

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of April 29, 1997 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate met at 2:00 PM on Tuesday, April 29, 1997 in the Center for Tomorrow to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Approval of the Minutes of April 8, 1997](#)
3. [Report of the Provost](#)
4. [Resolution on Administrative Resignations \(Second Reading\)](#)
5. [Policy on the Primacy of Commitment and Conflicts of Interest \(First Reading\)](#)
6. [Resolution on Coursework of Undergraduate Transfer Students \(First Reading\)](#)
7. [Proposal for an Advanced Honors Program](#)
8. [Resolutions of the Governance Committee](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that numerous Faculty Senate committees have focussed on the Provost's document, "Planning UB's Academic Future", while others have taken up charges given specifically by the FSEC; three committee reports are slated for discussion at this meeting.

The FSEC had discussed at length last Wednesday (April 23) two items in connection with the Provost's planning document: (1) the question of "adequate" time for consultation, and (2) the role of the Hearing Panel. Some members, including the Chair, were concerned that the Hearing Panel might be seen as carrying out the major function of faculty governance units, particularly of the Faculty Senate, "to review, prior to adoption, all formal plans relating to the future of the University" (Charter of the Faculty Senate). The Governance Committee has drafted two motions, for consideration at this meeting, the first regarding faculty participation in the review of the planning document, the second regarding the timing of the President's decision on possible reorganization.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes of April 8, 1997

The Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of April 8, 1997, were approved.

Item 3: Report of the Provost

With the aid of overheads and the nuisance of a malfunctioning microphone, the Provost delivered his report, the text of which follows.

What I want to do today is focus first of all on what I regard as the key points in my report, and offer some explanation on those aspects, because I think that, in some ways, in all of the comments that I have heard so far, some of these points are getting missed; I want to bring them out and put them very much in the foreground.

The three key points are:

(1) That we have to, and we can, take control of our future, that over the past any number of years you can think of, we have been generally reacting to the annual budget cycle of the State government, that we have adjusted all of our thinking in terms of those short-term problems, and that by so doing, we have ignored our long-term development and future, and we have to stop doing it that way. I will take you through some financial detail to show you how and why I think we can do that.

(2) Second, that we are a very complex university, with multiple missions and multiple goals. This imposes upon us certain obligations, but it also gives us certain opportunities, and I want to talk about the way in which these multiple missions and multiple goals affect the kinds of things we are doing and interrelate with each other.

(3) Third, and probably the most controversial, and what I consider the most radical thing that I have talked about, is to focus on academic units; academic units have collective responsibilities, we can define those responsibilities, and they should have collective accountability. That is, I think, a very important aspect of what I have been talking about in the report and in other settings; and I will come and talk about the implications of that for what we do.

Let me start on number one, which is taking control of our future.

[Slide 1: Potential Increase in Operating Funds]

This is a table from the report in which I was trying to project, in a very conservative way, the potential increased resources we might have for operating expenses within the University. Essentially, what it does is outline our major sources of support and then make suggestions based on the best information that we have now. I'm going to go through and explain how I get to those figures, and then also why I've chosen to outline a future direction which involves a certain amount of central direction in the use of those resources, and a certain amount of distributed, decentralized use of those resources. First of all, I have put in no expectations that State tax support is going to increase; I'm not going to project that it is going to go down, basically because I think we ought to be able, in this political environment, to ensure that it doesn't go down; if it goes up, I think it will be a substantial plus, but I'm not going to count on it. I think that anyone who looks at the political configuration of this and other major industrial states, particularly in the Northeast, realizes the impact of Medicaid, and realizes the impact of the changes in the welfare system, and realizes the impact of the expansion of the criminal justice system, realizes that there is not going to be a lot of money which will be available for expansion of public higher education. If it manages to keep pace with the expanded demands of enrollment, I think we will be fortunate. So I'm simply not going to count on that as a source of support for this University. I hope we can keep it at its current level; we have certainly tried our best to put ourselves in a position, politically, to carry that message. But I cannot see that we can realistically plan on State support expanding.

[Slide 2]

This is another chart from the report. I've truncated it a little to focus in on the particular issue. I have compared ourselves with Iowa, Missouri, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, and Virginia, which are other public AAU institutions, about our size, that have medical schools -- those are the key variable in this kind of comparison. What you see across the top are full-time equivalent students; you can see that all these universities are roughly in our size configuration --- around 20,000 FTE. I've highlighted the state appropriation; this was three years ago, so there has been some deterioration in our state appropriation. When you look at the other universities that are about our size, that at least two years ago, Iowa was at \$200 million in state appropriation when we were almost at \$245 million; Missouri was at

\$145 million; North Carolina, which does have a very concerted policy of low tuition --- at that point, similar to ours --- and thus higher state appropriation, was somewhat higher than ours, but then, they were a little bit larger. If you filter out the FTE, the difference would narrow some, but they are certainly better funded than we have been. Pittsburgh was at \$110 million; Virginia, which is thought to be the cream of the crop in many ways among public institutions, was at \$111 million. Now, the politicians will look at those numbers and say to us, "Look, you've been very well funded, compared to these other places that you want to be seen to be like, and want to be compared with, the State has been doing very well for you." Now that's true --- you can't ignore that.

What's the difference between those places? In some, places, they have more flexibility on tuition --- Virginia and Pittsburgh in particular, and we are pushing for more flexibility on tuition. We're making only minor progress on that; but that is one of the differences. They are all, except for Missouri, better at extracting external support for research --- same size schools, but they are doing a lot better, and have done a lot better. Likewise in terms of private gifts and grants, they have a much larger lead on us, Virginia in particular, but Pittsburgh and North Carolina have done pretty well as well. If you look at this in terms of the long term, this explains why I don't think we can count on a large increase, or a return to previous days, of local State tax support. What they'll say to us, or what we hope they'll say to us is, "Well, we'll give you some flexibility on tuition, so that you can behave like some of these other places and make adjustments in your revenues that will be matched in some measure by modest increases in tuition. But I don't think they should give us a free hand on tuition; that's not our role. Our role is to keep tuition at a reasonable price so that everybody in the State can afford an education. So I don't think we should be pushing for large increases in tuition, but a modest amount of flexibility makes some reasonable sense. We've got to do a better job in extracting that money from outside sources. Now, we've been doing a better job, but we must keep the pressure on ourselves, pressure on our system, to develop and build in these areas, because that is where the future will be for this institution.

[Slide 1]

That's the ground; let me come to "Looking Ahead". As I said, I think we can count on some

modest increases in tuition. The increases in tuition that are built into these assumptions, \$12 million, the total kicking in in the year 2001, picking up reasonably quickly over the next few years, involves a \$600 increase in undergraduate tuition, and selective increases of about \$1250 in selected graduate/professional programs --- basically Management, Law, Pharmacy, Dentistry, and Medicine. If we do that, it will yield an increment of about \$12 million. I think that's reasonable, and I also don't think we ought to push the tuition envelope much beyond that; if we do, it will only be in some special programs where there clearly is the capacity to increase the tuition and also provide substantial financial aid, so that students who need the money in order to get the education we provide won't be deprived of it.

