

Merrick School of Business Faculty Senate

Minutes - November 22, 2002

Steve Isberg opposed the cloture measure limiting faculty to two discussion opportunities of no more than two minutes each.

A vote was held with 10 in favor of the measure and 9 opposed.

The minutes of the October 18, 2002 minutes were approved, with one correction; Veena Adlakha was present at that meeting.

Alan Randolph requested that an item be added to the agenda. The item is a request for an update of progress on the strategic planning process.

Dean's Comments

Anne McCarthy provided an overview of the strategic planning process. She noted that a team of consultants were on campus and outlined the process they would follow. There would be a four-stage process of fact finding and reports. Stage one is the focus group stage that should be completed by December.

Anne noted that President Bogomolny directed the effort with a commitment to implement the findings.

Anne noted that none of our academic programs is currently profitable. She promised to share a report on the profitability of each of the MSB educational programs with the faculty.

Faculty business

Twenty-eight voting members of the faculty were present. Lourdes White and Al Bento were elected to replace Dick Adams and Danielle Fowler on the Curriculum Committee. Pete Lynaugh and Steve Isberg were elected to replace Susan Zacur and Marilyn Oblak on the Academic Policy & Review Committee.

Division Director Comments

Each of the Division Directors commented on the PFP and AFPR.

Phil Korb commented on the importance of refereed vs non-refereed journals in the PFP.

Marilyn Oblak provided history to the efforts to revise the documents. The president and dean brought energy and haste in making changes. Their objectives are to make something positive happen.

Marilyn views the AFPR and PFP as a way of redefining what we are. The process is grounded in history. Setting weights for evaluation defines what we value. Bob's zero weight for service has some appeal because it is part of our daily life and should be part of our personal values. However, the details of service have to be worked out.

She noted that PFP weight setting is critical.

Jim Dutt echoed Marilyn's comments and added concern for the continued evolutionary changes make it a moving target difficult to hit. For example the changes in what 10% service means for us. He commented on the inflexibility of a portfolio, and mentioned that the evaluation of each faculty to be shared among the division directors is contrary to the faculty handbook.

Mike Laric made complementary comments about the opportunity the mandated changes present. He noted that 90% of the PFP process should be done during the year to insure that people know what is expected.

He also emphasized that the changes in service really mean that what counted for 20% last year will only count for 10% this year.

Faculty comments

Several faculty asked why the changes in the portfolio weights are necessary. Another comment stressed the importance of setting priorities to support the school's mission. The challenge is to match support with expectations.

Another faculty concern is the question, "What will insure our future survival and growth?" The answer given was enrollment management and accreditation are most important. Increasing enrollment does not mean publishing in first tier journals.

Faculty are concerned with a cookie-cutter evaluation approach. Several expressed the need to manage performance as a team to manage teaching, research and service goals. The approach would be flexible and maximize the school's achievement while capitalizing on individuals' strengths.

Dan Gerlowski noted that the AACSB reaccreditation process will emphasize more intellectual contributions. The vision to do research as a job expectation will make MSB look better in the process. The 30% research / 10% service ratio is driven from the top – i.e. Bob and Anne.

Alan Randolph noted that leadership and outcomes in service should be rewarded. That sparked a discussion that ‘outcomes’ will be the measure of importance with each area.

The faculty senate asked the president to forward the following concerns and recommendations to the Dean for consideration and possible action:

Concerns based on a Unanimous Vote of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty's primary concerns for survival and success of the Merrick School are:

1) enrollment management; and 2) AACSB re-accreditation.

Recommendations based on a Unanimous Vote of the Faculty Senate

- The University's mission and strategic plan need to be determined before Planned Faculty Portfolio (PFP) policies are finalized. In this way, teaching, research, and service portfolios will be consistent with the institution's goals.

The Faculty understands that we must have a draft set of PFP policies to be followed while we are developing UB's strategic plan; however, we wish to know that the PFP policies will be revised to fit the strategic plan once we have one.

- The final PFP policies need to be determined before the Annual Faculty Performance Review (AFPR) policies are finalized. In this way, faculty will make their annual plans with full understanding of the consequences.

The Faculty understands that we must have a draft set of AFPR policies to be followed while we are developing UB's strategic plan and final PFP policies; however, we wish to know that AFPR policies will be revised to fit the strategic plan and final PFP policies.

A sensible process looks like this:

Mission and Strategic Plan $\Rightarrow$ final PFP policies $\Rightarrow$ final AFPR policies

- Faculty members require additional support to enable them to achieve new standards in teaching, research, and service.
- Faculty Portfolio percentages for teaching, research, and service require flexibility, rather than having fixed percentages for each category to which all faculty members must adhere. Ultimately, what matters is that the faculty as a whole sustains a profile of quality and quantity in teaching, research, and

service. Therefore, individual faculty member's portfolios can be customized, provided that as a whole the desired institutional outcomes are achieved.

- We are struggling to understand AACSB research requirements that are consistent with the Merrick School's mission. By unanimous vote, we request that a research "Gap" analysis be conducted to provide us with the following information:
 1. What is the acceptable level of research required for AACSB re-accreditation?
 2. Where are we now?
 3. What is our plan to close the "Gap"?
- We recommend clarification of the process and standards for promotion.
- For non-tenured assistant professors, we recommend formalizing PFP policies and guidelines to create a clear understanding of percentage weights assigned to teaching, research, and service.
- We recommend that measures and processes established to evaluate the relative quality of faculty performance in teaching, research, and service be reassessed to insure they yield valid and reliable results. (The Faculty Senate President will add this as an agenda item to the December Faculty Senate meeting.)

Recommendation forwarded to the Dean based on a Majority Vote of the Faculty Senate

- By majority vote, the Faculty recommends that the "tiered activity structure" table on page 6 of the draft AFPR be deleted. Instead, the faculty proposes use of the "general ranking of publication outlets" on page 5, with one addition to "2nd Tier", i.e., a new bullet specifying "Other refereed publications".

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 pm.

Attendance of MSB Faculty Senate Meeting November 22, 2002

Acs, Zoltan	
Adams, Richard	
Adlakha, Veena	In attendance
Aggarwal, Anil	In attendance
Andrea, George	
Arsham, Hossein	
Benrud, Erik	
Bento, Albert	
Bento, Regina	In attendance
Bowers, Mollie	
Brownstein, Barry	In attendance
Chen, Honghui	
Choudhry, Yusef	
DeChant, David	
Dutt, James	In attendance
Ford, Deborah	
Fowler, Danielle	
Fritsche, Steve	In attendance
Gerlowski, Daniel	In attendance
Herron, Lanny	
Isberg, Steven	In attendance
Jenkins, Milton	
Kemery, Edward	In attendance
Korb, Phil	In attendance
Laric, Michael	In attendance
Levy, David	
Luchsinger, Vince	In attendance
Lynagh, Peter	In attendance
Lynn, Susan	
McCarthy, Anne	In attendance

Mersha, Tigineh	In attendance
Milbourn, Eugene	In attendance
Mirani, Rajesh	
Molly, Jaya	
Morse, Joel	In attendance
Nielsen, Christine	In attendance
Oblak, Marilyn	In attendance
Otto, James	In attendance
Parham, Wayne	
Pitta, Dennis	In attendance
Popjoy, Oveta	In attendance
Randolph, Alan	In attendance
Richardson, Lee	In attendance
Robinson-Backmon, Ida	
Rollier, Bruce	In attendance
Sawhney, Bansi	In attendance
Schrenk, Lawrence	
Sigler, John	In attendance
Singhal, Jaya	
Singhal, Kal	
Sriram, Ven	
Stanton, Kenneth	In attendance
Stevens, David	
Stiff, Ronald	
Trotter, Richard	In attendance
Vemuganti, Rao	In attendance
Vermeer, Thomas	
White, Lourdes	In attendance
Weiss, John	
Zacur, Susan	

