

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of November 19, 1996 - (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting of the UB Faculty Senate was called to order at 2:00 PM at the Center for Tomorrow to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Approval of the Minutes of October 22, 1996](#)
3. [Report of the Provost](#)
4. [Nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate](#)
5. [Draft Resolution of Budgetary Implications of Resolutions \(Second Reading\)](#)
6. [Resolution on the University Recycling Policy \(Second Reading\)](#)
7. [Proposed Amendments to the Charter of the Faculty Senate \(First Reading\)](#)
8. [Report of the Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee \(First Reading\)](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

Prior to the meeting, the Chair had mailed to the senators two written reports, the first listing the most recent activities of the Senate committees, the second listing (a) the items to be discussed at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) for the academic year and (b) the agenda items for upcoming Senate meetings. He had drafted the schedules in order to guarantee sufficient time for significant issues. He invited any interested senators to attend future FSEC meetings, even if they were not members.

His report focussed first on the Senate's role in academic planning. The tendency of this University to proliferate programs and complicate jurisdictions, he believes, has resulted in an "image" which is not clear, consistent, or widely understood. If this is an issue, he continued, we need to consider what impact this may have on our academic planning. Several efforts in the past -- such as the Graduate Research Initiative, "Pathways to Greatness", and various "vaunted" searches -- have left few traces

as they dwindled into oblivion. On the other hand, the Graduate Groups program continues, and the now-disbanded Undergraduate College has led to serious curriculum development, built from below largely by faculty initiative. He concluded that our best efforts arise from a reciprocal process combining "bottom-up" faculty initiative with "top-down" encouragement and consultation by the administration.

Why mention this? The Chair sensed a certain paralysis of faculty efforts in actively planning for the future. Rather than await the Word from "On High", he urged the Faculty Senate to bear in mind its responsibility to review, prior to adoption, formal plans relating to the reorganization of the University, as well as proposals regarding the formation, reorganization or dissolution of academic units (to paraphrase the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and the Charter of the Faculty Senate). Although Senate involvement may be largely excluded from unit-internal matters, its consultation and deliberations are imperative should any problem extend beyond a unit's scope of governance.

The Chair then addressed the faculty's role in admissions and retention. In recent years, the decline in student enrollment by about 16% (from 28,000 in Fall 1988 to 23,500 in Fall 1996) has been proportionately greater than the loss of faculty. The danger of dropping below enrollment targets and consequently receiving less funding behooves the faculty to become more directly involved in recruiting and retaining students.

Professor Brown asked whether the \$2,500/FTE above or below the enrollment target applied to undergraduates as well; the Chair said it applied to all FTE students. Professor Malone wanted to know how the enrollment targets were generated; Professor Welch deferred this matter to the Provost, but pointed out that the data he and the deans had received was based on figures of the particular Schools and Faculties over the past five years.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes of October 22, 1996

The [partial] Minutes of the Senate meeting of October 22, 1996 were approved almost unanimously. One senator opposed.

The Chair invited those senators who had made comments at the previous (unrecorded) meeting to submit those comments in writing to the Secretary for inclusion in the Minutes.

Item 3: Report of the Provost

Provost Headrick wished to postpone his comments until after he had heard discussion on the report of the Faculty Tenure and Privileges Committee, but addressed Professor Malone's question and welcomed others.

The administration is using historical data to find levels of enrollment which would constitute sufficient targets -- in most cases, the enrollment levels of two years ago. With other units, there are plans either to expand or decrease enrollments and set the targets accordingly. Professor Malone hoped that the administration, in targeting peak enrollments of X years ago, would find out and take into consideration the national trends as well; otherwise, the administration might, for some Schools, set an unjustifiably high target. Provost Headrick replied that they had not yet consulted national data in any detail, and said it was difficult to ascertain correlations between national trends and our own. Targets have been established, and the deans have the opportunity to discuss these targets and the rationale underlying them. He added that there were a variety of ways -- such as putting off-budget enrollment on budget -- in which we can try to meet the targets.

To Professor Brown's question regarding the \$2,500/FTE, Provost Headrick explained that the administration will essentially return to a unit a portion of the cut that the University would have to absorb. Although the administration presently absorbs cuts of about \$3,400 per student, it plans to remit or reclaim the \$2,500 as a share of the proportion of the averaged total budget. Professor Brown said he was concerned about the mix, since to his understanding an FTE counts more as a graduate than as an undergraduate. The Provost replied that it does indeed count more for graduates, simply because it takes fewer credit hours to them to attain FTE status; when combining part-time and full-time, it is the total number of credits which determines FTEs for part-time students.

Professor George first warned against the danger of faculty members becoming so overly conscious of their individual roles that it distorts our sense of mission at UB; as a counter-example, he cited the growth of the UB Civil and Mechanical Engineering programs through hiring at a time when most other institutions were eliminating theirs. He thought that the way to improve is to buck the trends, contrary to what the Provost seemed to suggest. Secondly, he learned from personal experience that many

prospective students were being advised not to attend UB; the reasons given -- that it was too difficult, that UB was going downhill -- confirmed UB's image problem.

The Provost assured him that the administration was conscious of, and is addressing, the image problem. The administration has put money into advertising and recruitment; however, the Provost added that it is difficult to "get a handle on all the pieces of the budget that affect a particular activity". Addressing Professor George's first comment, Provost Headrick agreed with his concerns, and said the administration is treating the enrollment- target strategy as a short-term solution. In the longer run, it would like to change to a responsibility-centered budgeting system, which entails not only choices, but also a consciousness of how those choices are made.

Professor Ebert argued that history cannot be reversed, that there were enrollment shifts, up and down, in various departments over which the faculty had no control. While for some departments the General Education program, for example, was rewarding, for others it was "devastating". Such a reward system, which he said could be compared to the gulags of the 1930s, could be dangerous to the morale of the University. He hoped the administration would not move too quickly, but rather would carefully consider the effects that General Education and other programs/policies have on the departments.

Provost Headrick explained that most were school, not departmental, targets. The administration is focussing on freshman and transfer students; in particular, it hopes for a more rapid turnaround on transfer applications. He argued that the faculty should not act out of self-interest in gaining funds for a particular unit, but rather should be conscious of their responsibility to the University in meeting the overall enrollment problem. He emphasized that targeting is a one-year effort, to be assessed at the end of the year for its efficacy.

Professor Doyno suggested that someone be delegated to examine the composition of the formula for determining the targets, to see whether certain groups (e.g., senior citizens) count toward the targets. Provost Headrick replied that "some of the best people in the world" were considering all aspects.

Professor Cai wondered how the Provost planned to implement this plan, since the \$2,500 increase/decrease is relative to some existing level. Some departments already experience a "tremendous strain" in dealing with a large number of students who might constitute the target. Provost Headrick replied that he had "no choice but to start where we are". Were it a long-term plan, such a factor could be taken into account; but the short-term plan must rely on present enrollment and budget figures.

Item 4: Nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Secretary announced that 21 nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate had been submitted. Of the ten contacted so far, two have accepted.

Item 5: Draft Resolution of Budgetary Implications of Resolutions (Second Reading)

The Chair announced that the draft resolution had undergone some minor changes in the wording since its first reading. He invited further discussion, but received none. After a formal second reading, the resolution passed unanimously.

Item 6: Resolution on the University Recycling Policy (Second Reading)

The Chair summarized the resolution on the University recycling policy for those not present at the previous meeting, and invited discussion. Professor Metzger, referring to the phrase stating that "lack of participation will be addressed on a case-by- case basis", asked, by whom? If we cannot clarify such an ominous (or harmless) phrase, then it should be removed. He had suggested this to Mr. Simpson at the first reading of the resolution. Professor Welch replied that much depends on how the President planned to implement the policy; what the Senate is being asked of is an endorsement of a request to the President to implement such a policy. Professor Malone suggested that if we support the policy, we should use as little paper as possible; one way would be to encourage CIT to encourage the use of e-mail. Should the Senate adopt the resolution, the Chair assured him that he would transmit it to the President along with suggestions of other helpful policies that could be adopted.

The resolution passed unanimously.

Item 7: Proposed Amendments to the Charter of the Faculty Senate (First Reading)

Professor Welch explained that the single proposed amendment to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty was an explanatory footnote. The parliamentarian had indicated that such a footnote, which does not change the substance of the Bylaws, need not be submitted to the entire Voting Faculty for approval.

Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Bylaws Committee, reminded the Senate that all but one of the proposed changes emanated from the report of the University Governance Committee, which the Faculty Senate approved on April 9, 1996. She briefly reiterated the proposed changes which were self-explanatory, and concentrated on the reapportionment of the Faculty Senate.

With the recent inclusion of the Geographic Full-Time faculty (GFTs), she explained, the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences would be entitled to 40% of the Senate seats. The Bylaws Committee felt this would be an overly powerful representation. Consequently, the Committee proposed that no unit be entitled to more than 25% of the Senate seats, and discussed the matter with members of the Academic Council of the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, who agreed to the 25% cap. This School's representation on the FSEC would also be increased accordingly.

The Governance Committee had also recommended that the Charter be amended to say that appointments to Senate committees be made as early as possible in the academic year. The Bylaws Committee decided that this statement is not suitable for the Charter, but rather would be most appropriately included in the Standing Orders. Professor Hopkins then reviewed in detail the proposed amendments to Articles III and IV of the Charter of the Faculty Senate, which deal with the calculation and allocation of Senate seats for the Voting Faculty. After several attempts to construct an appropriate formula, the Committee decided to abandon the concept of a Senate with a fixed membership of 100. Instead, apportionment would be based on three principles:

1. proportional representation would remain, i.e., there would be one senator for every X number of Voting Faculty, $X = 15$;

2. there would be a minimum level of representation -- every electoral unit, no matter how small, will have at least one senator;
3. there would be a maximum level of representation -- no electoral unit, no matter how large, will have more than 25 senators.

Professor Baumer noted two inconsistencies. First, the proportional principle of 1/15 does not recognize any cap. Secondly, a cap of 25% is not the same as a cap of 25 members. He suggested that the document be revised before it returns for a vote. The Chair instructed the Bylaws Committee to meet and resolve this issue before the next Senate meeting.

Professor Schack asked for clarification of the 1/15 representation in cases of non-integer quotients; Professor Hopkins noted that Article IV.4.B stipulated how the number would be rounded off. Professor Acara wondered if the Committee had considered adding the Senior Vice-Provost and the Vice-Provost for Faculty Development to the membership of the Senate. Professor Hopkins replied that the Committee considered only those offices recommended by the Senate in April 1996.

Professor Ludwig asked for explanation of the term "Presiding Officer". Professor Hopkins said the change in terminology was to reduce confusion in the terminology, such as Chair (of the Faculty Senate) and Vice-Chair (of the Voting Faculty) referring to the same person. Professor Brown suggested a change in the wording of Article III.5.A. to read "Representatives of the Voting Faculty..." Professor Metzger asked if the change in terminology from Vice-Chair to Presiding Officer [of the Voting Faculty] affected the title of the Chair of the Voting Faculty, namely the President. Professor Hopkins replied that it did not.

Professor Schriber asked whether the Voting Faculty in the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences had been asked about the cap. Professor Hopkins called upon Professor Acara to respond to that question. Professor Acara explained that the Steering Committee of the Faculty Council of the School had met with the Bylaws Committee and had agreed to this cap; furthermore, the issue had been presented at the past few meetings of the Academic Council of that School. Professor Schriber replied that, although few would care, Roswell Park (and possibly other groups) had not been informed of this, but should have been.

Professor Amsterdam remarked that a cap of 25 (members, not percent) does not take into account the possibility of an expanding Senate; there should instead be some sliding scale to accommodate any such change. Professor Hopkins replied that every time the cap would be recalculated, the percentage allocated to the other Schools would need to be recalculated as well. She added that it is not likely that the size of the Voting Faculty would change considerably in the near future; should that occur, the Senate could change the Charter accordingly.

Professor Douglass pointed out that the Medical School had accepted a cap of 25%, and not 25 senators. Professor Baumer suggested, on the basis of the preceding discussion, that the Bylaws Committee scrap the limit of 25. Professor Hopkins reiterated that the Committee would rework the formula.

Item 8: Report of the Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee (First Reading)

Professor Welch noted by way of introduction that the report had aroused a good deal of discussion not only within the Tenure and Privileges Committee itself but also in the FSEC the previous week. What the Committee is calling for, he said, is the opportunity for faculty members to provide fuller documentation of their teaching skills than is currently required by University policies; the Committee has put forth a series of suggestions of how this might be accomplished. The report is intended as a means of examining the ways we carry out our teaching responsibilities and how to best document these for the promotion process.

Professor Acara, Chair of the Committee, said the report goes even farther in recommending that additional weight be given to the teaching criterion in the review for promotion to Full Professor. The Committee had examined trends in the promotion process at other universities. Higher education is changing, she noted. Since we have not reviewed our guidelines for promotion in decades, it is time we do so, "and perhaps we should be viewing and reviewing our promotions in a little different light". She reminded the Senate that the goal was not to devalue research, but to value and reward the other missions of the University, teaching and service. The Committee focussed on teaching achievements, and in the course of deliberations had considered a two-track system, which it rejected

because this would have created a group of second-class citizens. Instead, the Committee favored the present proposal.

Professor Jameson noted that the report conflates two issues which should be considered separately, the first dealing with how much weight should be given to teaching in the promotion decisions, the second with the evaluation and presentation of teaching in the promotion dossier. Since the quality of documentation on teaching is presently inadequate at both promotions, any improvements we recommend must be explicitly applicable to both promotions. She observed that the World Wide Web provides access to promotion and tenure standards at several institutions, and strongly suggested that the Committee review some sample policy documents. Professor Jameson had randomly selected a few herself, and discovered (1) "surprisingly rigorous expectations for teaching excellence at the promotion to tenure" level, (2) guidelines for the preparation of a tenure dossier based primarily on teaching, (3) instructions for documentation of teaching quality which emphasized "continuous peer evaluation" (not as an option but as a requirement), and which construed teaching as including thesis guidance, clinical mentoring, and student advisement, as well as the development of instructional technology materials.

Professor Acara referred to the section of the report which requests that the teaching portfolio be school-specific. Since there are any number of specific items which could be included in a teaching portfolio, and since different schools/units have different methods and technologies, each school would be expected to develop the specifics of the portfolio.

Professor Schack supported the idea that we need to count teaching and service more in the promotion to Full Professor, but did not think the report suggested the right way to do this. He argued against the premise that a two-track system would create second-class citizens by pointing out that Distinguished Teaching and Distinguished Service Professors never fail to write out their full title; those promoted for their teaching would be proud of it.

He then criticized the inclusion of the personal statement, saying he would have hated writing a description of what he does for the dossier and then think that people who were determining his future would weigh how well he did that instead of how well he performed his actual job. Although the

personal statement is recommended as an option, Professor Schack noted that similar options often become an unwritten rule.

He also doubted that -- at least in most cases -- the PRB, Provost, and President would be in a position to judge a candidate's syllabi and teaching materials; yet the mere fact that they receive these materials to evaluate leads them to believe that they can. He suggested instead that we find mechanisms that cause the departments to evaluate teaching seriously.

Professor Benenson asked first whether in the report the term "promotion" referred only to promotion to Full Professor. Professor Acara said that it did. He noted that Item 5 on page 36 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook, dealing with the dossier and evaluation of teaching, applies to both promotion levels.

Professor Acara agreed that this is correct. Professor Benenson considered the proposed resolution premature, in the sense that the Committee had not yet considered the third prong of the promotion process, that of service. He saw no crisis looming in the near future, and suggested holding the resolution until criteria for both service and teaching have been developed so that we could look at the tenure process in a more global fashion.

It was clear to him that the proposal suggests an alternative route to promotion to Full Professor. He cited that this was clear

- from Provost Headrick's presentation to the Committee "some time ago";
- from the discussion within the Committee that "all the members of the Committee are fully aware [...] that this resolution will be employed as an alternative route for promotion";
- from a headline in the Reporter of last week;
- from the structure of the resolution -- "when you look at it in detail and carefully, that it is much more than a simple expansion of the detail of the teaching evaluation"; in particular, sections 1.C. and to some extent 1.B. provide the thrust for the alternative path.

He said that the question before us should be to ask what our role is as a research university. He further suggested that we counteract our negative image by showing our faculty's achievements in

teaching and especially in research, which can bring in "real economic benefits" as well as many cultural benefits.

Professor Acara believed that the Committee must consider teaching and service separately, and not together as Professor Benenson had suggested, since there were different aspects to be considered.

In an impassioned speech, Professor George supported the resolution. He reminded the Senate that the promotion from Associate to Full Professor costs the University nothing; the only thing that mattered in promoting somebody, then, was whether it would be in our best interest to do so. He argued that it is in our best interest to have standards that are neither too narrow nor too broad, neither too high nor too low. Our standards must be directly relevant to our primary mission.