"Research and Technology Transfer" --- This is probably the most speculative of these assumptions. Most of the money that I've built in here comes from projections of what will occur in terms of currently projected licensing arrangements, technology transfer that will kick in in the next three to four years and then presumably continue over the ten-year period. Some of it would come from replacing senior faculty who have not been, or are not now, research-productive with younger faculty who are --- which would then generate some additional, indirect overhead money which could be funneled into support of research. That's where that number comes from; it's quite speculative, and I would hope that that is a very modest and conservative estimate, but we don't know what's going to happen to federal support for research. We don't know what's going to happen to private support for research and scholarship. It's also difficult to project what we'll get from technology transfer; in some measure, those numbers are quite speculative, because they depend upon products coming to market and generating licensing revenues.

I'll go down to the bottom line and then come to the turnover pool. These numbers ["Private Group Endowment Income"] are based upon, I think, very conservative numbers projected by Ron Stein's operation with respect to the actual increment in spendable annual dollars that might come out of a capital campaign, if we geared it up over the next three to four years. I took it out to their target estimate and streamlined it after that. I would hope, and expect, --- and as I said before, if we want to take our standing among major public universities of our size and type, I would expect that this has to grow a lot faster. But I

don't want to count on it; I don't want to make my plans on the basis that it might, that it has to, because then all of a sudden you're making commitments, or creating expectations, that you don't have some assurance that you can meet. So I would rather keep it at a fairly modest level; but we are certainly capable of meeting those targets.

"Turnover Pool" --- This is the one that I think is causing some concern, and it is also the one that I think in some ways gives us the biggest opportunity. What I did was take our faculty demographics and look at those people who are over 60 years old; out of that group, some portion of those people will retire --- we know that, that's been our experience. Some will retire in their early 60s, some will wait until their 70s; but some portion of those will retire. I have made some modestly conservative estimates of the rates of retirement out of that pool on a year-by-year basis, and then I assumed that there is probably no unit on our campus that could afford to lose the lines, that we would have to replace the people who leave with someone --- there may be a few places where you might want to shuffle from one area to another --- but basically I think my experience, and all of our experiences, is that we are underfunded and understaffed, in all sorts of ways, both on the faculty side and on the professional side. And so I assumed that if we replace all those people with someone at a junior level, there is a salary differential that could be created. What is that differential going to be? It plays out over ten years to almost \$11 million. Now that's the calculation; is that a good policy? To only replace senior people who are leaving with junior people? No, of course not. But the point is that there is \$11 million there about which we can make those kind of decisions; and we can make other kinds of decisions for the institution. We ought to do that consciously, rather than plowing the money simply into the same way, to the same places where it's been before --- that may not be the smartest thing for the University to do. That's how I put those numbers together, that's my thinking about them.

[Slide: Summary Sheet]

Essentially, what we're saying is, if we think about the future, we've got close to \$36 million that we might expect to have in increased operating funds over the next ten years, on an academic budget of the State appropriations of about \$130 million, a total budget of about \$212 million --- that's a sizeable increase that we can generate. My main point is we ought to be thinking about how we're going to use the \$36 million, and not how we're going to

adjust to one or two or three million every year. We've been focussing on the one million to two million to three million, and we haven't been focussing on the longer term future of what we're trying to accomplish. That's point number one: We can take control of our future if we do it in a sensible way.

[Slide: Multiple Missions and Multiple Goals]

As I've said time and time again, we've got a lot of things we're supposed to do as a University. We have to do undergraduate education well; we can't do it poorly, we can't put it as a secondary part of our mission --- it's a primary mission. So is research and graduate education --- they're primary missions, too; one is not more important than the other, they're both important and we've got to do them both well. Now let me talk a little bit about undergraduate education. I was down in Philadelphia for some meetings this past week, and I just happened to ride in the plane with a rather bright young lady from Jamestown. She had just been to a national conference for outstanding graduates of junior colleges and community colleges. She was carrying a trophy; she had been awarded a Fulbright scholarship to a private university in North Carolina, \$10,000 a year. She was ecstatic about this, because she wanted to go to this place and she didn't think she was going to be able to afford it; this scholarship kind of came out of the blue at this meeting. She was one of three people who were given these awards. We started talking about her ground. She has all As at Jamestown Community College. She is going to finish an Associate's degree in two fields --- she started off in Criminal Justice, decided that that really wasn't the field she saw a long-term future for herself in. so she switched over to computers and information science. But she wanted to finish her Criminal justice degree because she started it. I said to her, "How did you make this decision about where you wanted to go to school?" She said, "Well, I thought I really had to go to a State school." I said, "Well, what about UB?" She said, "It's too big, it's not friendly; it's not the kind of place I want to be. I don't feel I can interact with faculty members there, and interacting with faculty members is crucially important to the way in which I get my education. I feel I'd just be a number there, and so submersed in the largeness of the place." I thought to myself, most of the classes she'd take, as a junior and senior, at UB, would be relatively small. So we haven't gotten that message across. I wasn't going to argue with her at that point, because she was happy, she

won the scholarship, she was getting married --- this one was lost. As a lawyer, I know when to give up on a lost cause; as a Provost, I don't. In any event, this was the message that she was getting. I asked her whether she had been on the campus --- no; had she thought about SUNY schools --- yes, she'd thought about going to Geneseo.

I think we have got to find a way to make this a big friendly university, and we've got to project that image, and we've got to deliver on that image. I think we can do that. But it means changing the way we go about doing a lot of things about undergraduate education. We've got to be more attractive to stronger students; we've got to keep them around here once they get here; we've got to attract some students from out of the State. Now, not all of these responsibilities rest upon the academic units; there are other kinds of things we've got to do within this environment to change the image we have and change the way in which we project that image. And we are making some of those changes. We're creating a Vice-Provost for Enrollment Management who is going to have in his/her bailiwick Admissions, Recruiting, Advising, Financial Aid, Student Records, and I hope eventually Career Planning & Placement. So we have a totally bundled set of student services that can respond to the needs of our students as they see them, when they start to make the application. When you apply to these places, this person was thinking about what she was going to do when she graduated. We've got to be able to respond to those kinds of concerns; our system now doesn't work. We're going to change that.

We also have to change the way in which the students interact with the faculty, and the faculty with the students. It's not just what goes on in the classroom. We can do --- and I think we do do --- a marvelous job in classrooms; by and large, we do a great job, but that isn't enough. We've got to figure out ways to do it better.

Now, in the report, I talk about this, and I talk about this in the context of the Arts & Sciences. The real responsibility, I think, for improving our undergraduate education has to rest with the Arts & Sciences departments. Yes, there are other key elements in our undergraduate program, most of them are at the upper-division level, in most cases, there is more interaction with the students in those programs than there is in the more general Arts and Sciences area. We've got to have some sense of what we're trying to accomplish with undergraduate education that goes beyond simply getting people through the General

Education program and then on to a major or a degree in some particular professional area. So I urge people to think about those kinds of issues that I've raised on pages 69 and following. I think they are crucial. I think they are absolutely crucial to the future health of this University.

