

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of May 13, 1997 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

Faculty Senate met at 2:00 PM on Tuesday, May 13, 1997, in the Center for Tomorrow to consider the following agenda:

1. Report of the Chair
2. Reports of Faculty Senate Committees on Academic Planning, Budget Priorities and University Governance
3. Report of the President
4. Resolutions of the Governance Committee ("Second" Reading)
5. Appreciation of Claude E. Welch
6. Revised Resolution on Coursework of Undergraduate Transfer Students (Second Reading)
7. Primacy of Commitment and Conflict of Interests (Second Reading)
8. Report of the Affirmative Action Committee (First Reading)
9. Remarks by the Chair-Elect

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair started the meeting with the following announcements:

The Provost would soon announce the recruitment, on an interim basis, of a Vice-Provost for Enrollment Management.

- An electronic version of the Faculty/Professional Staff Handbook will be available by late Summer 1997.
- The University-wide Faculty Senate has selected four Student Life programs at UB for recognition in October as "outstanding" programs within the SUNY system.

In their meeting last week with the President, Provost, and Senior Vice-President, the Senate Chair and Chair-Elect underscored faculty concern over several aspects of the planning document, including: governance of centers and institutes, especially relative to departments, faculty appointments, and promotion; Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM); and the timing of the reorganization of Arts & Sciences. Also under discussion were the Senate's role in monitoring the implementation of the

recommendations from the Task Force on Women, the decentralization of Affirmative Action responsibilities, and the policy on conflicts of interest.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) met last Wednesday and scheduled an additional Faculty Senate meeting (for June 17) to discuss further the Provost's planning document.

The Chair reported that the Hearing Panel had met twice in the past week and had heard three testifiers (himself, Vice-Provost Goodman, and Professor Wang). He himself spoke to the Panel largely on a personal basis, but also voiced the concerns of the Senate where appropriate, and tried to indicate what he considered the strengths and weaknesses of the University's current organization. He expressed an "agnostic" view toward reorganization, remaining open to reason and strong arguments in its favor. The Chair invited the Panel to attend the meeting in June to exchange views with the Faculty Senate.

Annual reports from a variety of Faculty Senate committees were distributed prior to the meeting; Professor Welch stressed the importance of the Senate's responsibility as the major governance body of the faculty.

Item 2: Reports of Faculty Senate Committees on Academic Planning, Budget Priorities, and University Governance

Academic Planning Committee

Professor Malone reported that the Committee, which had met twice since the last Senate meeting, is "somewhat discomfited" since the Hearing Panel has been receiving input from a few individuals, whose comments have been shared with the Academic Planning Committee (APC); also, members of the APC have attended the Hearing Panel discussions. Since it would be inefficient to duplicate the function of the Hearing Panel by holding simultaneous meetings of the same sort, the APC will wait for the Panel's report, consider its merits at that time, and report to the Senate thereafter.

The APC has received the comments of Professors Goodman, Wang, and Welch, and has met with Professor Dauber (English); the APC will meet on Friday, May 16, to continue discussion and to meet with a member of the Mathematics department.

Professor Malone expressed the opinion that the issue of the formation of some morphology of an Arts & Sciences faculty should be effected by the end of July, since the leadership of the new structure is of paramount importance. He argued that the issues of the provision of undergraduate education on the

one hand and of research reputation on the other --- both central to the planning document --- are "unfortunately not soluble by one master organization": The former, through utilization of faculty from appropriate departments, would seem to imply structures centered on the concept of undergraduate education; but the organizations pertinent to increasing research reputation would be intrinsically different. This leads to the problem of deciding who would control these disparate structures --- for example, how would credit for instruction be allocated between the structures? The APC holds that it would make no sense to generate another structure similar to the present one, but labelled differently. Also, the concept of using faculty from other disciplines to provide instruction in various high-load areas seems efficient, but dilutes the influence of the present departments.

Possible inherent contradictions in the planning document need to be considered and resolved before implementing any reorganization. Professor Malone argued that the budgetary alteration of replacing older faculty (who have solid research reputations) with younger faculty (who would earn less money) would detract from a research center's reputation and funding, and that increasing enrollment numbers while maintaining quality of instruction seemed a bit unrealistic.

He suggested the development a more careful analysis of the expected time-scale for the results --- one which answers the questions when and how we evaluate the results of the changes.

Budget Priorities Committee

Professor Nickerson reported that subcommittees of the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) are examining several budgetary implications of the planning document --- (1) Responsibility-Centered Management; (2) how realistic the numbers presented in the document are, as well as the assumptions underlying those numbers; (3) the reputational rankings presented in the report, and whether there is a better means of comparing and ranking UB with other institutions; and (4) the cost of a combined BA/MA program, the details of which have not been sufficiently worked out.

The BPC also discussed the issue of "dormitory self-sufficiency" --- a plan of the Board of Trustees under which "the debt service will now be added to the bill" which the students pay. President Greiner interjected that the debt service has already been in the bill for the last ten years; the issue now is how to re-allocate it. The BPC reviewed the numbers, and found that it will have minimal effect on the room rates.

University Governance Committee

Professor Albini reported first that the University Governance Committee, acting on its first charge, determined that the bylaws of most schools and departments were in compliance with the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty.

Regarding the planning document, the Governance Committee is primarily concerned with the evaluation process itself, since it has the responsibility to review, prior to adoption, all plans for reorganization of the University. It is also considering structures which would most likely facilitate and realize the advice given by the Senate, one which reflects at least a majority of opinions expressed by that body. In its report, the Committee has suggested that the formation of centers and institutes should include some thought on their governance structures, in particular, their relations to departments; in the past, the lack of appropriate procedure led to serious problems. Thirdly, and most importantly, such a long and complex document --- which took a long time to create ---- also requires sufficient time for the faculty to examine carefully. For this reason, the Committee has proposed the two resolutions to be considered later at this meeting.

Item 3: Report of the President

President Greiner had met with Professors Welch and Nickerson to discuss a variety of faculty concerns. He said that Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) and a Management Information System (MIS) would be developmental processes which would take some time. We first need to have a technology infrastructure in place; at present, we have no adequate system for tracking our academic achievements, for tracking our students, or having access to the information we need. The possibility of an "all funds" approach to budgeting, in which all funds available to the institution and its sub-units would be available for inspection, will take some time yet; nor will RCM be possible until we have both Academic and Management Information Systems --- probably another three years. In the meantime, he noted, we should be preparing ourselves for it.

The issues of centers and institutes, of moving faculty across traditional lines, and of the criteria for their hiring and promotion, will require additional discussion. President Greiner suggested that, rather than argue about the details, the faculty should first focus on the diagnostics in the planning document, and then discuss "whether the prescriptions are wise enough". If the faculty do not engage in "the diagnosis of the current condition of the University and its place in the larger public environment, then the faculty has decided to opt out of this conversation". The notion of developing

more centers and institutes, he continued, is driven by two things: (1) The small size (and large number) of our departments and programs; and (2) the accelerating trend at other major universities of forming institutes and similar non-conventional organizations.

The issue of the College of Arts & Sciences, President Greiner noted, would have been resolved by now, had not the Provost entertained the idea of joining the sciences and engineering; not many have voiced support of the idea, which leads administration to conclude that the faculty are simply not interested in participating in this conversation. Pulling the arts and sciences together is nothing new; two-thirds of the AAU public universities have done this, as did UB prior to the split, some 30 years ago, into the present three-faculty structure, and the later dissolution of the Arts & Sciences umbrella organization. The lack of integration among the three has, he argued, hurt the University. The proposed College will not be accomplished by Fall 1997, since its development will need more time; nevertheless, President Greiner stressed, we must move forward very rapidly.

