

Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
Sept. 11, 2007
HH 119

Senators present –Clarke, Curtin, Gilkey, Hammond, Hopson, Khazeh, Lawler, Ludwick, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Rieck, Ritenour, Robinson, Scott, Shannon, Shipper, Zaprowski

Senators absent – Diriker

1. Pres. Curtin called the meeting to order at 3:34; a quorum was present.
2. Pres. Curtin welcomed the senators and visitors and the senators each introduced themselves.
3. Minutes – The minutes from May 8 were accepted with one correction (Sen. Ritenour was not present). The minutes from May 15 were accepted as written.
4. Announcements from Pres. Curtin. She asked for senators' help in encouraging involvement of more faculty in campus governance, particularly serving on senate committees and as senators; communication is the key. Along those lines, she will try to send the senate agendas out a week before the meetings. Senators are asked to submit motions, etc. they plan to bring before the senate to her in writing at least a week before the meeting. Current problems communicating with the Forum, so far no decision on a president (who needs to come from the staff senate this year). Membership and Nominations Committee has filled the 4 one-semester vacancies on committees (from 21 volunteers) and next will send out a request for nominations for other vacancies and hold elections soon after that. Jo Laird reminded of a need for an additional faculty rep on the Fiscal Advisory Committee. Sen. Shipper expressed concern about bureaucracy, such as the overlap between Fiscal Advisory (Forum) & Senate Finance Committees. Pres. Curtin agreed; we should constantly look at overlap between committees & unnecessary committees and consider eliminating.
5. A word from the Administration – Tom Jones thanked senators for their service, indicated that this will be a very interesting year and mentioned that he plans to work closely with the senate and senate officers. He will try to keep us informed as best as possible, but some things need to be dealt with in a short time frame. Enrollment & Budget - together "the Big One" for this coming year.
 - a. Enrollment - This year, our projected increase was dropped from 300 to 150 FTES. We surpassed the 150, which is good because 1) we often lose some students from fall to spring (& the USM directive is for an increase of 150 for the year) and although our FTES are high our headcount is low (and MHEC uses headcount). Also, 2) we get additional tuition dollars from those students and should also get enhancement money from the state for them. Next year – system is currently saying our increase will be 300 FTES, although that may change. Such a degree of uncertainty makes it difficult for Enrollment Management to recruit and for hiring of new faculty. Most of the increase will be freshmen.
 - b. Budget – FY 2008 – we had to give back \$418,000 from our budget to state and we lost \$244,000 (when the state decreased the enhancement money from \$5,500

to \$3,900 per student). At this point no one is talking about giving back again this year. But the governor's office has notified USM that it may be getting a cut anywhere from \$20 to 60 million in AY 2008-09. (That translates into between \$700, 000 and \$2.1 million cut to us). Exec staff has been directed to come up with plans for handling those cuts. A cut of \$700,000, could be met without direct cuts to academics, through indirect cuts - including delays in filling staff vacancies, not replenishing cars in the fleet, etc. A cut of \$60 million to the system, would mean a cut of \$2.1 million to us and would affect academics, with a cut in the number of FTNTT faculty. We need to prove to the Governor and Legislature that such a cut to the comprehensives would affect the quality of higher education in the state. Chancellor thinks the Gov, is unlikely to risk that. At same time, system is said to have another plan in case none of this happens and we get our regular base budget, the enhancement for the additional students and also money from a special enhancement fund – which has \$875,000 ear-marked for us. This enhancement money is for academics, including retention. The Chancellor's priorities in this area are 1) narrowing the achievement gap between socioeconomic groups, 2) work force development – especially secondary ed teachers in science and math (STEM) and 3) climate change (combining academics and physical things on campus).

- c. Salary enhancement – had hoped for \$2-3K this year, but only had \$100,000 for faculty adjustments and \$50,000 for exempt staff (due to drawback of funds by state). Worked with deans and chairs for faculty adjustments; first tried to get all Asst. profs at or above the level of new hires (took \$53K). Used the remaining \$47K to try to correct for salary compression and bring closer to AAUP levels. President & Provost are committed to continuing this next year.
- d. Sabbaticals - wants to work with Faculty Welfare Committee on this. This year there were more applications than average (so more had to be denied than in past). With the number of new hires, the number will only increase and one semester sabbaticals are expensive. Need to project ahead to get a better handle on the number to expect, encourage faculty to work more closely with chairs & deans, and/or perhaps set a quota, entice faculty to apply for year long sabbaticals. We may need to get away from the scenario when all faculty expect to get a sabbatical after 6 years. Sen. Zaprowski asked whether as an alternative, a program of approved part-time release (mini-downloads) to work on projects would be attractive to some faculty. Tom will make appointment to meet with FWC through designated Sen. Khazeh.
- e. Strategic planning process – was discussed at an Executive Staff retreat last week. Pres. Wants to have an across campus group involved, but faculty will take the lead. Our current plan will continue through Fall 08, to give us time. Amy Hassan will come up with a time line and steering committee will put together focus groups this fall. At the same time, a group working with Noel Levitz on Enrollment Strategies will be drafting their plan. The two plans will be combined in late spring and a (paid) task force will work over summer on the final plan to be presented to governance bodies in fall. The goal is a focused, workable plan, not one as general as the current plan.

- f. Gen Ed Transition plan – a group working with UCC is close to finishing a plan to help advise students on Gen Ed during this transition period. Should be released to faculty soon.
 - g. Concerned about the curricular review process – to streamline it, have less paperwork, coordinate better with TEC.
 - h. Also concerned with the seats in Gen Ed and trying to figure if we'll have enough when new curriculum goes into effect.
 - i. Service – Dr. Jones met with the Senate officers and is considering ways to encourage service – perhaps providing clerical assistance to some committees with heavy work loads (could include web stuff), perhaps in the form of dollars.
6. New Business
- a. Charges to designated senators – If committees haven't already met and elected a chair, the designated senator (posted on web) should call a meeting, at which the chair will be elected, and report back to the Senate Pres & Webmaster before Sept. 25. If a committee has some specific issues on the agenda for the coming year, those should be sent to Elizabeth by the end of Sept. If a committee has no issues on its agenda, members should consider whether it is really needed. With regard to the Forum's Fiscal Advisory Committee, perhaps the senate rep can be from the new Senate Financial Affairs Committee (once it is approved).
 - b. Long Range Academic Planning Committee – Designated Sen. Hopson should inform the LRAPC that it has been given the charge of "jump starting" the strategic planning process. They or reps from the committee will be on the Strategic Planning Executive Committee.
 - c. Proposed By-laws for the new Academic Assessment Committee – by-laws were submitted by the Ad hoc committee, but they need to be in the format of the other senate committees. Also, some items differ with approved senate procedures (for instance, making recommendations to the senate and Provost). Need to be sent back to the committee, but many of the members are no longer on it or available. Senate officers will edit and bring back changes by next meeting. (Do we need a made for a Rules committee?). It would be good if these changes could be made before the final election this fall.
7. Other business - Sen. Khazeh expressed concern that a large percentage of the senators and senate officers are dept. chairs, program directors or Assoc. deans, particularly in light of recent changes in compensation to chairs. Sen. Mullins objected to springing this topic on the senate, but Khazeh said this was advance notice that he is considering submitting a motion for a By-laws change. Others mentioned that this highlights the need for more faculty involved in service; that the same type of people that are willing to step up and be chair also step up to be a senator; and that the most recent change to chair's compensation discourages chairs to serve for more than 6 years.
8. Meeting adjourned at 4:53 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary