio participants: the Provost and/or his or her deputy (during their terms of office); the *current* chairs of both the Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Senate (during their terms of office); and the *previous* chairs of the Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Senate (for a single transition year each). *See the membership list at the end of this report.*

Although its members come from across the University as a whole, they do not “represent” specific areas. Their selection depends upon individual competence, experience within UB (for that reason, almost all faculty members have been full professors), and broad understanding of the complex budgetary interactions of an institution as broad as UB.

Similar to other Faculty Senate Committees, the BPC is asked to report (usually on an annual basis) to the Faculty Senate as a whole, whether via the Executive Committee or to the entire Senate.

Membership: Current full-time faculty members include John Canty (Medicine), Michael Detty (Chemistry), Bob Hoeing (immediate past chair, Faculty Senate; Linguistics), Peter Horvath (Public Health), Myung Kim (Accounting, School of Management; appointed 2012), Athena Mutua (Law), Cristanne Miller (English; appointed 2012), Jason Young (History), and Claude Welch (Political Science, Chair). Ex officio members include the Provost, Sean Sullivan (Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Budget), Janiece Jankowski (immediate past Chair, Professional Staff Senate; University Libraries), Ann Marie Landel (Chair, Professional Staff Senate; became BPC member 2012; CIT), and Ezra Zubrow (Chair, Faculty Senate; became BPC member 2012; Anthropology). Early in 2012, Claude Welch announced his intention to resign as the Committee’s chair at the end of the academic year, having served as member or chair for the preceding five years, in keeping with the principle of rotation noted above. Appointment of a new chair is anticipated by the end of the academic year.

Appendix B

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE 1 May 2012

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee referred no university reorganizational issues for the Committee's consideration. The Committee tries to follow educational trends of reorganization, combination and development in comparable national and international institutions.

The Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee met with Interim Provost Harvey Stenger on October 14th and had a very productive discussion about the interface between the Provost and the FSAPC, the present state of academic planning, and the issue of education measurement models.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee requested Reports on The Gen Ed/Core Committee's progress and on the search for a Director of the Honors College. At the January 25, 2012 FSEC meeting VP and Undergraduate Dean Weber and FSAPC Chair Christian reported the slow progress in implementation of the Gen Ed report. There are many reasons including UB Provostal changes and coordination with SUNY Central. Progress has been made on expansion of the Writing across campus implementation. Funding was approved for first stage implementation through the 3E initiative.

The Committee has devoted extensive discussion to Gen Ed issues and recommends the Stanford report of January 2012. The link for this report is http://news.stanford.edu/news/2012/january/SUES_Report.pdf

The national search for Director of the Honors College and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education was concluded in March with the appointment of Professor Andrew Stott. In an excellent field of nationally qualified and experienced candidates, internal candidate Stott was an exceptionally talented visionary. He assumed the position in March and will serve also as a leader for undergraduate education at UB.

The Committee looks forward to establishing a strong relation with Provost Zukoski.

Respectfully submitted,



Diane Christian,
Chair, Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee

Appendix C



University at Buffalo
The State University of New York

Faculty Senate

1 May 2012

Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee — 2011-12

The Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee was charged by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to review and recommend action on the numbers of UB Faculty Senators representing the several Schools and College. With data provided by Senior Programmer-Analyst Lynne DePasquale, Academic Planning and Budget, the Bylaws Committee recommended allocations of UB Faculty Senators to the Executive Committee at its 27 February 2012 session. The recommended allocations were approved.

WHBaumer

William H. Baumer
Chair, UB Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee
Director, Graduate Studies
Professor, Philosophy
136C Julian Park Hall
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260-4150
Tel: 716-645-0164
Internet: whbaumer@buffalo.edu

Appendix D



University at Buffalo
The State University of New York

Faculty Senate

1 May 2012

Faculty Senate Grading Committee — 2011-12

The Faculty Senate Grading Committee was charged by Faculty Senate Chair Ezra B. Zubrow to review and recommend action on

1. January Intercession and UB Academic Calendars
2. Modification of Add-Drop Periods
3. Modification of Dean's List Criteria
4. Additional Course and Section Grade Pattern Standards

The Grading Committee recommended adoption of resolutions addressing each of these to the Executive Committee at its 25 April 2012 session. The recommendations were approved.