Professor Metzger asked if the issue of structure would address not only the question of which blocks go together again in Arts & Sciences, but also the issue of whether to continue delivering graduate and undergraduate instruction through the bifurcated system we still have. President Greiner replied that, at least for the Arts & Sciences, the place of the graduate school should be preserved; Arts & Sciences would be empowered both with respect to undergraduate education in their area, as well as for graduate education --- as it was thirty years ago.

Professor Wooldridge, reminding the President of his comments (at FSEC meetings) of having no objections to a bit of a delay in coming to a final decision on reorganization, asked why he nevertheless "seemed to believe that a decision [...] must be reached during the summer"; President Greiner replied that either he misspoke or was misunderstood: The process of reorganizing Arts & Sciences needs to start moving forward this summer; he added that he has little patience for delay on issues of urgency.

The Chair asked Professor Wooldridge to reserve his response until discussion of the Governance Committee resolution. Because the resolution is intended as a "total substitution", with changes in emphasis, for a similar resolution discussed at the previous Senate meeting, the Chair ruled that the present version would be considered a first reading, rather than a second. This would invite discussion of the merits of the proposal, and would delay any action until the June meeting. Professor Benenson asked the Senate to overturn the Chair's ruling on the grounds that (1) the date is indicated

already in the resolution as it now stands, and (2) "the only real change is simply a clarification of how we go about insuring that we have a process that does have an end". Professor Albini seconded the motion, and the parliamentarian judged it a debatable motion.

Professor Schack pointed out that, under the Standing Orders of the Faculty Senate, the Chair's ruling was not necessary, since neither the present draft resolution nor its predecessor was not on the agenda of the previous Senate meeting; therefore, this could only be a first reading. Professor Meacham urged the Senate to support Chair's ruling, since it would have another opportunity at the June meeting to vote on the resolution. In addition, the Senate would have more information between this and the June meeting from both the Hearing Panel and the Provost.

The motion to overturn to the Chair's ruling was defeated.

Item 4: Draft Resolution of the Governance Committee (First Reading)

Professor Wooldridge argued that the point of the resolution is not the delay per se of a decision, but rather to avoid having any major decision made during the summer, when several faculty are not in residence. Professor Schack countered that this is hardly a "precipitous decision", since the Senate seems to discuss the issue quite often, and welcomed some decision soon "so that we'd have to shut up about it for a few years" and revisit it then. He also did not favor a decision being made during the summer; but he reminded the Senate that "if that happens, it's our fault" for not acting more urgently.

Professor Albini responded, first, that the Faculty Senate has "the responsibility to review, prior to adoption , all formal plans relating to the future of the University" (as stated in the Charter of the Faculty Senate); secondly, the review process is minimal; thirdly, three months do not constitute a long delay for a decision affecting the next thirty years of the institution.

Professor Benenson commented that members of the Senate should not be made to feel guilty for wanting to execute their duties. The resolution presents first, a process independent of the planning document under consideration, and secondly, a specific date for addressing the document. Yes, he said, the planning document became available in mid-February --- a date he considered to be "rather late in the academic year"; a mere three- month period for discussion of a document of such importance does not suffice.

Professor Malone considered the issue to be divided into two distinct parts: (1) Whether there will be a College of Arts & Sciences, and (2) the details of reorganization, which, although critical, are second-

phase details which need not be resolved until the first matter is settled. He added that, if the faculty felt a desperate need for further input, debate, and discussion, then some --- other than the present three --- should bother to show up at the meetings of the Hearing Panel and make their voices heard. Professor Baumer seconded the distinction of the issues; the decision the Provost intends to make this summer is simply with regard to the establishment of the College of Arts & Sciences, "and nothing else". Secondly, he argued that the proposed deadline in the resolution is, in terms of further faculty involvement in the issue, "essentially meaningless". Little is accomplished in the first four weeks of the Fall semester, other than getting classes under way --- therefore, "if we have not yet done anything with regard to the issue of a College of Arts & Sciences, we are not going to do it" by September 30. Besides, he concluded, "the absence of any action on the part of the three faculties over the last months, since the meetings with the Provost, is, I think, indicative of the great urgency with which this issue is viewed".