Our primary mission, our ONLY mission, he stressed, is teaching. The emphasis on research, on calling ourselves a research university, has caused "undue problems" for us and caused us to be hammered from all sides for doing research and not teaching. Of course, research is important: we train researchers, and cannot train them if we do not know how to do it ourselves and do it well. Research also brings in money -- but what good is it to bring in money, he asked, if we do not teach with it?

Professor George said he does not consider publications and research papers are "a whit more relevant" than teaching. He recalled an interview with Leslie Fiedler on the Dick Cavett Show, in which Fiedler said that "everyone is a good teacher to somebody"; the challenge to the University, Professor George argued, is to identify to whom a faculty member is a good teacher, and then to decide whether that is enough for promotion. In our efforts over the last decade to "remedy the research dollar deficiency", we have lost sight of our mission. then, if someone acted like Full Professors, we made them Full Professors, whatever the criteria may have been -- scholarship, publications, classroom expertise, supervision of graduate students, or assumption of administrative responsibilities. He thought we need to return to our pre-AAU status years and mentality, to return to promoting people when they act like Full Professors. Such a change can only come from strong leadership from the Provost and the President.

Professor Cai, who mentioned that he had recently been promoted to Full Professor, quoted from the Handbook that one of the criteria required for promotion is "clear and strong evidence [of] first-rank

performance as a teacher". Thus he had trouble understanding why we have been saying that research has been over-emphasized. He disputed the claim in the report which stated that "nothing in these recommendations should be construed as implying a reduction in the importance of research", and asked what weight would indeed be given to teaching. If we assume the package statement in the Handbook as 100%, and we increase some of it, this necessarily implies a decrease in something else. He agreed with Professor Schack that a two-track would not create second-class citizens. He added that he would like to see more input into the Committee from people who have done research in evaluating teaching performance.

Professor Acara doubted that anyone who served on promotions committees would argue the fact that research is the criterion which is given the most weight.

Professor Metzger requested the inclusion of more emphatic mention of successful development/implementation of instructional technology, which is exceptionally demanding on a faculty member's time; it would also send a signal to the junior faculty interested in pursuing this type of work.

Vice-Provost Fischer, expressing astonishment at how the proposal "galvanized so much intensity", found the recommendations rather modest. He said it would be unfortunate to delay consideration of it, since the Provost had issued the charge to the Committee because of a genuine concern that there are not adequate ways of acknowledging good teaching. He added that its main function is not to shift the weight between teaching and research so much as it is to call increasing attention through a structural methodology to the importance of teaching for all of us.

Professor Kuo, speaking from personal experience, claimed that the very good, the inspiring teachers were invariably good researchers as well. Professor Acara mentioned that the proposal is not meant to reward ordinary teaching, but excellence in teaching.

Vice-Provost Goodman supported more emphasis on teaching, but was concerned at how we demonstrate excellence in teaching. This can be demonstrated above all by letters from students ten years later, who remember a particular instructor. He was also concerned about the replacing standards based on teaching with those based on scholarship about teaching; there is often a gap

between the theory and the practice. He agreed with Professor Jameson that we need to have a broad conception of what teaching is. Thus the Committee needs to refine how we evaluate and demonstrate teaching.

Professor Acara did not think members of the Committee would not want to get rid of some of the things the Vice-Provost had mentioned, such as conference papers on teaching. She disagreed with him, claiming that the delivery of papers on the methodology of teaching in the different disciplines should be considered important.

Professor Schack referred to Professor Cai's comment that the Handbook already called for excellence in teaching; in addition, he said Professor Acara observed (correctly) that everyone knows that research counts first. His question: What will be gained by passing the resolution? He agreed with Professor George that there is only one way in which to change the weight of teaching in the promotion process, namely through the leadership of the Provost and the President. To this, Professor Acara replied that that is why the proposal begins "The Provost will instruct..."

Professor Meacham believed that the proposal on the floor is weaker than what is in the Handbook. The problem, he said, is that promotion and personnel panels are out of compliance with policies and procedures which have been adopted. A promotion committee which considers only research is thus not fulfilling these policies, nor living up to existing procedures. He quoted a sentence from the Handbook which states that "candidates [for promotion to Full Professor] with no previous teaching should be given an initial term appointment at unqualified rank or a visiting appointment", which he believed indicated how important we regarded teaching in the past. The Handbook also states that "excellence in research [...] will not counterbalance failure in teaching".