I also suggested that we should think about raising the sights of a number of our students -- that they're not here just for a bachelor's degree, but they can go on to further education. Why did I say that? Because I think, in the 21st century, people who have more and better education are going to fare better. I think we've reached the stage in the structure of our society and in our global economy and so forth where more and better education is going to set you up to be happier and more productive over the course of your lifetime. So what have I heard in reaction to this idea? Some people say that this is enrollment- or dollar-driven --- all we're really interested in is getting more students in here and charging them more money. Well, I take you to the history. I made this point long before I ever started talking about money, and it flows out of what I said: I really do believe that in the 21st century, people who have more and better education will be better able to satisfy their own purposes as well as to make better contributions to society. I don't think it really has much to do with, in fact it may cost us more money and we may not get the enrollment. I would still think it's a good idea.

Why else do I think it's a good idea? Because it's using our strength. Our strength is not in lower-division education. yes, we probably do it well in some areas, and don't do it well in other areas; but our strength is in the upper-division and graduate-level education. That's how we hire people, that's how we decide whether they're part of our community, and that's basically what we expect them to do. Why don't we concentrate in those areas and leave the lower division to other parts of the educational system which can do it well? About this person I talked about from Jamestown Community College --- I'm convinced she got a good education there; I could tell by the way she talked about things. This is a smart person who had been well educated. I think there are a lot of people out there like that, that we could find, if we go after them and if we have something to sell to them. What we have to sell to them is a high-quality, upper-level education with an opportunity to prepare themselves better than other people in their competitive cohort for the challenges that they are going to

face.

The other thing is, I think, by doing that, we're going to create a niche for ourselves. There isn't any other institution in the State University that can do that as well as we can, because, there are other institutions that have graduate faculties, there are other institutions that have a fairly broad range of programs, but none of them have the range that we have. None of them has the capacity, in the way in which they are structured, to put things together the way we can, if we do. So I think that that is something we should very seriously consider. I think in many cases, in many parts of the campus, we're already getting there --- but we're also getting resistance. Where there is resistance, I think we ought to think about it; I don't think resistance is necessarily bad --- it may be right. There may be some areas where expanding Master's degrees does not make a lot of sense. People have said to me, "What's the market?" My answer is, I don't know --- let's find out. But let's not dismiss it before we've gone out and found out whether we can do it. People have said, "Well, this is a way of expanding or preferring professional education over Arts & Sciences -- - I want to come to that issue a little bit later.

My sense is, this is an invitation to think creatively about how we can combine liberal arts education (because that is one of our strengths, one we ought to preserve and develop) with professional education; and by having five years rather than four, we may be able to do a much better job of thinking about how these programs ought to work. together, rather than treating them as competitive, one with another.

Let me address a couple other points.

On improving undergraduate education: It may not have been highlighted in the report, but I think you'll find these things are there. People have said, "Well, you haven't said anything about undergraduate education." I probably haven't said it in a compact, concise, and well-organized way, but there are a lot of ideas in that report about improving undergraduate education. One is to expand the faculties that are in those programs that are impacted, so that students do not have to wait an extra semester or year to get into a course they need to take. Another is to attract some star-quality teachers and scholars, people who do both -- - really good people who want to teach but who are also good scholars. {Another is to] reward quality teaching and innovation. And I've already talked about revamping Student

Advising and Counseling, expanding the Master's degree opportunities, and increasing the opportunities for guided student research at the undergraduate level. Those are all things we can do, and it will take some of that \$36 million in order to do them. There's no doubt about that.

Now let me talk about doctoral programs. I don't know whether you saw this piece in the New York Times; my friendly clippings service, Vice-Provost and Graduate Dean Triggler, keeps me supplied with all kinds of information that he pulls out of the popular press, and sometimes not-so-popular press, on higher education and other related issues. It was a two-page article entitled, "Everybody Else's College Education", written by --- and I want to just emphasize this ---- Louis M. --- I don't know the person, but he describes himself as someone who teaches English at the Graduate Center for the City University of New York. So I assume he is at least flying under the colors of being a faculty member in one of the humanities departments. It's too long to read, but I want to set up the key points that he makes, because he's really taking aim at the elite private institutions and at the supposed hysteria which has been promoted by Time magazine and some other popular magazines about the high cost of higher education. What he points out is that out of some 2,200 four-year institutions in this country, 36 are charging tuition over \$20,000 a year. The growth in higher education, as we well know, over the past thirty years has been in public higher education, where a five- or six-thousand dollar tuition for an in-state resident is a very high tuition; in fact, the average is under three thousand. And we, as we all know, are above the average, as are all the states around us --- Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut --- all are at our level or higher. There are an additional 6.3 million students in public higher education, 1 million in private higher education.

The growth has been in the diversity of our student bodies. In public higher education over the past decade, 1984-1994, the percentage of increase attributable to white males was --- ZERO. ZERO. The percentage attributable to domestic students --- African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian Americans --- was 71%. This is out of two million people. Percentage attributed to foreign students --- 29%. The point is pretty clear: We are serving a particular role in higher education. It is not the same role that is served by the elite private educational institutions. We sort of know that; in our gut, we kind of know that,

but we sort of forget it in our heads from time to time; and I think we have got to keep that --- not that it has to necessarily change or re-structure the way we think about all the issues, --- but we 've got to keep it there, remind ourselves what we're doing.

The other point he makes is that almost fifty percent (49.8%) of the undergraduates in public higher education are over twenty-two years of age. We are not dealing primarily, and certainly not exclusively, with an undergraduate population between 18 and 22 . Again, we know that, but we sometimes forget about it when we start thinking about ourselves and where our role is and what we're supposed to be doing in higher education.

That's ground. He also says --- this is where I agree with him, so I'm quoting --- "The older profile of college students is likely to have two long-run consequences for the way higher education is practiced. One comes from the pressure students are putting on the traditional curriculum, with its division of knowledge in the scholarly disciplines, majors, its practice of teaching by means of lecture and text. The sign of things to come might be Bradford College, a private college in Massachusetts, which offers what it calls a practical liberal arts curriculum." Students combine general education --- non-specialized study --- with comprehensive (that is, cross-disciplinary) majors, and practical, that is, vocationally oriented. Students do internships for practical learning experiences in their junior year, and they are assessed by portfolios rather than individual papers in individual classes. In other words, there's some attempt to measure what went on in the whole education, rather than all the little discrete pieces. We have a particular role, we have a quite different student body from what we think of sometimes as our measures of what we're trying to accomplish, and we have to think in terms of a different kind of education.

You ask, "Alright, what does this have to do with doctoral programs?" This leads to the final point: The academic job market is bad everywhere. The reason may be that the students' training is perceived as too specialized, their teaching experience too narrow, by many of the schools where the jobs are available. A recent internal study of the University of Chicago reported that graduate students there were concerned that their training is not preparing them for jobs at schools with more heterogeneous classrooms. It was reported that Chicago undergraduates were asking for more vocationally-related courses; Robert MAYnard Hutchins just turned over in his grave!

So he [Louis M.] finishes up: "People sometimes fret about the emergence of a two-tiered system --- a hundred or so select institutions where the traditional liberal arts are still taught, and everyone else. But most of the jobs in the economy today are jobs teaching everyone else. Sooner or later, universities engaged in the production of new professors will likely decide if they want their graduates to get these jobs, [they're going to have to train them appropriately]. And when the way professors are trained changes, the whole picture will start to change --- the dog will finally be big enough to wag the tail."

That sets the stage for what I am trying to suggest about doctoral programs. I think we've got to look at, seriously, the opportunities that are their for our graduates, the likely expansion of the academy and what's needed in order to prepare them to take jobs in the economy, the content of our programs vis á vis these opportunities and needs, the possibility that advanced Ph.D. training is good training and education for other kinds of jobs other than teaching and research in the academy --- those are the things we've got to think about, and think about ver seriously. Does that mean that UB is going out of the business of training Ph.D.s? No. But it does mean that we're going to have to bring some focus to those efforts, we're going to have to improve the quality, and we're going to have to do it within the expected financial envelope.

In the report I suggest that we need a program-by-program study that develops a plan for each academic unit, based on a realistic assessment of their position and their programs and the demand for those programs, both by the students and by the employers, and do it in the context of the multiple missions of each of the academic units. As I said (on page 73), "based on this analysis, I will make some preliminary recommendations" --- I strongly believe that we must move in the direction defined by these recommendations; but at this stage, I want to leave open for discussion the specific ways UB might achieve the aims of the recommendations, which I am fully aware will be well-received in some quarters and not so in others. The only way to get a clear mutual understanding of where the arts and sciences should be heading is to engage in a dialogue around the specifics. That is what this part of the document is intended to elicit. And it has. And I think that that process is on-going; I want to talk a little bit later about where I think we ought to take it, but that's where we are on that.

I would just say a couple things about research. I don't divorce graduate education from research; on the other hand, there are ways in which we evaluate research differently from the ways in which we evaluate doctoral programs, and I think that we should, in a serious way and on a regular basis, realistically assess our research, both the quantity and quality of research, and look for ways to improve. This certainly has to be done by the individual, but I think there has to be some sense of a collective effort to do this.

I now want to talk about centers and institutes, [a topic] which has raised a lot of concerns, but also a lot of positive feed. Let me drop the label "centers and institutes" --- I think interdisciplinary education and research are important, I think they are important ways of exploring new avenues and developments that are necessary for the advancement of knowledge. If you look at our university compared to what's going on in other universities, we're probably a little bit behind. There are things we should do to emphasize ways to catch up and, I think, be better. Some of the things I heard about the material on centers and institutes in the report I would like to respond to. One is that this is sort of top-down innovation, and that innovation has to come from the faculty --- with which I agree --- and that top-down innovation won't work. Let me just say, well, I'll go through them, piece by piece, to show you what's top-down and what's bottom-up:

Humanities Initiative and Institute. I think the Humanities could be helped significantly by making some significant, high-level appointments. One of the things that might attract people here is that we have plans for some kind of serious Humanities Institute. This proposal has come in several fashions. Once, it was elicited by some discussions that Steve Sample had, and didn't seem to go anywhere; Aaron Bloch asked for a report from a rather distinguished Humanities Committee, and appended to that was the proposal for a Humanities Institute. I'm simply incorporating into this document that history.

A Policy Institute. There has been a series of discussions about setting up centers for research in graduate education, in policy analysis, in regional analysis; there's a proposal to revise and rejuvenate the Ph.D. in Policy Studies; there's the Governance Project that's been spear-headed by people in Planning and in Vice-President Scheffer's office --- those are all things that have spawned discussion about some larger group of people in some kind of Policy Institute. It doesn't have much shape, it doesn't have much form now, it's now a

series of different ideas that I collected under one rubric. But most of this stuff, most of these ideas, come from faculty --- proposals that have been across my desk, and across the desk of my predecessor.

Biological Sciences Initiative. That one, I have to admit, comes to some extent from some instigation from people in Capen Hall. But it does not come without a good bit of support, at least oral support, from members of the faculty in the Biological Sciences departments, particularly in the Medical School, and from other parts of the campus as well. What triggered my interest in it in discussions with David Triggie, as Graduate Dean, is the sense that we are making a fairly sizeable investment across this campus in the Biological Sciences. We have it split up into ... you can take your pick, anywhere from 8 to 18 departments, each of which has its own way of going about deciding whom it should add to its faculty, what the research emphases will be and what research groups form, and each of which does not spend much time talking with the others. If you were running or at least overseeing an operation in which you had sizeable resources devoted to similar kinds of activities, ---- and by "sizeable", we are talking about maybe 150 faculty members, certainly 120, in all kinds of research efforts --- and these people were not talking to each other, do you think you might suggest that they talk with each other? That's basically what I am talking about here: Get together and think through what you're trying to accomplish, and what you can accomplish together by working together, rather than working separately.

The same is true of the Chemical Sciences Initiative. There have been steps in that direction ---some cooperation between Medicinal Chemistry and the Chemistry Department and the Pharmacy School. But there's a lot more chemistry going on in this institution. Why shouldn't we at least talk with each other and think through what we can do collectively, rather than what we've been doing separately? Information and Communication Technology. I'll plead guilty on this one. But it comes from the same sort of perspective. We've got Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, a Computer Science Department which is strapped for resources to meet the escalating student demand, a demand for a Computer Engineering degree --- and this one did bubble up from below --- which integrates Computer Science and Computer Engineering, which came out of those two

departments, but with a lot of horse-trading, a sense of the departments trading their turf rather than conceiving of the right kind of academic program. At least that was my impression as I looked at that proposal --- not that I don't think we ought to go forward with it, and I have said that, and I think we are going forward with it --- but I think it would be better, it could be better, if there were more sense that this was not something that was joined together at the hip and nowhere else. We also have a very small Library and Information Studies school, which does a very good job; but its field is changing, it's moving rapidly in the direction of becoming much more engaged in Information and Communication Technology. They ought to be part of these conversations. The same is true for the people in the Communication Department, social sciences who have interest in the way in which various communications networks operate, because that provides a theoretical base for the kinds of work that may be going on in terms of what happens in information and communication technology. I think the people in these areas ought to talk with each other. Maybe, for a variety of good reasons, the talks won't go anywhere, in the short run, but I'll bet you, I'll bet you, ten years from now, there's going to be a School of Information / Communication Technology, which combines Engineering and Computer Science and Information Science and communications theory, somewhere, in a good public university, of which people will say, "They got out in front of the curve." And I would not like to be behind the curve if we don't have to be.