WH Baumer

William H. Baumer
Chair, UB Faculty Senate Grading Committee
Director, Graduate Studies
Professor, Philosophy
136C Julian Park Hall
University at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260-4150
Tel: 716-645-0164
Internet: whbaumer@buffalo.edu

Appendix E

Faculty Senate Computing Services Committee Annual Report, 2011-12
Chair: Troy D. Wood
Report Date: April 24, 2012

This year, the CSC had two priorities. The first was an assignment from the Faculty Senate to investigate drafting a policy regarding access of personal IT information on faculty and staff from outside agents. Charles Dunn, UB's Information Security Officer, reported to the Faculty Senate that such a policy statement to cover paper and electronic formats of personal information for faculty and staff may be appropriate considering numerous request for such information from law enforcement officials. The second was to gather input from faculty and staff regarding current issues with the HUB system, such that we could deliver to the CIO's office a prioritized list of issues that need to be addressed.

The CSC met on February 8th, 2012, to address these two specific issues and to provide information on a number of smaller ones.

Professor James Milles from the Law School graciously agreed to provide us with advice with regard to legal ramifications of drafting an IT release policy. As Professor Milles noted, there are a number of state and federal statutes regarding electronic discovery that mandate that the university respond to requests for access to such personal IT information. In addition, he noted that by law, there are prohibitions in place such that the university **cannot** alert its personnel that such a request has been made. The university's practice has been that it will provide such information to the appropriate authorities when legally obliged to do so. However, during our discussion it was revealed that law enforcement officials have, at various times, made requests of *library staff* to disclose information about material university personnel had checked out of the libraries, often without a formal warrant request, and thus they would like to have a formal policy in place. A consensus was reached by the committee that the university should comply with local, state, and federal statutes to provide such electronic records to authorities only when legally obliged to do so with properly submitted requests to the university; otherwise, without a valid legal basis, for the protection of personal information of its faculty and staff, this committee feels that such information should not be voluntarily passed along by the university to outside agencies. A more complex aspect that was discussed was if the Faculty Senate also wished the CSC to comment on the university's policy of such electronic record retention. As pointed out, UB's current minimalist approach on electronic record retention could appear, to outside forces, as an attempt to evade and delay in the provision of records. It was suggested that the CSC may be an appropriate place, perhaps in consultation with other FS committees, to discuss and develop a university record retention policy that is broad and would represent a "good faith" effort by the university to cooperate when legally obligated to do so. Thus, the CSC wishes for further direction from the Faculty Senate on whether we should be addressing this issue.

Considerable discussion focused on the roll-out of HUB to the UB community. It should be noted that the CSC chair was surprised at the lack of communication regarding the development and planned implementation of HUB to the CSC; as the Faculty's central voice on computing services issues, it seems evident that the CSC **should** have been involved in these discussions, yet we were not consulted. The reason this is pointed out is that, had we been consulted and advised along the way, some of the problems that HUB experienced after its roll-out might well have been avoided. That may be moot now, but for the future the CSC hopes that it will be consulted as such major initiatives (that fall under our purview) are undertaken. CSC members discussed a number of specific problem areas for HUB, one of the primary ones noted being the extremely slow loading of HUB windows to individual's desktops. The bandwidth for the HUB server **MUST** be increased significantly (as of the writing of this report, this problem remains). CIO Tom Furlani graciously agreed to meet with Chair of the Faculty Senate Professor Ezra Zubrow and the CSC chair in the Fall 2011 semester, and he was very open to input from the CSC on suggestions to help prioritize and improve HUB. Thus, the CSC decided to commission a sub-committee to look into the HUB issues. This committee, called HUBBUB, was charged with the following:

Consult a broad sample of faculty members and professional staff in order to ascertain which of HUB's features unnecessarily impede the performance of tasks related to teaching, course planning, and student advisement. Draft a prioritized list of such features for submission to the FSCSC by April 15, 2012.