Professor Sachs observed that the attitude in the proposal is that there is a difference between research, scholarship, and teaching. He believed that, at a research-oriented university, the purpose is "to pursue the truth and to communicate the truth, and if one is a good researcher, he will automatically have the inspiration to communicate that".

Professor Acara pointed out that part of the literature on promotion comes out of trying to redefine what the criteria should be with something more expansive, under the title of "scholarly activity", which should include more than research.

Professor Doyno recalled that, when he was a member of a committee chaired by Professor Reichert in the mid-1960s, candidates for promotion were required to have documentation on their teaching, and in fact some were turned down because of the lack of it. In some ways, this University is not the University that some faculty came here to build, and the discussion on the floor was evidence of this. He suggested the Committee take into consideration the work of the Reichert committee. He believed that part of the problem was the shift to the "managerial university", in which some members of the University do not teach -- which also tends to lower the value of teaching.

Professor Swartz considered the subject unripe for action at the next Senate meeting --- the Committee report is thin on documentation of what is done at other universities, thin on the analysis of the assessment of excellence in teaching, and it omits any consideration of service as a promotion criterion. In addition, one possibility not yet considered is that each unit could create its own criteria, which would nevertheless be congruent with the broader guidelines laid out in the Handbook.

Provost Headrick mentioned that he attended mainly to hear everyone's thoughts on the subject, but wished to clarify a few points. He agreed with Professor Jameson that the two issues presented needed to be separated and considered separately.

He stressed his concern over the paucity of information that goes into promotion dossiers at any level; whereas the research is usually well-attested, the teaching is not. The primary basis of evaluation of teaching -- students' evaluations over a period of time -- is effective only to a limited degree. It is a problem we must deal with, and the present proposal is only a step in the right direction. Although he has some misgivings about personal statements (which at best tend to be self-serving), and believes the teaching portfolio idea has to be expanded and developed, he agrees that the portfolios must be evaluated by people who understand good teaching. For that reason, he would like to see both internal and external feed-in to the process.

He further believes we ought to get in touch with former students, five or ten years after they have left, "who can relate what they learned to what was expected of them in the outside world and how it affected the way in which they see themselves and measure themselves against others in their field". This should improve the quality of the information we get about the impact of teaching and what it does for our students.

Finally, echoing Professors George and Doyno, he pointed out that there are people at the University who are not put forward for promotion because their research does not measure up to the expectations of others in their units, but who nevertheless have been "exquisite members of their departments in terms of their teaching and service" --- that is what caused him to request the Tenure and Privileges Committee to look into the aspect of teaching as a promotion criterion. To be a first-rate university, he concluded, we must deal with that problem.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: C. Welch

Secretary: R. Hoeing

Architecture: M. Tauke

Arts & Letters: V. Doyno, J. Holstun, M. Horne, J. Ludwig, M. Metzger

Dental Medicine: A. Aguirre, G. Ferry

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

Engineering & Applied Sciences: D. Benenson, C. Bloebaum, W. George, R. Wetherhold

Health Related Professions: S. Kuo

Information & Library Studies: G. D'Elia

Law: L. Swartz

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

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, D. Amsterdam, H. Douglass, W. Flynn, R. Heffner, C. Leach, B. Noble, R. Perez, J. Schriber, C. Smith, M. Spaulding, J. Wactawski-Wende

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: J. Cai, C. Fournier, M. Sachs, D. 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, P. Hare, L. Mattei, J. Meacham

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

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

Absent:

Architecture: G. Danford

Arts & Letters: A. Anderson, C. Bramen, M. Frisch, M. Gutierrez, N. Grant, M. Hyde, R. Mennen

Dental Medicine: R. Baier, R. Hall, W. Miller

Education: J. Hoot, L. Ilon

Engineering & Applied Sciences: J. Atkinson, M. Ryan

Health-Related Professions: A. Awad, P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidinger

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albin, C. Bloomfield, J. Richert, F. Schimpfhauser, H. Schuel, J. Sulewski, A. Vladutiu, B. Willer

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

Nursing: M. Marecki

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

Excused:

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: J. Faran

Social Sciences: C. Sellers

Social Work: L. Sloan