Urban Initiative. In a way, this is related to some of the things in the Policy Institute, but in a way it is also a response to concerns we've heard expressed within the Law School, to some extent, Architecture and Planning, Social Work , --- I'm trying also to engage some people in Education in thinking about the role of this University and its relationship to an urban environment. A lot of universities are stuck off in cornfields; we're maybe stuck off a little bit, but we're not that far and we all know that the urban environment surrounds us and it shapes us and it affects us and we're part of it. Sometimes, taking a look at the problems that exist at home, there's a way to build some strength within a university. I think we ought to do that. I think there are already people who have expressed an interest in that. And there will be more, if we give it that kind of study and focus.

The Women and Gender Institute is a proposal that has come from a large group of

mostllym but not entirely, women faculty members, who want to establish a mechanism for collaborative research and education in Women and Gender Studies ---- I think that's a good idea; I don't think that I should make that decision on my own, but I think the idea is worthy of serious consideration, and I've encouraged them to go forward with the development of that proposal.

The same thing is true for the Environmental Institute proposal. It comes out of a year-long study in a group of faculty from eight/nine different schools and departments, very multidisciplinary, with a lot of potential for interaction among those faculty and other members of their schools and departments --- and they're ready to go; they're chomping at the bit. In fact, they are wondering why I have not anted up some money already to do some of these things. I think we need to give that a serious review and serious study and make some determination about it.

The Neuro-Science Initiative is something like ours, which have medical schools and strong psychology departments and other kinds of activities that support it. We have tried at various times to move that initiative, but not successfully; maybe this is the time to do it, maybe it isn't.

Now, those are where the proposals come from. I don't think it's top-down ---- maybe it's the top looking at what's going on, and saying "Hey, guys, let's think about some things" --- that's true, but it's not me saying "This is what we've got to do". We're saying, if the interest is there, if the capacity is there, if we can find the resources to get these things going, let's do it.

[Another concern about centers and institutes is that] It's going to destroy departments. Think about this proportionately: we have \$36 million, we've got a lot of things to do, we want to build some departmental graduate programs, we want to develop and expand our undergraduate capacity in one way or another to improve the quality of undergraduate education, we want to support research in some areas that are quite focussed disciplinarily..... \$36 million, a \$210 million budget --- so what if we put \$7-8 million into supporting some developments of centers and institutes? Or \$4 million? This may be more realistic. That is not going to change this institution radically. It is not going to destroy departments. It is going to provide opporunities for faculty who have those interests to get

the support to explore them. It is going to provide those opportunities. That's what we ought to be doing.

One good thing about this is that it has elicited proposals; they have come out of the woodwork, so to speak. [There are] Some very interesting ideas; and I think they have to be put into the mix, and I'll talk a little bit more about how I think we should go forward from here. They have to be put into the mix; just because they make the report doesn't mean they are not viable or are not interesting or shouldn't be considered. As I indicated, some of the things that did make the report may never see the light of day, for a variety of reasons.

But I also have heard some talk, not so much written, but talk, which does trouble me a little, that somehow people say that "Well, now, the Provost says that the new currency of the realm is interdisciplinary programs and centers, therefore we better sign up quickly if we're going to get any of the goodies. That, I think, is the wrong attitude. If that's what provostial leadership is, I'd give it up --- you can have it. That's not what I'm talking about. If people have good ideas and can pass the test of their peers as to whether they are good ideas, and convince us that we ought to spend money at the University to do them, we'll do them. But we're not going to have a sort of sign-up sheet where everybody decides to do this, that, and the other thing that don't have any academic substance or intellectual ing. I want to get that one off the table.

I have also heard [concerns] about Graduate Groups, and I have to admit that's true. The problem David Trigg and I have had with the Graduate Groups is, too little money has been spent, it's been spent year after year without much really serious evaluation. The Groups don't always have much of a purpose that has any sort of future, that's going to develop into anything. They exist, they do their thing, and we just thought that maybe we ought to step and look at this. There may be very good reasons for having groups of faculty come forward and say, "We've got some ideas about how we can work together; get us ten thousand dollars, twenty, twenty-five thousand dollars for three years; but at the end of three years, we expect to be able to do this or that" --- Give them the money, see what happens. At the end of three years, they're either ready to take the next step, or they aren't; if they aren't, let's give the money to someone else. We have been giving money to

some of these Graduate Groups for fourteen years. Let's create a process in which, if people have good ideas, we them; if they turn out not to be good ideas, then we go on and try somebody else's good idea --- not keep spending the money year after year, because somehow they have established themselves as a Group. That's all we're saying. It's not that they're bad ideas, it's not that anybody thinks that that kind of interdisciplinary program is being pulled out while we're pushing something else --- that's not what's going on.

Now, where do we go from here? I think, as I've already indicated, these are not things that the Provost's office should simply sit, in its deficient wisdom, and say, "We'll this and not that." I think we've got to develop some criteria for how these groups get set up, we've got to develop some criteria for judging the adequate support levels, we've got to develop some measures for assessing whether they're doing what is expected of them, and whether they should be continued at various points in their history --- three years, five years, whatever the case may be --- when they are put through a serious review and we decide whether to continue them, to expand their support, or decrease it, or phase them out. I think we also need a system for managing these criteria, and a process that involves inside and outside evaluators at these key points, and budget determinations, and some focussed administrative responsibility. One of the problems has been this problem we have fought over endlessly about, "Well, if we want to do these things, we've got to report to the Provost's office"; --- that's a way to ensure that they're not going to get the kind of attention they need. So we've got to find some administrative mechanism in the system that will provide the kind of attention they need and deserve, and not just simply do it because of the way in which the organisation chart of the University plays itself out.

Point Three: Academic units have collective responsibilities, and they should have collective accountability. I think we have not really done that at this University; I doubt they've done it at most universities in a very direct and effective way. I think of units having to fit their responsibilities into some kind of university goals and missions, and they may be, as I indicated, multiple missions, multiple things that they have to accomplish; and that for any particular unit, there may be a different mix, a different mix of missions. Some may have more responsibility in undergraduate education, some may have more responsibility in graduate education, some may have more capability and responsibility in terms of

