**UFS Draft (1/14/15 Version)  
January 14, 2015, SC Bogomolny Room  
11:30 Lunch  
12:00-2:00 Meeting**

Please note that each agenda item has an indicated number of minutes associated with it. For example if a [5] appears, the agenda calls for 5 minutes on a particular item. Please also note that documents either posted on the UFS Sakai Site or those intended for posting on Sakai are marked [Sakai]. We ask, of course, that everyone prepares for the meeting adequately with thoughts ready on agenda items and also that we do our best to be parsimonious in our comments while respecting everyone’s right to speak. Naturally communication outside of the meeting is encouraged to make each of us better prepared. The UFS, at the discretion of the Executive Committee reserves the right to schedule a follow up meeting two weeks hence 1/28/15 to complete discussions and actions of agenda items not addressed at this meeting.

1. Logistical and necessary items [5]
   1. Approval of minutes from December 4, 2014. [**Saka**i]
   2. Approval of January 14, 2015 agenda
2. President’s Update [10]
   1. Enrollment levels Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 absolute and relative to expectations
   2. Evolving Budget expectations this year
   3. Other items?
3. Provost’s Update [10]
   1. Overload/Overtime Issues
      1. Staff related
      2. Faculty related
   2. Provost Office Personnel Changes
   3. Provost Office Retreat
   4. MSCHE update – details?
   5. UFS consideration of policy creating admission consideration of students from local Rabbinical Colleges with national accreditations. Current policy precludes our consideration of these students in the admission process. Draft from Provost Office, forthcoming.
   6. UFS consideration of establishing a policy on awarding of posthumous degrees. Draft from Provost Office, forthcoming.
   7. Introduction of idea regarding a peer based council to help in resolving student complaints in online classes. Practices used in face-to-face courses are not generally applicable because of instructor only access to online courses.
4. Adjunct Faculty Advisory Council – Bucher [10]
5. Updates of general faculty concern
   1. OTS Cloud migration update [Sakai]
   2. Flyer regarding Title IX compliance efforts on campus [Sakai]
6. SEPSC Report – Pfeiffer [10]
   1. Please note 2 handouts. One shows the “format” of the report SEPSC will write regarding University’s Enrollment Strategy, the other is a set of questions asked of SEPSC by the UFS Executive Committee. [Sakai]
7. Update on Title IX activities – brief report from Anita Harewood read into minutes. Anita informed UFS Executive Committee that more information is likely to be available following a meeting/conference call on Tuesday 1/13/15. [10]
8. UFS/ APC – **Action Item [10]**
   1. In December the UFS approved and passed onto the Provost and President a new policy requiring each undergraduate student matriculating to UB to attend an orientation. The UFS Executive Committee requests approval of a motion charging the UFS/APC with determining the academic content or portion of that required orientation. In this work the UFS/APC is asked to consult with on campus experts, particularly Dr. Cheryl Wilson to incorporate prior findings and expertise on student success. The UFS/APC is also encouraged to look at best practices at other universities with missions similar to UB’s.
9. Discussion UFS resolutions sent to President Schmoke and Provost Wood, December 2014. [15]
   1. We are thankful for the consideration and thoughtful response of President Schmoke regarding our resolution related to the staffing issues facing EMSA and the UFS was pleased the Miriam King was so helpful to UFS in framing that resolution at our December meeting. A response to President Schmoke is suggested by the UFS/Executive Committee as:  
      President Schmoke, thank you for your kind and thoughtful reply to our resolution regarding EMSA staffing and the University’s ability to meet enrollment goals. We wanted to be sure that you understood our concerns in particular regarding the continuity of staffing, or the observed staff turnover in that area. To the extent that faculty, through their roles as program directors, department chairs, etc. interact with EMSA there is concern that contacts and assignments of EMSA staff seem to shift over time in a way that does not facilitate constancy and familiarity.
   2. The UFS would like to thank Provost Wood for his response on behalf of the administration regarding our resolution regarding the UFS role in program recommendations for approval. A response to Provost Wood is suggested by the UFS/Executive Committee as:  
      Provost Wood, thank you for the reply outlining the steps the university takes and the compliance with USM and BOR policies in considering new programs. The UFS will continue its efforts to update our by-laws setting forth criteria regarding: the level of market support from the university for its new proposed programs, the likelihood of program duplication or cannibalization of existing academic programs, and the available intellectual capital of full time faculty to support both new and continuing programs as they are proposed. Naturally we will also consider the proposed program’s strategic fit with overall University Strategic Enrollment Goals as developed in a meaningful interaction between governance and administration. We know we can count on the counsel and support of your office in our endeavors.
10. UFS resolution on budgetary priorities – drafted by UFS Executive Committee [20]
    1. Draft Statement:   
       In advance of budget cuts we reaffirm that the central mission of the university is education. We recommend a prioritization of budget cuts with the highest priority being the preservation of faculty and other personnel that deal directly with students. As a result of looming budget cuts we recommend that a critical analysis be completed of the breadth of upper level non-teaching and -student support positions; by and large these positions are considered centralized in budgetary terms. We must preserve the integrity of the mission of the university.
    2. Background:   
       Over the past several years the University Faculty Senate has consistently argued for stronger support from the University regarding our central mission. During the 2000’s as the University grew, the University Faculty Senate noted that resources dedicated to directly supporting our students in the classroom grew, but did so at a much slower rate than general university expenditures. These concerns fed through the University governance system and resulted in the work of the President’s University Budget Task Force. That report issued in early 2013 stopped short of achieving a consensus regarding the appropriate mix of academic and non-academic resources needed given our mission and our students. Appendix 2 of that report is attached as background. [Sakai] It is particularly worth noting that despite internal requests, past analysis of trends relied on publicly available data – “Governor’s Proposed Operating Budgets.”  
         
       There were in the most recent several years faculty hires and the Provost has regularly reported net growth in faculty lines across the university. A similar report on net growth of centralized non-student facing positions was never forthcoming.   
         
       There is a very real fear that several lean budget years will lead the University’s leadership team to give less than a deserved priority to the need to maintain a strong, core faculty. Several faculty leaders also would welcome a certain amount of resource shifting from the executive level to the operational or student facing front of the university.

Dates for Future Consideration