

Arts & Sciences Senate
February 18, 2002
Tentative Agenda

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Approval of minutes from November 26, 2001
- III. Report of the PTC Committee (Fred Gardaphe)
- IV. Report of the Committee on Academic Standing and Appeals (Bill Godfrey)
- V. Restricting Majors by GPA - brought to us by the Curriculum Committee
- VI. Other Old Business
- VII. Other New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

Arts and Sciences Senate
Minutes of the 11/26/01 Meeting

The Arts and Sciences Senate met on Monday 26 November 2001 at 3:30 PM in the Javits Room. The meeting was called to order at 3:39 PM.

I. Item IVa, an informational point about Freshman Seminars, was added to the agenda. The agenda as amended was then approved by voice vote.

II. The minutes of the 10/15/01 meeting were approved following revision of the Dean's comments in section IV.

Agenda item III and IV were transposed.

IV. A. Tyree led the discussion on the Report of the Unmet Demand Working Group. The purpose of the discussion was to provide feedback to the Dean; the Senate was not asked to accept the report.

It is clear the definitions are important. There is a distinction between "tolerable" and "intolerable" unmet demand. The latter would, for example, prevent a student from graduating in a timely manner.

A number of suggestions were offered that might mitigate against the unmet demand.

- It was suggested that DEC credit might be removed from very popular courses, in order to decrease the enrollment by those students not requiring the courses for their majors.
- It was suggested that we might offer fewer small "boutique" courses. This would result in fewer choices overall, and some feared that it might be a step towards a common curriculum.

III. A. Tyree presented the "Proposals for Improving Conditions for Full-Time Lecturers", the report of the Interim Dean's working group on the status of Lecturers in CAS, dated 6/13/01. The main issues are salary (this is easy - it only requires money), review, and recognition. The need for regular reviews of lecturers, and for a "Senior Lecturer" title, were acknowledged by the Senate. The Dean noted that there will be legal and union constraints in any proposals involving possible changes in the conditions of employment.

It was noted that most lecturers will not be affected by these proposed changes, as most leave the university within 5 years. It was also noted that the duties and responsibilities of lecturers varies widely between departments.

Members of the Senate questioned some of the details in the proposal. Specifically, the Dean was asked to clarify the "Departmental and University commitment to the faculty member" (i.e., lecturer). The

Dean responded that after passing the first few reviews, subsequent reviews will become more "pro forma".

The concern was raised that this proposal might lessen the University's flexibility in dealing with imbalances in teaching loads.

IVa. Your secretary suggested that departments might look into the concept of Freshman Seminars as a way of providing incoming students with a way of sampling departments and selecting majors.

Currently, many students are introduced to programs through the Prime Time events. These are short, and many are scheduled at exactly the same time. For example, about 1/3 of the events are during the Wednesday Campus Life time, and 1/4 are at noon on Monday.

A Freshman Seminar would be a 1-credit course open to students interested in exploring a field. There would be no pre-requisites. Over the course of a semester, these seminars would give a broad overview of the intellectual activities of the department and within its field.

These seminars would require no new teaching resources, and can be instituted fairly quickly. I suggest that the seminars could become the prime vehicle whereby undecided students explore their options.

Freshman Seminars are planned for Astronomy, Physics, and Sociology for Fall 2002. We encourage more departments to offer such seminars. We ask that the Dean and the Registrar advertise these seminars prominently, during orientation and in the class schedule booklet.

If enough seminars are offered, there should be a web page devoted to the seminars.

V. There was no other Old Business.

VI. There was no other New Business.

The Arts and Sciences Senate adjourned at 4:53 PM.

Submitted 10 December 2001

F.M. Walter

Secretary

Robert Liebermann

02/13/2002 12:07 PM

To: CAS Chairs

cc: Robert McGrath/Prov@SUNYSB, Eugene Katz/UHMC@SUNYSB,
Clyde Miller/CAS@SUNYSB, Nancy Tomes/CAS@SUNYSB

Subject: Decision on budget savings plan for CAS for 2002/03

Dear Colleagues:

As I explained in detail at our last meeting on January 30, 2002, I have been engaged for the past two months in the development of a coherent plan to identify 5% savings in the CAS budget for 2002/03, as all Deans were asked to do by the Provost. This required me to identify \$2.565 million in savings in a total budget of \$51.3 million.

Based on input from you all in early January, the Associate Deans and I met throughout the month of January and formulated a plan for meeting this budget cut in a manner that held no unit harmless, spread the pain among various units and different budget categories, all with the objective of "minimizing the negative impact" of such cuts on the academic mission of the College.

I presented this CAS plan to the Provost and his colleagues on a number of occasions, and also endeavored to incorporate the feedback I received during these meetings in revising the original plan. To protect against a potential "shortfall" in savings anticipated from departures of faculty, an additional \$392K "buffer" was incorporated into our revised plan.

On Monday, Feb. 11, I presented our final plan to the Provost. In my judgment, this final revised plan represented the best approach for dealing with a difficult budget scenario and would have left the CAS in the best possible situation for the new dean when s/he takes office [not later than July 1, 2002].

As a reminder of some of the elements of our budget savings plan, it included reducing the number of new faculty hires from the 27 searches originally authorized in August 2001 to the 11 which we considered to be of highest priority, reduction in TAGA lines, very severe reductions in the Supplemental Instructional Budget [SIB], and in various "other" savings; these latter include "taxing" certain departments for 2002/03 in amounts ranging up to \$300,000 [incidentally, these taxed departments all agreed to this levy yesterday, despite the impact such a tax would have on their academic programs].

Having been immersed in this strategic budget process for most of the past two to three months, I am disappointed to have to report to you that the Provost has decided NOT to accept my plan for the CAS budget savings. At our meeting this morning, he informed me of his final decision on our budget proposal: the most significant and dramatic consequence is that he has instructed me to terminate all searches for new tenure-track faculty in CAS, effective immediately. If any new faculty are hired for Fall 2002, these hires will result from institutional decisions of the academic leadership above the level of the College of Arts & Sciences. In other words, if any faculty are hired, it will only be on the basis of decisions of the Provost and the President as part of institutional initiatives.

In the context of the Provost's decision on faculty hiring in CAS, I will be scaling down the budget cuts in the other categories described above. These include the SIB ["adjunct" monies], TAGA allocations, and the other savings in our original plan.

I will be informing you of the details of these modified cuts by the end of this week.

I fully expect this topic to be the major issue under discussion at our Chairs and Directors meeting at 12:30 PM today, and have therefore cancelled the scheduled presentations by Lorne Mendell and Judy Segall.

Best regards,
Bob

February 16, 2002

Professor Peter Manning, Chair
Department of English

Dear Peter,

This is in response to your e-mail of 2/13 on behalf of the CAS chairs.

Let me first characterize some of what has been happening. The forecast from SUNY is that we should expect of the order of 5% budget reduction for the fiscal year beginning July 1st. The actual number is not yet clear because the state budget isn't known, but also because it is still somewhat unclear in detail how SUNY will allocate to individual campuses. As a prudent business approach the president has directed all vice presidential areas to develop a plan for achieving 5% reduction in expenditures compared to base expenditures this year.

I in turn have had a number of meetings with unit directors in the academic sector about how this will be accomplished. My basic approach is to require all units to have a 5% reduction. On the other hand, there is general agreement amongst the group of deans and directors of large units that priority needs must be funded even in the face of a budget reduction. One example of a need like this is the teacher education program where it is clear that not hiring next year would jeopardize our plan to achieve the state-required NCATE accreditation by 2004. Another need in this category is delivering on certain grant matching requirements.