development of new knowledge and research, --- so there may be different mixes among our units, and the units have got to think in those kinds of terms. Some may have better opportunities for public service than others, and that has to be part of the mix. Some may be better capable of supporting various kinds of interdisciplinary projects and programs, and that could be part of the mix. I think we've got to focus in on what our academic units are supposed to accomplish as a collective, and then set up the process of measuring, assessing, accounting for, and evaluating the extent to which they're meeting those responsibilities. I think that's a major shift in the way in which people within universities think about themselves. We tend to think of ourselves as the summation of individual efforts; and we are that to some extent. But we also, I think, have a collective responsibility, a collective effort, and collective accountability. This opens the way to think about different faculty members making different contributions --- not everybody has to be cut out of the same mold, devoting their time in the same way to the same parts of the unit's mission. I've been saying this for a year and a half, I've said this in my Convocation talk early in the Fall of 1995, and I said it in the report here; I think it's the most radical thing I've said. I think it would reshape the University, I think for the better. I think we'd be able to do our job better, I would hope that people within the University, faculty and staff, would feel that they were making a better contribution to the kinds of things they are expected to do. Let me just give an example of what I'm talking about, and I think it's easy to parody, but I think there is an element of what I'm trying to get at. Let's take a Unit X: I think we can say, by looking at projections of enrollment, past data and so forth that shape the program, that we can expect that they have to produce a certain number of student FTEs at different levels --- lower division, upper division, graduate, advanced graduate --- and that this is their role, their mission. How they go about it is their job to figure out; but we want it to be very high quality, and we can figure out ways to measure that quality. By the same token, we can expect that they are going to produce a certain amount of research, certain levels of quantity and quality. And we can assess that, and feed to the unit whether they're accomplishing it. Which means, if they have the responsibility to figure out how to do it, that there are some interesting possibilities. Faculty can specialize in the things they do well and like to do, and not be dragged into some of the things they don't like to do and don't do

well. Now, you have to pay attention then to the mix of the faculty you have in order to support your responsibilities. But it does give us a way to think much more flexibly about what we're doing and how we're doing it. The reasons for this are, I think, we're going to increasingly be asked for this kind of accountability. It is also just sensible for the way in which we go about using our resources. I think we will be increasingly required to be much more flexible, much more responsive in a much faster time-frame than we have been in the past. It is also a way, I think, of getting at assuring some understanding of a fairness in resource allocations. I think it's important, and I think that this point has not been taken up and discussed, and as I said, I think it's the most radical thing I'm talking about --- by far. Where do we go from here? If my analysis, and the goals that I've set out for the University, and the overall prescription that I've laid out and elaborated on today are wrong, let's have some alternatives. I don't profess to have all the wisdom in the world. I've spent a long time in higher education and I spent a good bit of time thinking and working on these kinds of issues, and I think I've got things right --- I would say I wouldn't have written [the report] if I didn't. I wouldn't have put it out there for the kind of reactions that I'm gathering on it; but there may be ways in which my emphasis is wrong, or that there are ways of looking at these problems which could be different, and some people think I've been too conservative and not radical enough --- but let's have the alternatives rather than just sort of picking at the pieces. What I hope I got across is that these things fit together -- - what kind of University we are, what kind of faculty we have, what kinds of students we can appeal to, what the mix should be, and where we're likely to get some resources. So let's focus on those issues, and if the emphases are wrong, then let's figure out better ways to do it.

I have been listening, I have been listening I think very carefully, and I've hear a lot of concern about how we do these things, how much of anything we should do and what kind of direction, emphasis should be placed on it, and certainly on who will decide. I think those are important questions, and I've never dismissed those questions right from the beginning . I just think they are next-stage questions. They are next-stage questions. We've got to get some control of our future, sort out what our goals are, and understand how we are going to, in some sense, organize ourselves to accomplish those goals, before we get down to the

nitty-gritty. I have also heard some denunciation, I think by exaggeration and modest distortion, I've heard advice about forms of presentation, criticism of data I've used, challenge to my explicit and implicit criteria, particularly as they are applied to particular units, ---- I think much of that is very well taken. And I'm listening, and reading. And I agree that much more needs to be looked at before coming to decisions about future plans for particular units and programs. But I also think that those plans must function within a context of University-wide goals and reasonable financial expectations ---- which I think the report sets out very explicitly. If not, then let's do it better.

Now I haven't heard, "You've got it all wrong", that the missions are misdescribed, that the goals are wrong, that the financial parameters are too optimistic or too pessimistic, or that the sources of our problems are misdiagnosed. Again I say, if that's the case, I want to hear that; I don't want to take us down a path that's wrong. That's not my role. But you've got to help in that. And if I am right, then let's get on with it, and do what we need to do.

Next Steps, 1997-1998: On the Arts & Sciences, I think I've outlined where I am on that, but I guess, deep in my heart, I think we should implement the Trigg Report, which said that we should have a College of Arts & Sciences. People have forgotten what it said, but if you go and read it, that's what it says, that a majority of the committee proposed a College of Arts & Sciences. And I've said the reasons why I think that's important, and I'm not going to elaborate on them here. Some people think that this thing ought to be stretched out for another three or four months, and I'll listen to that, but quite frankly, I'll tell you why I don't think that should be the case. We've had extended studies, we've had reviews, we've had lots of theoretical discussion about it, we've had lots of information-gathering about other universities. What you see if you look at the other AAU universities is that the really large ones, the 30,000 or 33,000 and plus universities tend to split up their Arts and Sciences, the ones that are about our size, 22,000 to 24,000, tend to put them together, --- it's a question of size and mass and so forth and it makes some sense. But I think there are also local reasons why we ought to do it, and I don't think we should spin out this discussion for a long period of time. I think we know what the issues are. What I suggested is that we should take another quick look and let people think about the issues in a focussed way --- understanding that there are going to be some changes, I think that is pretty clear. the

precise nature and parameters of the particular change, we can focus on those issues and sort those out. But I don't think we need to take it past the middle of the summer. I really don't. And the reason I don't is because I think there are some important things that have to be done once we move toward a reorganization. We've got to set up some kind of "Founders' Committee" to work on the structure of the College, the bylaws, the key structural components, the kinds of activities that go on within the College. If we have an Arts & Sciences College, we can think about shifting around some of the administrative services that are now centralized, into an Arts & Sciences College. Secondly, we need to get moving on a search committee. If we wait until November of next year to set up a search committee, we have a good chance of not having a dean of the College of Arts & Sciences to start in the Fall of 1998, which means putting it off to the Fall of 1999. I think there are serious costs we are paying now, and I don't think we ought to put it off. So I would like to see a search committee get going over the summer, to get the preliminary work done so that in the Fall, they're ready to start looking seriously at candidates. I think we need to set up study groups on how we handle appointments, promotion and tenure in a new system, and I think those groups ought to have time to reflect on those issues and do them in a sensible way. I think we ought to have ways of gathering the Chairs together to talk about some of the issues of integration and what can be accomplished in a new setting. I think we ought to have staff groups and finance groups talk about the implications of how we organize our staff to provide the services for the College, and also the way in which the finances would be handled. There are difficult, thorny issues, but you don't get to it until you know where you're going. I think if you take a year doing those things, that would be far better than spending three or four months arguing about whether to do it or not. Basically, I think when people look at this in a serious way, they will realize the time has come to make this kind of change.