This sub-committee, chaired by Professor Maureen Jameson, started a blog to gather input from the UB faculty and staff. The blog enables the UB community to examine what some of these issues are, and can be found at

<http://amerune.drupalgardens.com/>

The issues discussed on the blog have not been prioritized; some of the issues appear to be items easily fixed with a few hours dedicated to them. Others are clearly more daunting yet require attention—the issue of loading figures prominently throughout the blog and this needs to be a high

priority. Degree auditing issues are a significant concern, and since the roll-out of HUB numerous undergraduate students have been caused unnecessary angst because old advisement records and HUB were often not in agreement. Although it does not affect faculty directly, one of the biggest issues discussed were the problems associated with student financial aid. Numerous members of the sub-committee had anecdotal reports of long delays in dispersal of financial aid, as well as reports of graduate students with tuition waivers being billed for their tuition and being informed they were going to have automatically large bills automatically deducted from their bank accounts. Because so many records exist outside of the Registrar's Office—for example Admissions, the Graduate School, Financial Aid, and Student Accounts—the subcommittee views where HUB is housed as a significant issue. One issue that CSC members expressed was that HUB is not user-friendly, and the lack of availability of adequate training resources was deemed a significant deficiency in HUB's implementation.

CSC also discussed the alternatives being discussed as the digital measures replacement for future faculty reports, the Digital Communications Initiative to create and manage web sites across UB, the departure of Dr. Jason Adsit from the Teaching and Learning Center, and the suspension of activity of the Enterprise Systems Advisory Committee (ESAC), whose activities still have not restarted as of April 2012.

Appendix F

Faculty Senate Facilities Planning Committee Annual Report 2011-12

We have received a charge to gather information from Decanal units on how our equipment and services compare with other universities in the AAU. We have formulated a plan to gather data and are in the process of confirming the committee membership and adding new members.

Chair: Robert Wetherhold

4/25/12

Appendix G

Faculty Senate Tenure & Privileges Committee Annual Report 2011-12

The Committee is just forming, and I am in the advice gathering stage, so there is nothing to report.

I expect to be functional by Fall Semester.

Chair: Joseph Woelfel

4/24/12

Appendix H
Report of the Faculty Senate Library Committee

Report of the Faculty Senate Library Committee

Stephen L. Dyson, Classics Department-Chair

The Faculty Senate Library committee met twice during the 2011-2012 Academic Year. With the appointment of Austin Booth as Vice Provost for University Libraries we felt that the time was ripe for the Committee to resume its activities. A general call was sent out for new and renewed members. The response was gratifying. Although there are still gaps in the representation of our membership, we now have a working group that better represents both the library faculty and staff and the areas of the university impacted by the libraries.

The committee was very pleased to see the leadership void at the libraries finally filled, and the members were very happy with the appointment of Austin Booth. However, concern was expressed about the 'in-house' nature of the process and the lack of a national search. Some felt that it was an expression of the limited priority that the libraries have in the central administration. That was part of wider concerns about the role and place of the libraries on the wider UB scene, issues which were central to discussion within the committees during both the sessions.

VP Booth updated us on issues related to budget, staffing, and philanthropy. While the libraries have suffered less than many other entities of the university in the recent budget crisis, still the combination of reduced funding and inflation in the cost of library materials has meant that the libraries continue to lose ground. That is especially acute at UB, since we don't have the strong base found at many other AAU libraries. The same problems relate to staff, where retirements and departures have taken a significant toll without full replacement.

A similar toll is affecting facilities, where use and demand continue to rise. Help is coming in certain areas like cleaning and maintenance, but more needs to be done. The facilities planning picture is also a mixed one. New initiatives like the renovation of areas of the Health Science Libraries are being funded. In other areas of new planning such as the new downtown medical campus, the role of the libraries is more uncertain.

One special interest and concern of VP Booth and her staff is philanthropy. If the library is going to grow with the new vision of the university, it will need new sources of support. A larger fund raising operation more centered within the library is something much to be desired.

On a number of fronts concern was expressed that the concerns of the library were not part of the planning process in a number of areas at UB. The committee proposed that we invite Alex Cartwright, VP for Research, to talk with the committee about his own views of the role of libraries and their resources in planning for research at UB. He very graciously joined our second meeting, and a very fruitful discussion ensued. Several members complimented him on the recent Faculty Book Fair, which highlighted the ongoing importance of traditional publication in the university scholarly profile. VP Cartwright expressed solid support for the libraries, as the university develops its research agenda. He alerted the committee to new challenges such as the need to store massive data sets. The stage was clearly set for an ongoing dialogue between the Libraries and the Office of Research.

The committee hoped to have one more meeting. That would have provided the occasion for Sean Sullivan to talk about facilities planning for the downtown campus, especially as they relate to library needs. Time did not allow for that. It will serve as a good topic for the first fall meeting of the committee.

The year has been a successful one for the Senate Library Committee. Since the future hopes of UB are closely tied to the strengthening of the libraries system, the Faculty Senate Library Committee should continue to play a major role in promoting that dialogue.

Appendix I

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING MAY, 2012

Interim Chair: Peter A. Nickerson (spring 2012 semester)
Permanent Chair: Phillips Stevens

The committee has addressed three issues during the spring of 2012 Semester:

Middle States: issues related to teaching and learning.

The committee interacted with Michael Ryan Coordinator for the UB

Middle States review. He shared peer institutions academic goals (there are no current academic goals to which all UB undergraduate graduates must be exposed). The committee is working on this issue currently.

Interaction of UB admissions with superintendents of School and advisors in the WNY areas.

The committee has discussed UB's interaction with superintendents of schools in our local area. Dr. Paul Wietig is the interim director of the Center for Teaching and Learning at UB (previously he was Superintendent of Schools for Amherst, NY).

Dr. Wietig, the interim chair of the T&L committee and the Chair of the UB Faculty Senate met with the Director of Undergraduate Admission at UB and will report to the T&L Committee this week.

How might UB help our accepted undergraduates become ready in the summer for study in college?

Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education Weber asked the committee to consider how UB could make it easier for incoming undergraduates to adapt and to become ready for study in college.

The committee reviewed the 3 day workshop done during the summer to prepare students for taking biology courses with lectures and laboratories.

The T&L Committee will work further on this issue.

Appendix J

April 26, 2012

To: Faculty Senate
From: Edward Herman, Secretary to the Faculty Senate and
 Chair of the Elections Committee
Re: 2011/2013 Report of the Elections Committee

The Elections Committee reapportioned representatives to the Faculty Senate in 2011/2012. The *Charter of the Faculty Senate* stipulates that this should be done every five years in years ending in 4/5 and 9/0 (i.e. 2004/2005 and 2009/2010). However, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged the Bylaws Committee on October 12 to assist the Secretary in doing so because reapportionment had not been done recently. The Elections Committee expects to re-assume a regular schedule beginning in 2014/2015. I am grateful for the assistance provided by William Baumer, Chair of the Bylaws Committee. The University's Office of Academic Planning and Budget provided the statistics.

The new allocations are as follows:

Unit	Senators
Associate Vice President for Campus Life	
College of Arts and Sciences	33
Division of Athletics	
Division of Continuing and Professional Studies	2
Graduate School Of Education	5
International Education	
Law School	2
Provostal Institutes	
School of Architecture and Planning	2
School of Dental Medicine	4
School of Engineering and Applied Sciences	9
School of Management	3
School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences	25
School of Nursing	2
School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences	2
School of Public Health and Health Professions	4

School of Social Work	2
University Libraries	3
Vice President for Research Centers	
Institutional/General Unit	1
Total	99

Basis of allocation as specified in the *Charter of the Faculty Senate, Article IV*

Units whose Voting Faculty are less than 10 or do not have a Dean shall be combined in the Institutional/General Unit.

Each Unit having more than 25% of the total Voting Faculty but instructing less than 20% of UB's students shall be assigned 25 Senators.

The remaining Senators [100 less that allocated in step 2] shall be allocated proportionately among the remaining units.

Charter of the Faculty Senate, Article VI,F,5.

Charter of the Faculty Senate, Article VI,F,6.