We are also going forward on the second stage of our program to improve salaries for individuals according to their integrated contributions to the university missions. Just to be clear, the money to fund these salary increases comes from the president's monies and so has nothing directly to do with managing the budget cut in the provostial area. It is simply another reminder of how the university manages budgets for priority needs even when things take a downturn.

Somewhere in this budget reduction planning process (it started well before the holidays) it became clear that the cost of maintaining the expanded and enhanced graduate TA enterprise developed over these last two years would have to be taken out of the provostial base budget next year. This year the president supported the cost of this activity with one-time monies at about \$1.7 million. [For orientation, this is about 1.7% of my all-funds provostial budget.] During the discussions of the deans and directors of large units there developed a consensus view that the enhanced graduate program support package should continue even in the face of a budget cut. I agree, and note that this approach is different than what has happened in the past in the face of budget cuts where TA lines (in those days we weren't supplementing stipends) were amongst the first to go.

I go through all this just to suggest how some of the issues have played out during this period. All unit heads have naturally had a difficult time in figuring out how they will do the required savings while doing more instruction and other activities. Certainly Bob Liebermann, as interim

dean, had a tough task in developing a plan to find about \$2.5 million in spending reductions for the next year for CAS. His plan evolved over time. For example early versions included significant cuts in TA lines. The version he and I discussed last Wednesday consisted of a mix of savings predicated on the assumption of \$3 million of cost reductions coming from a combination of unpaid leaves and resignations. The plan also had about a \$400 thousand "cushion" that I had asked for because of the intrinsic uncertainty in the \$3 million expectation. I am sure Bob has presented the details of his plan to you and your colleagues so I won't belabor them here. In his plan there are "taxes" to a subset of departments, reductions in the supplemental instruction budget, and the number of faculty hires would go down to no more than 11 (compared to the 27 faculty searches Bob authorized last August).

Circa last Wednesday, the major point of contention between Bob and me was that I wanted to see a smaller number of faculty hires... somewhere in the range 5 or 6... instead of 11. Let me explain why I took this more conservative approach on hires. First, we are in the process of identifying new long-term leadership for the college. Extra monies will be required in the event an external candidate is appointed. Second, the new dean whomever s/he is needs to inherit a structure with at least some flexibility to do things already on day one. Third, most people would agree the college is operating with too little flexible money to realize its potentials and to be able to evolve new forward-looking structures; additional taxes obviously have an adverse effect here. Finally, my overall provostial plan for next year leaves me little flexibility to act on the inevitable situations that come up without notice such as retention counter offers. This is the thinking that led me to wanting even fewer faculty hires for this next year than Bob. You have heard his take on the situation at the chairs' meeting later that day.

OK, enough history. Let me try to answer your specific questions and then propose how we might move forward. I have not yet had a chance to discuss this with Bob, but then he encouraged me to read and respond to you as quickly as possible. I have discussed this with the president and on the basis of her advice have moved to a slightly less conservative position ^a a few days ago!

The president's diversity initiative and also her "stars" program remain in place. You may not know that already she has funded one diversity hire for next year. An offer for a second person was authorized some time ago jointly by her office and mine. Because quick action was needed, it was not resolved whether this might also be considered a diversity pool hire. The President and I are also discussing proposals from Music in the context of the stars program

Clearly we must do some hires. I hope that the interim dean will continue working with his chairs to figure out how to hire the best set of new colleagues. I am now comfortable with a target number of eight for CAS. This is still a small number, certainly not one to sustain the quality of CAS in the long run, but under the circumstances it makes sense to me.

It will be essential for Bob and I to work together in the next months to make sure we use developing news about factors such as unpaid leaves/departures and next year's state budget to minimize the impact of the reduction on the College and academic sector as a whole.

I hope you find this letter helpful. Especially because all of this is happening in “real time” in the midst of recruiting season, please know I’ll respond as quickly as possible on questions or actions.

Bob

Xc: Robert Liebermann
Shirley Kenny