Interdisciplinary Programs, Centers and Institutes. Again, I think we need a committee to develop criteria, reporting relationships, guidelines for faculty participation, measures for an evaluation process for establishing these things, a process for continuing their support....and we ought to get that moving, early in the next academic year if not earlier. Third, one of the things that's become very clear to me, over working on these kinds of

issues and interactions with deans and departments over the past year and a half or two years, is: We really don't have a very good academic information system. Before we can really change and implement any kind of spearheaded and transparent budgeting system, we've got to have a good academic information system. Besides, if we're going to have academic units having collective responsibilities and collective accountability, then you have to have an information system that supports that kind of system. So I think one of the key things we have to get moving on --- and a lot of people criticize the data, they talk about the NRC ratings and so forth.....The NRC ratings have some currency, partly because it's a national study, but also because institutions like ours have not gathered information of the kind that would establish some measure of your activity, and the quality of it, and put that information out to the public on a regular basis, so that every ten years when somebody comes along and publishes a study, it becomes very, very .significant. If we could define ourselves maybe differently from the criteria the NRC uses, but still convince people that we're doing quality work, then we could shape our programs in the ways that we want to shape them, that makes sense to us and makes sense in terms of the opportunities we have, and define what quality is, and in a sense override the implicit assumptions in the NRC approach to evaluation. So the third step is, I think, we've got to set up some kind of steering committee which will involve itself with extensive interaction with the academic units, so that we can build an information system which is useful for some kind of monitoring and evaluation on a regular basis; and a system of information that people have confidence in. We can get four or five different counts of faculty in a department, depending on whom we ask and what we ask and what figures they choose to look at. That's no way, as they used to say, to run a railroad --- and we know what happened to the railroads. That's a step, and that will support what I've been talking about, which is, academic unit planning. Some academic units are pretty far along in their planning; some really haven't gotten started. I think we've got to bring these things together. That's what I see us doing over the next academic year, 1997-1998, which will then lead to some serious consideration of our incentive structure, our budget system, and such things, but they ought to flow from these other key things that have to be put in place first.

Let me just add a postscript --- and here I'm going to get a little querulous, I guess,

because a lot of the discussion gets framed in what's good or bad for the professional schools and what's good or bad for the arts and sciences. What I want to say is, Can't we get rid of that dichotomy? Can't we get rid of it? Let me just say, I spent six years as Vice-President of Academic Affairs, and Dean of the Faculty, for a small liberal arts college. I know what liberal arts are about. There wasn't a professional...well no, that's not quite true; there were some professional musicians, but that's all. There weren't full professionals around anywhere in that environment. I've taught in a professional school. I've also taught, about 17 out of 21 years here, undergraduates --- general education programs and so forth. I think I understand what a university is about, I think I understand what the arts and sciences are about, I also understand what professional schools are about. Quite frankly, the commonalities of what we're trying to accomplish are far greater than the differences among us, far greater. And if we put these walls up, that in some way inhibit us from taking advantage of the strengths we have as an institution, we're short-changing ourselves. That's why I cavil when I hear about who's getting the most out of this or that.

I also just want to produce one piece of information, that set aside some of those [ideas]. I went and asked my staff to do the best job they could at tracking, over the last ten years, faculty positions in each of the departments, and they claim that they have sorted through all the data and they got now the best figures we can get. And I looked at, say, the last seven or eight years, when we've taken the hits and taken the cuts, and looked at the different schools and the different areas, faculties, where the cuts have been taken. And I think it will surprise some people in the arts and sciences to know that, over the last six or seven years, Arts & Sciences faculty has gone down by 9.2%; non-health professional school faculties have gone down by 13%; Health Science professional faculties have gone down by 10.4%. Those are the facts. I hope that that will put to rest the kinds of concerns tha people express about those kinds of divisions. And I also hope, more broadly, that we put to rest our thinking in those kinds of terms, rather than constantly worry about who's getting what and who may be doing better.

Thank you.

The floor was opened for discussion. Professor Boot observed that the Provost's "radical" ideas concerning workloads in various departments had been thoroughly discussed "and in

fact ratified" by the UUP and the senates of the New York and California State systems were not so radical after all; tying in events from the outside world into the report would strengthen its standing.

Professor Schack, while acknowledging the plan to create our own "measuring system", criticized the one used repeatedly throughout the report. The Stony Brook index, he argued, was "deeply flawed"; it is neither widely recognized, nor predictable when compared with the more reliable NRC rating system ---- for example, the Stony Brook index replaced reputable highly reputable mathematics departments such as Chicago, Yale, Wisconsin/Madison, Brown, and Johns Hopkins with less prestigious ones at Arizona State University, Clarkson, and Delaware. He consequently urged that it not be used in making in decisions at UB.

The Provost replied that he used the Stony Brook index as "just another source of information", and said he would not make any decisions based on any index; the purpose for its inclusion was simply to "get people to think" about the ideas in the report. The more information presented, the better we can judge what course of action to take.

Professor Schack countered that it was particularly bad information; our goal, he argued, is not to have more information, but rather worthwhile information.

Item 4: Resolution on Administrative Resignations (Second Reading)

Professor Schroeder, Chair of the Grading Committee, presented the slightly revised resolution on administrative resignations. Changes included:

a clarification in Point 3 that a grade of W indicates withdrawal from a course not attempted;

the extension of the deadline for applying for a retroactive administrative withdrawal until the end (instead of the middle) of the subsequent semester;

the clarification that the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education is responsible for considering and acting upon petitions for withdrawal, and that he may consult faculty and others as appropriate;

the stipulation that the Vice-Provost be required to report to the instructor who assigned the grade all changes of grades to W;

the addition of Point 7, which insures the accountability of the Vice-Provost to report annually to the Grading Committee on these matters, including any exceptions to the guidelines in any of the cases considered.

Professor Ebert argued that, since the Vice-Provost will not handle hundreds of petitions personally but will distribute the work among several individuals, the faculty member should be included and consulted in the process from the start instead of ex post facto. Professor Schroeder indicated that he would be willing to change the word "may" to "should"; the amendment was approved.

Professor Malone asked whether the accumulation of W grades would be detrimental to a student's GPA. Dr. Kaars explained that, since the W grade would be used chiefly in cases of catastrophic illness and similar circumstances, it would not factor into the GPA or academic review process.

Dr. Coles questioned the possibility of a student receiving an administrative withdrawal (in exceptional cases) in courses where the faculty member does not assign incompletes; Vice-Provost Goodman responded that his office, under the resolution, would consult with the appropriate faculty member, but would also make the final decision. Professor Schroeder explained certain difficulties and vagaries of the I grade, and hoped that the faculty would be more willing to assign an I grade when the circumstances warrant it.

Professor Ryan found the "all-or-nothing" clause in Point 6 (a) too restrictive and inappropriate; students in difficulty often "try to salvage what they can" of a semester's work, but cannot do so with every course. He moved to eliminate that restriction. Professor Baumer reminded the Senate that the resolution presented principles only, and that the Grading Committee is aware that there may be exceptions; the present wording permits the student to make a special petition and thus need not be amended. Professor Schack warned that principles can rigidify and become precedents; furthermore, the resolution could exacerbate the University's retention problem. Professor Fournier spoke against the amendment, arguing that the resolution as formulated was fairest to students. Professor Wooldridge supported the amendment, noting that the Vice-Provost would not be likely to permit a student to abuse the policy. The amendment was defeated.