Item 5: Appreciation of Claude E. Welch

President Greiner presented to Professor Welch a plaque in recognition of, and appreciation for, his service as Chair of the Faculty Senate for the 1995-1997 term. He commended the Chair on his "truly extraordinary" leadership in this and many other offices over the past thirty years, adding that this is just another award to remind him of the regard and affection of his colleagues.

Item 6: Revised Resolution on Coursework of Undergraduate Transfer Students (Second Reading)

Professor Metzger reported that the Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC) decided not to remove a minimum of the proportion of a major requirement, so that the resolution continues to read "Be it resolved that all undergraduate major programs at the University of Buffalo shall allow accepted transfer students to apply courses towards at least one third, but no more than two-thirds, of the program's requirement." The only change was the deletion a word for the sake of clarity. Professor Baumer requested an explanation of the resolution's final paragraph, which he found redundant vis á vis the penultimate paragraph. Professor Metzger replied that the intent is to impose a sort of "residency requirement" that transfer students complete at least one-third of a program's major requirements at this University.

Professor Frisch reminded Professor Metzger that this document would be read by prospective students and their advisors throughout the State, and thus it is important to clear up any ambiguities

and inconsistencies before the resolution becomes policy. For this reason, he asked why the EPPC did not remove the statement on the minimum. Professor Metzger riposted that the word towards is clear and appropriate in expressing the intent. Professor Frisch agreed to vote in favor of the resolution if the language were to be refined for clarity.

Professor Meacham did not share Professor Frisch's concern, but agreed with Professor Baumer that the last paragraph was technically redundant, but felt that it should be kept in order to convey "a full sense" of the resolution. Professor Wetherhold wondered whether the proposal would prohibit transfer students from transferring to yet another institution to complete their requirements; if the major program allowed them to do so, Professor Metzger replied, then the resolution would not prohibit this. Professor Ludwig urged deletion of the last paragraph, since if the Senate could not understand it, we could not expect advisors or anyone else to. Professor Spaulding suggested instead the deletion of the penultimate paragraph. Professor Ludwig asked for further clarification of the intent, and then supported Professor Spaulding's suggestion of deleting the penultimate paragraph "so that the clarity of the last paragraph is evident".

At the suggestion of the Chair, the Senate approved a motion to remit the resolution to the EPPC for clearer re-wording.

Item 7: Primacy of Commitment and Conflict of Interests (Second Reading)

The Senate approved the motion to receive and file the report under discussion. The Chair reminded the Senate that, by the phrase "receive and file", it indicates that this is a policy which it wants the administration to implement. Because of the complexity of the issues involved, the Senate also recognizes that there may be a continuing need for modification.

Item 8: Report of the Affirmative Action Committee (First Reading)

Professor Banks reviewed the Committee's recommendations in response to its charges to investigate (1) salary discrepancies and (2) the hiring members of protected groups proportional to the available pool; a written summary of these was distributed to the Senators prior to the meeting. He directed particular attention to two of the recommendations, namely, the appointment of members of protected groups to specific administrative positions (chairs, deans, vice-provosts, provosts), as well as a special effort to recruit our own graduates who are members of protected groups and who are qualified as candidates for open faculty positions.

The Committee also recommended the creation of a President's Task Force on Racial Minorities on Campus, similar to the Task Force on Women which issued its report earlier this year.

Professor Wetherhold pointed out that the recommendations were a mixed bag, some which directly address the inequities, others which create layers of bureaucracy and seem to have no clear purpose.

Professor Banks replied that, in salary negotiations, it is essential to know where one stands, and thus have access to the appropriate facts and figures --- many of which can be found in administrators' databases. Also, the wording of som>

Transfer interrupted!

ly vague, first because there is no clear prediction as to how the plans will unfold, and secondly, to allow the administration flexibility in enacting the recommendations.

Professor Bloebaum, who had worked on the Task Force for Women, pointed out that the most obvious disparities existed not along gender lines, but rather among the professional staff "compared to UB professionals of the same rank"; thus, instead of looking at salaries of members of protected categories, the Committee should look into equity across the board for all faculty. She also objected to the proposed annual publication of a faculty member's salary and benefits ---isolated numbers disjunct from that person's other merits --- as well as to the creation of another administrative office.

Professor Cowen, reiterating an observation by Professor Schack, commented that the "single biggest thing that we could do to improve hiring of minorities and women is to recruit earlier in the cycle"; often, by the time recruitment procedure is approved and initiated, the top level of female and minority candidates is already gone.

On the recommended hiring procedures, Professor Mattei suggested that the wording include items that administrators should avoid, such as placing all women and minorities of a department on search committees, since this often consumes too much of their time; rather, they should appoint such people from outside the department as well.

Professor Benenson wondered if Professor Banks could give a "brief

statement on where Affirmative Action stands in respect to its legal positions in New York State and within the SUNY system and UB"; Professor Welch suggested that the question is so important that it should come up before the full house of the Senate. In addition, the issues surrounding the responsibility for Affirmative Action, particularly in light of decentralization, imply a greater role for faculty participation than may have been perceived in the past. For these reasons, the Chair and Chair-Elect have slated further discussion for the Fall 1997 agenda. Professor Benenson agreed, but warned against voting on recommendations for Affirmative Action without fully understanding all the legal implications.

Item 9: Remarks by the Chair-Elect

Peter Nickerson thanked the Chair for continuing to strengthen faculty governance, and expressed the need to involve a wider variety of the faculty in this. A common view is that not enough faculty participate, leading administration to "do an end-run around governance".

He announced the change from Tuesdays to Wednesdays for Senate meetings for the coming academic year, as well as the new place of assembly in the Senate Chambers in Talbot Hall.

The meeting concluded at 4:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing,

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

PRESENT:

University Officers: W. Greiner, T. Headrick, N. Goodman, W. Fischer

Faculty Senate Officers: C. Welch, R. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: M. Frisch, M. Gutierrez, M. Horne, J. Ludwig, M. Metzger, A. Rozak

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, R. Baier, M. Easley

Education: J. Almasi, B. Johnstone, L. Malave, T. Schroeder

Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson, D. Benenson, C. Bloebaum, W. George, M. Ryan,

R. Wetherhold

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

Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elia

Law: E. Meidinger, L. Swartz

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albini, D. Amsterdam, R. Heffner, C. Leach, B. Noble, R. Perez,

H. Schuel, C. Smith, M. Spaulding, A. Vladutiu

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: J. Cai, P. Calkin, J. Faran, C. Fourtner, M. Sachs, S. Schack, R.

Vesley

Nursing: M. Rhodes, P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N. , W. Conway

Social Sciences: D. Banks, W. Baumer, J. Gayle Beck, J. Charles-Luce, V. Ebert, M. Farrell, P. Hare, M. Harwitz,

L. Mattei, J. Meacham, D. Pollock

Social Work: L. Sloan

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

University Libraries: W. Hepfer, M. Kramer, D. Woodson, M. Zubrow

ABSENT:

Architecture: G. Scott Danford, M. Tauke

Arts & Letters: B. Bono, V. Doyno, J. Holstun, R. Mennen, M. Runfola

Dental Medicine: R. Hall

Education: J. Hoot

Management: L. Brown, P. Perry, R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: W. Flynn, F. Schimpfhauser, J. Sulewski, J. Wactawski-Wende, B. Willer

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: S. Bruckenstein, H. King, R. Shortridge

Nursing: M. Marecki

Social Sciences: C. Sellers

University Libraries: L. Bushallow-Wilbur

EXCUSED:

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Management: J.Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: H. Douglass