

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of June 17, 1997 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate met at 2:00 PM on June 17, 1997, in 107 Talbert Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Report of the President](#)
3. [Interim Report of the Hearing Panel](#)
4. [Report of the Academic Planning Committee](#)
5. [Resolution of the Faculty Senate Governance Committee \(Second Reading\)](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

After briefly reviewing the accomplishments of the Senate this past academic year (major revitalization of the committees, regular written reports of committee activities and of the implementation of resolutions, and the examination of the Provost's planning document), the Chair expressed concern over the the following items:

Due consideration of the Provost's planning document, which has been hampered by a tightly compressed timetable, the variety of goals presented in the document, and by the Provost's decision to seek advice from selected groups of faculty and from a Hearing Panel (the members of whom the Chair promptly thanked).

The seemingly limited discussion within some units of the implications of the proposed changes; the Chair was not sure whether this indicated agreement, apathy, or a weakness in faculty governance.

The modest progress in the evaluation of deans; in his view, it is crucial that senior academic administrators be held accountable for their overall record

Unfinished/postponed activity of the Senate and its committees on certain issues, such as the reconsideration of promotion criteria.

Overall, the Senate has achieved greater recognition as the leading voice of the faculty on academic matters, and as a chief commentator on other matters. Because a great deal

remains to be accomplished, the Chair offered his reflections on strategies of how best to proceed.

He first noted two contrasting forms of Senate involvement: process, which emphasizes continued dialogue, and resolution, by which the Senate formally takes a position on an issue, with "negotiations" to follow. He reminded the Senate that the actions it takes on the Academic Plan could establish a precedent for future Senate involvement in issues of academic organization. The question is how best to enact the Senate's responsibility to review all formal plans regarding the future of the University.

The various forms of Senate involvement in reviewing the Academic Plan have included (1) the full Faculty Senate, providing the most crucial forum for discussion; (2) the FSEC, through its formal and informal meetings with the Provost; (3) the Senate committees, most particularly the Academic Planning, Budget Priorities, and University Governance committees, but others as well; and (4) the activities of the Chair and Chair-Elect, who have pressed for faculty involvement and maintained open dialogue with administration, but whose influence on University policy is only as strong as the involvement of the Senate as a whole. "Irrespective of whatever actions we take today," he continued, "we as a Senate must continue to be very heavy in terms of the process side, as well as being concerned on resolutions."

Item 2: Report of the President

President Greiner, following up on the Chair's comments, noted that the institution needs resolutions, and needs them "in a timely way." However, he proposed that we [administration?] should consider "how we engage the Senate in the resolution of issues, rather than sending us resolutions". The institution must come to "resolution closure from time to time on issues, and move on", rather than allow process to "get in our way."

In his progress report, he mentioned that chances are good for "at least a benign budget" for the coming academic year, and a reasonable chance for a full restoration budget. In addition, there is at long last reason to be optimistic about a contract between the UUP and the State. What he feels best about is "knowing there is a Chancellor and an emerging senior leadership team in the central office that may be able to provide us with the kind of

leadership [...] that I think we have lost in some ways."

The President reported that Vice-President Palmer has decided to take a position as Vice-President for Student Affairs at California State - Fullerton; President Greiner asked Dennis Black to fill the vacancy for the time being, and intended to form a search committee for a permanent replacement. The position is particularly important for this University, since several issues of Student Life still need to be resolved. Chief among these is the expansion and improvement of residence life on both campuses. Towards this goal, the UB Foundation is building on a piece of its property (near the I-990 ramp) student housing, scheduled for completion in little over a year, and expected to accommodate over 400 students. No State investment is helping to fund the project. President Greiner hailed it as an example of what we can accomplish; the next --- and more difficult step --- is to develop similar housing on campus.

Item 3: Report of the Hearing Panel

Michael Stokes, Chair of the Hearing Panel and of the Professional Staff Senate, briefly reviewed the purpose of the Panel:

To solicit information and opinions covering two major reorganization proposals --- (1) the creation of a College of Arts and Sciences, and (2) the creation of both a College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences and a College of Sciences and Engineering.

To create a report which identifies the strengths and weaknesses of various proposals.

The Hearing Panel received 17 different proposals, only 5 of which (from Biology, Statistics, Computer Science, Engineering, Life Sciences) were formally drafted and submitted.

Concerns centered on the quality and extent of undergraduate education, the linkage between undergraduate and graduate education, and the creation of interdisciplinary work with the concomitant elimination of interruptive bureaucracy.

The Panel identified two major sets of proposals, the first espousing a College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the second suggesting local options; the option of creating two colleges (mentioned above) was not considered. Proposals of the first group suggested the CAS as a way to alleviate the concerns that were identified; specifically, it would provide a comprehensive undergraduate education, an identity, resources and authority in one central

area so that changes could be made rather easily. On the other hand, they expressed concerns that a CAS would develop or accentuate the cultural differences between the science and non-science components and make interdisciplinary work difficult, and would create another layer of bureaucracy in necessitating a search for a dean who is familiar with three separate faculties. Also of concern are the role of centers (and their connection to the CAS), and the interrelation of graduate and undergraduate education.

The other model (a "Science" model) had the benefits of linking the graduate, undergraduate, and professional schools more easily, and in offering pre-professional training in its programs.

Professor Mensch summarized the "unresolved dilemmas", concerns which surfaced repeatedly and could not be resolved by any simple structural change. These included: Mission clarification and prioritization.

Resource allocation.

A reward structure which corresponds to our stated priority of undergraduate education.

Governance and the allocation of decision-making.

Chairman Stokes added finally that the Panel had completed a first, very rough, draft of its report, and had set as a target the end of June to prepare the second draft for consideration by the Faculty Senate as well as by administration. He then invited questions and comments.

Professor Metzger commented that one issue which received a good deal of attention over the past year was that of the perceived quality of UB's programs in national evaluations; he asked whether this question was raised in the hearings, and whether the Panel had any sense as to which structural model might address this concern most effectively. Professor Mensch replied that what emerged was a series of possible ways of addressing program quality, for example, by making undergraduate education a top priority, by emphasizing the role of the centers, or by building on the linkage between good specialized education and the graduate programs in the professional schools --- instead of emphasizing a core comprehensive undergraduate education.

Professor Benenson asked whether the Hearing Panel's report will also address (1) aspects of the finer structure, such as department location, and (2) the implementation of certain

kinds of institutes. Professor Mensch replied that the Panel had heard several concerns on this matter, and would include that information in the report. President Greiner interjected that the Panel was not charged to fine-tune any of the proposals. Professor Mensch reiterated that the two major thrusts of the proposals were (1) a cohesive undergraduate education within a College of Arts and Sciences and (2) a separate Sciences unit that would link all the professional schools as well as their undergraduate and graduate programs.

Item 4: Interim Report of the Academic Planning Committee

Professor Malone briefly summarized the changes the Academic Planning Committee (APC) had made to its two prior interim reports. The two issues that appeared to be most critical were undergraduate enrollment and the research reputation in the graduate programs. He added that the two structures we might put together to optimize either of these issues are not necessarily the same.

The APC had considered the advantages and disadvantages of moving departments into a CAS, but decided that alternative proposals must be addressed as well in the immediate future. Nevertheless, the APC found it advisable to at least begin with concept of a CAS; otherwise, little progress would have been made.

Like the Hearing Panel, the APC had also heard the concerns surrounding the "culture problems" of rearranging departments --- namely, the lack of understanding of the disciplinary customs, which could lead to difficulties in the promotion/tenure process. He added that interdisciplinary groups, or "centers", should be referred to as "partnerships", thus underscoring the independence of the members of these interacting groups; however, the lines of authority within these groups will need to be clearly defined, as must their governance structures

Another set of concerns focussed on how budgetary decisions would be made, and how Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) would work.

All of these concerns, he argued, are reasons for deciding on at least a general structure, so that the details could be expedited and clarified. Moreover, if the University wishes to improve both undergraduate education and services as well as our research reputation, it will have to prove that it rewards efforts in both areas.

One committee member recommended that the APC contact Ross MacKinnon (now a Dean of Arts and Sciences at another university), whose remarks were summarized in Appendix B of the interim report. MacKinnon thinks a unified CAS approach is preferable, although any structure could be made to work, and that a CAS would strengthen the perceived importance of the Arts and Sciences. Several universities have switched and forth, proving that no structure should be regarded as permanent. One negative aspect of a CAS is that the dean loses the intimacy with the individual programs and departments within a larger Faculty.

Professor Bono asked whether the Hearing Panel, in its consideration of the proposal for a separate Sciences college, had any sense of what the implications would be for general undergraduate education, were indeed such a college to be formed. Mr. Stokes replied that many of the "Science" proposals focussed on the students in their departments and their educational needs within their programs, and few considered the consequences for an "overall" education. Professor Bono acknowledged the "huge tension" between the needs to acquire general knowledge on the one hand and specialized knowledge on the other, but considered the former crucial to every student's education. Mr. Stokes answered that this is a common concern, and that the Panel would give it due attention, but added that the Panel "did not hear a compelling case for why the science specialization and linkages could not be done within the context of an Arts & Sciences College".

Professor Baumer remarked that, judging what he has heard, the proposals for a Science college "were in fact multiple proposals for multiple different colleges; and in several cases, if not all, the departments making the proposals effectively said, 'If we can't get the college we want, we want to be in a College of Arts and Sciences'".

Professor Welch explained that if the Senate were to adopt the report of the APC, there would be "some tension in the modality of the way in which the report came about"; the report is atypical in the sense that the APC reacted to comments to, and discussions within, the Hearing Panel. Professor Baumer moved to adopt the CAS model and to urge the Provost to move on it as quickly as possible. The Chair replied that his motion did not directly address the APC report, and that, normally, resolutions undergo two readings in the full Senate prior to adoption. Professor Baumer countered that the Committee did submit a

report; furthermore, if the Chair were to ask for a motion to adopt the report, "it would then be parliamentarily in order to amend it by total substitution with the motion I've just put before the House". A second reading would be unnecessary and unacceptable, since "we have been talking about this for six months."

The motion now being on the floor, Professor Baumer argued that we need to move forward, and that he has heard neither a strong argument against the CAS nor a strong alternative. The principle issue is, he argued, administrative structure; there is an "awful lot of coordination" that has to go on among the three faculties to make the programs work well, and that coordination will work much better in the CAS model. Anticipating discussion of the next item of business, he argued that running this issue through the governance structures of the three faculties is "at least dubious, if not impossible".

The Senate voted unanimously in favor of Professor Baumer's proposal.

The Senate then voted unanimously to receive, transmit, and file the report of the Academic Planning Committee.

Item 5: Resolution of the Faculty Governance Committee (Second Reading)

Professor Albini presented the resolution of the Governance Committee, espousing a process which should be structured in a way that it comes to some closure, but on the other hand should allow for continuous review of any proposed reorganization within the University. The process must also be transparent in the sense that the faculty understands what is transpiring.

In order to keep the Senate involved in the process, Professor Albini proposed as a fourth step to the review process the formation of an ad hoc committee which would meet and report regularly on further developments in the reorganization process.

After a few minor amendments in the wording. Professor Meacham stated his opposition to adopting the proposed resolution, stating that "there has been ample opportunity on our campus for discussion and advice on the proposals that have been put forth by the Provost"; the Senate has fulfilled its responsibility to act as watchdog over due process, which in his opinion has been "exemplary". Adoption of the resolution, he warned, could lead to further delay. We have spent far too much time talking about reorganization, and it

is time we turn our attention to more urgent issues facing this University. He did, however, voice support for Step 4 in the proposal.

Professor Albini replied that there are many other issues in the Provost's planning document that have not received the appropriate amount of discussion; hence, a formal resolution on due process is as desirable as it is important.

Professor Malone asked the Provost if he could address the impact of this resolution, were it to be adopted. Provost Headrick found it difficult to address, since much of the terminology is far from precise. What he intended to do was to move forward on a decision with respect to a College of Arts and Sciences or a College of Science and Engineering, and then to set in motion the search for a dean for whichever College emerges, as well as a committee charged with setting the structure for such a College. There may also be a committee to address issues such as promotion and tenure, and how these would be integrated in the new College. He stated he would also like to charge a committee with designing the process of forming, securing funding for, and monitoring and evaluating the various interdisciplinary partnerships (or "centers").

Professor Wooldridge advocated adoption of the proposal, since it simply spells out what the Senate is already practicing. Professor Benenson pointed out that the resolution provides for faculty involvement in future decisions regarding the University, and thus extends far beyond the present discussion. He commended the Provost for his consultation with the faculty, yet emphasized the clear mandate to the Faculty Senate which the proposed resolution makes clearer. Professor Baumer observed that the only part of the proposal remaining to be executed is Step 4, and that we should avoid any further unnecessary hurdles. Professor Meacham found the proposal somewhat vague, and suggested reconsidering it in the Fall after some revision. Professor Meidinger also considered it to be "too broadly drafted"; without clear definition of some key terms, he would vote against its adoption.

The Senate voted to refer the proposal to the Committee.

Professor Baumer moved that the Senate acknowledge its appreciation for Professor Welch's two years of service as Chair. The Senate approved the motion with enthusiastic applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing,

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

PRESENT:

University Officers: W. Greiner, T. Headrick,

Faculty Senate Officers: C. Welch, R. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: B. Bono, J. Ludwig, M. Metzger

Dental Medicine: R. Baier, M. Easley

Education: L. Malave

Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson, D. Benenson, M. Ryan, R. Wetherhold

Health-Related Professions: A. Awad, S. Kuo

Law: E. Meidinger, L. Swartz

Management: P. Perry, R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albin, D. Amsterdam, H. Douglass, C. Leach, R. Perez,

C. Smith,

M. Spaulding

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: J. Faran, C. Fourtner, R. Vesley

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N. , W. Conway

Social Sciences: W. Baumer, J. Gayle Beck, V. Ebert, P. Hare, M. Harwitz, L. Mattei, J.

Meacham, C. Sellers

Social Work: L. Sloan

SUNY Senators: D. Malone, P. Nickerson, C. Welch

University Libraries: M. Kramer, M. Zubrow

Guests:

M. Stokes, Chair of the Provost's Hearing Committee, Chair of the Professional Staff Senate
E. Mensch (Provost's Hearing Panel)

EXCUSED:

Arts & Letters: V. Doyno, M. Gutierrez

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Education: J. Almasi, B. Johnstone

ABSENT:

Architecture: G. Scott Danford, M. Tauke

Arts & Letters: M. Frisch, J. Holstun, R. Mennen, M. Runfola

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, R. Hall

Education: J. Hoot, T. Schroeder

Engineering & Applied Sciences: C. Bloebaum

Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elia

Management: J. Boot, L. Brown

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: W. Flynn, F. Schimpfhauser, H. Schuel, J. Sulewski, A.
Vladutiu,

J. Wactawski-Wende, B. Willer

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: S. Bruckenstein, J. Cai, P. Calkin, H. King, M. Sachs, R.
Shortridge

Nursing: M. Marecki, M. Rhodes

Social Sciences: D. Banks, J. Charles-Luce, M. Farrell, D. Pollock

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson

University Libraries: L. Bushallow-Wilbur, W. Hepfer, D. Woodson