The resolution passed.

Item 5: Policy on Primacy of Commitment and Conflicts of Interest (First Reading)

Professor Yeagle presented the proposed policy on Primacy of Commitment and Conflicts of Interest. The Committee on Research and Creative Committee, of which he is Chair, had designed the policy to be one of disclosure that will be helpful in providing guidelines for the faculty in this new, more entrepreneurial university environment --- guidelines which had hitherto been lacking.

Professor Malone asked how, if indeed whether, the proposed policy related to the current procedures for resolving complaints. Professor Yeagle and Welch noted that, although this was not stated explicitly, the draft made reference to existing State, University, and union complaint procedures in sections 9 and 10, as well as to the Faculty/Professional Staff Handbook

No further discussion ensued.

Item 6: Resolution on Coursework of Undergraduate Transfer Students

Professor Metzger, Chair of the Educational Programs and Policies Committee, presented a resolution allowing transfer students to apply coursework taken elsewhere towards "at least one third, but no more than two thirds" of a program's graduation requirement, depending on the individual academic program.

Professor Baumer understood neither the minimum stipulated in the proposal, nor how it would apply, since a student may enter a major program with only three credit hours.

Professor Metzger emphasized that those three hours would count toward the minimum.

Professor Welch explained that the intent was to ensure that a student graduating from a program at UB had "at least some stamp" of that major. Vice-Provost Goodman asked for suggestions for more accurate wording; the thought behind the proposal, he said, is that "a department should be willing to accept at least a third toward the program's major requirements, yet insist that at least one third of the work toward the degree be completed at UB.

Professor Wooldridge asked if it would be inappropriate for a department to refuse to accept transfer credits which would total up to one third of the departmental credit requirements;

Vice-Provost Goodman replied that that is the case. Professor Wooldridge suggested breaking the statement into two sub-clauses to avoid the confusion, and also clarifying that the proposal addresses program, and not University-wide, requirements.

Item 7: Proposal for an Advanced Honors Program

Dr. Capuana presented a proposal from the University Honors Council to develop an upper-division Honors Program that will be open to all UB undergraduates who maintain at least a 3.25 GPA and have amassed at least 60 credit hours. In each semester of the junior year and in the first semester of the senior year, the student would enroll in either a designated Honors course or a contract Honors course (a regular course with an additional one credit hour's worth of independent study); in addition, the student would write a senior thesis, project, or performance. The students on the Honors Council also requested a "breadth" component ---- Honors students would be encouraged to pursue a second major or minor, overseas study, or similar additional work outside their major. Students in the expanded program would be entitled to the same benefits as regular Honors students. The Honors Council believes the expansion of the program would aid in the recruitment and retention of bright students at UB. The proposal was approved.

Item 8: Resolutions of the Governance Committee

Professor Albini presented two resolutions, the first urging the President not to make a final decision on the reorganization of Arts & Sciences (and possibly Engineering) before October 1, 1997, and the second urging the faculties of various units proposed for merger to prepare careful analyses of the potential consequences of a merger. Both resolutions requested an allowance for sufficient time for the faculty to consider each case and have a fair hearing. Allowing administration to make such important decisions over the summer break, and without sufficient time for the faculty to react, he argued, could establish a dangerous precedent.

Professor Baumer observed that, as far as he knew, Social Sciences was the only faculty governance structure within the three faculties that was proposed to be incorporated into the College of Arts & Sciences. Thus, a significant portion of the proposal --- that the matter

be referred to the governance bodies of the three faculties --- seems moot. The only place in which the three faculties truly have faculty representation is the Faculty Senate, which is consequently the only body which can discuss, and vote on, the proposed College.

Professor Metzger reported that neither the Educational Policies Committee nor the Dean's Advisory Committee in Arts & Letters had met to discuss the matter yet. Professor Doyno stated that the Arts & Letters Educational Policies Committee certainly does have an advisory role in this matter, according to its bylaws, and not the Faculty Senate alone.

Professor Benenson did not think the proposed resolutions articulated the Faculty Senate's role in a positive and constructive way. In view of the imminent changes at UB, he argued that that we must develop a procedure in which the Faculty Senate makes its recommendations to the President. The present resolution is a modest step toward that, and so should be supported and expanded.

Professor Doyno lamented the lack of decanal evaluation, which is granted to the faculty by the Policies of the Board of Trustees. Some programs and departments are now suffering --- and will continue to suffer --- from this lack of evaluation. "When this present system was set up," he argued, "deans were thought of as intellectual leaders, not as managerial people." Finding such an intellectual leader for "seventeen to twenty-three different disciplines" is impossible --- which will only reinforce managerial leadership, which, in turn, "will be consistent with many other things that I think are very harmful for the University."

Professor Albini concluded by saying that the Governance Committee is working on more detailed guidelines on the process of evaluating and consulting with administration, looking to find ways to make the Faculty Senate a more effective representative of the faculty, and is developing proposals for procedure on the establishment of centers and institutes.

Professor Welch noted that there are three deans slated for evaluation --- the result of pressure from the Faculty Senate. In addition, the faculty of the School of Medicine & Biomedical Sciences has, through its faculty council and executive committee, has adopted a procedure by which a merger of academic units should be considered.

The meeting ended 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

Architecture: M. Tauke

Arts & Letters: V. Doyno, M. Frisch, M. Gutierrez, M. Horne, J. Ludwig, R. Mennen, M. Metzger, M. Runfola

Dental Medicine: R. Baier, G. Ferry, W. Miller

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

Engineering & Applied Sciences: D. Benenson, C. Bloebaum, M. Ryan, T. Singh

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

Law: E. Meidinger, L. Swartz

Management: J. Boot, P. Perry, R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albin, D. Amsterdam, W. Flynn, B. Noble, R. Perez,

F. Schimpfhauser, H. Schuel, C. Smith, M. Spaulding, A. Vladutiu, J. Wactawski-Wende

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: S. Bruckenstein, P. Calkin, J. Faran, C. Fournier, M. Sachs, S. Schack,

R. Vesley

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N. , W. Conway

Social Sciences: D. Banks, W. Baumer, J. Gayle Beck, J. Charles-Luce, V. Ebert, P. Hare, L. Mattei, J. Meacham

Social Work: L. Sloan

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

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

ABSENT:

Architecture: G. Scott Danford

Arts & Letters: B. Bono, J. Holstun

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, R. Hall

Education: J. Hoot, B. Johnstone

Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson

Information & Library Sciences: G. D'Elia

Management: L. Brown

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: R. Heffner, C. Leach, J. Sulewski, B. Willer

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: J. Cai, H. King, R. Shortridge

Nursing: M. Marecki, M. Rhodes

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, M. Harwitz, D. Pollock

University Libraries: L. Bushallow-Wilbur

EXCUSED:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: H. Douglass

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson