

Approved* Minutes of the
Faculty Senate Meeting
13 April 2004
HH 119

Senators present:, Curtin, Diriker, Hopson, Hutchinson, Long, , McDermott, McCallops, McKenzie, Muller, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Parker, Pereboom, Rotondo, Rieck

Senators absent: Marshall, Mathews, Shannon

1. David Rieck called the Senate to order at 3:34. A quorum was not present.
2. David had several brief announcements:
 - A. He urged everyone to vote in the school-wide faculty elections.
 - B. He noted that the at-large elections will include referenda on several by-laws proposals.
 - C. Memo Diriker is the designated senator to the committee to look into evaluating administrators. Harry Womack also serves. Others are needed.
 - D. The report concerning the bookstore will be coming out very soon.
 - E. The document concerning the Chairs' Roles and Responsibilities will be coming back to us again.
 - F. Hopefully we will not meet on 20 April but will rather meet again on 27 April.
3. Dave Buchanan had several announcements.
 - A. The details for our budget remain unclear, but we'll learn more soon.
 - B. We will apparently be able to create PIN positions (real state jobs) without external approval, thus providing us more flexibility.
 - C. The capping of tuition increases, although tied to additional appropriations from the state, could be a problem for us.
 - D. Kent Kimmel is retiring at the end of December, and a position was circulated earlier in the afternoon by e-mail.
 - E. The Associate Dean positions in the Fulton, Henson, and Seidel Schools are also being resurrected.
4. David Rieck noted that a quorum was present.
5. The draft minutes of the 16 March meeting were approved,
6. BriAnn Tombetta, SGA President, and several of her officers gave a presentation explaining the "Pick-A-Prof" site. The SGA is considering using its funds to join. There were several questions from those present, but we did not take any action on this item.
7. Diane Davis and Jim McCallops presented information about New Student Orientation. Diane explained that she plans to pilot orientation material in three sections this fall, one each in PHIL 101, BIOL 101 Lab, and HIST 101. There were numerous questions, but there will be no loss of academic rigor in the three sections, and this is just an attempt to

see whether this approach will work better than the six-week orientation classes which we now offer. We can expect to hear how well this worked after the conclusion of the fall semester.

8. Dave Parker read a report concerning the first meeting of the PeopleSoft Academic Advisory Committee, renamed the SU Product Academic Advisory Committee. The text of his remarks are appended to these minutes. Jerry Waldron had several comments in response.
9. It was moved, seconded, and passed (13-0) that the following bylaws for the Long Range Academic Planning Committee be submitted to the faculty for referendum during the upcoming elections. (This committee is an ad-hoc committee at the present time.)

Section 14. Long - Range Academic Planning Committee

The Long-Range Academic Planning Committee exists to represent all academic and faculty perspectives pertinent to the strategic planning processes of Salisbury University.

The purposes of the Committee shall be to:

- A. Study trends in higher education in order to appraise the programs of Salisbury University.
- ~~B. C.~~ Assess the resources of the University to meet the needs identified.
- C. Regularly seek input from various academic and administrative units, departments, stakeholders, and opinion leaders on campus to inform its deliberations.**
- ~~D. B.~~ **Define Provide input for** the mission of the University in terms of the constituency it serves particularly from the standpoint of curricular offerings both undergraduate and graduate.
- ~~E. D.~~ **Recommend Provide input for** programmatic changes consistent with changing enrollment patterns and/or the educational mission of the institution.

The Committee shall consist of the Provost or his/her designee (ex officio and non-voting) ~~the Chairperson of the University Curriculum Committee the Director of Institutional Research the Director of Career Services one student appointed by the Student Government~~

~~Association (all ex-officio and voting)~~ and five representatives elected from the Faculty: one from each of the four Schools and one at-large serving two-year staggered terms. **Should an elected faculty member not be the Designated Senator, a non-voting Designated Senator shall also serve on the committee. The Provost or his/her designee shall serve as Chairperson. The committee shall elect a chairperson for the academic year at its first meeting convened by the outgoing chairperson.**

10. Memo asked that the committee looking into the evaluation of administrators be expanded to include additional faculty, in particular from the Seidel and Fulton Schools.
11. David Rieck adjourned the meeting just after 4:30 pm.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is tentatively scheduled for 27 April.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Parker, Secretary

*Minutes approved at the 27 April 2004 Meeting of the Faculty Senate

The Appended: Report noted above under Item 8 begins on the next pages.

*Report to the Faculty Senate
by Dave Parker
13 April 2004*

First meeting of the SU Product¹ Academic Advisory Group
(Originally designated the “PeopleSoft Academic Advisory Group”)
Held 15 March 2004, 2:00 pm - 4:00 pm, in the President’s Conference Room

Faculty:

Charles Cipolla,, Chair, Sociology
Mike Folkoff, Chair, Geography
Dave Parker, Faculty Senator
Denise Rotondo, Associate Dean, Perdue School
Carol Wood, Chair, Health, Physical Education, and Human Performance

Departmental Secretaries:

Linda Abresch, Administrative Assistant, Mathematics and Computer Science
Michelle Nelson, Administrative Assistant, Perdue School
Flannery O’Rourke, Administrative Assistant, Social Work
Debra Truit, Administrative Assistant, Psychology

Advising Coordinator:

Lee Townsend, Advising Coordinator, Perdue School

Administrators:

Jerry Waldron, Chief Information Officer
Sandy Cohea-Weible, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Jane Dané, Dean of Enrollment Management and Acting Registrar

Note: As appears in the Faculty Senate minutes of 9 December 2003, the Provost agreed to form this committee upon the recommendation of the Learning Technology Committee and the officers of the Faculty Senate.

Sandy called the meeting to order and presided. After everyone was introduced, we began presenting a variety of PeopleSoft issues. Of primary concern to the faculty, to the departmental secretaries, and to the advising coordinator were the numerous ways in which the current version of PeopleSoft has failed to smoothly integrate into the normal functioning of academic departments, most notably PeopleSoft’s inability to expeditiously service student’s academic concerns during the time of the semester when students’ demands are greatest. Various individuals also noted other specific problems, including: 1) the incredible amount of time required to input class schedules, 2) the incomplete and inadequate information provided on class rosters, 3) the inability of users to create their own reports, and 4) the need to enter the same data

¹ The “SU Product” is apparently PeopleSoft’s designation for our unique implementation.

repeatedly when moving through different PeopleSoft functions.

In my view, the meeting revealed that there was a surprising disparity between the administration's view of PeopleSoft operations and that of the individuals using the product. In large measure we were told that the modifications to academic operations that we requested were not warranted and somewhat unrealistic. Moreover these changes would require time, personnel, and money and all three of these were in short supply. (For example, why can't we create a means for department secretaries to prepare the schedules in Excel and upload their finished work into PeopleSoft, thereby saving several days of effort? Answer: This "fix" will *probably* no longer be needed after SU implements the next version of PeopleSoft, so a year from January this will *perhaps* no longer be a problem. Thus if they fixed it now, they would *probably* have to fix it again later, although it could take several registrations to effect this implementation.) In addition, so many problems had been noted by the Learning Technology Committee that it was impossible to decide which problems to address first.

When I presented a variety of issues of immediate concern to the faculty, one individual reacted as if my comments were a personal attack. This left most of the other participants feeling very uneasy and uncomfortable with the proceedings. When others explained their PeopleSoft problems, the administrators acknowledged that some problems existed, but their response was to counter with examples of areas in which PeopleSoft excelled. I was grateful I had to leave the meeting at 3:30. I had largely wasted my time for ninety minutes. It may also be that the administrators at the meeting felt the same way. Obviously, what's needed for this committee to succeed is for all involved to clear the air so that communication can be re-established and so that meaningful discussion can take place.

Jerry did concede that there are problems, but that the best solution was for IT to continue to actively participate in PeopleSoft user-groups and list-serves with PeopleSoft and with other institutions from around the country. If someone has already solved a particular problem, we could possibly also use it. Or, if enough people have the same problem, PeopleSoft might address it and provide a solution. Unfortunately neither approach provides us with a timely solution to any of our immediate problems, and this means that, as a direct consequence of using PeopleSoft, either

- 1) faculty and staff will radically change the way we interact with students by eliminating or reducing some services we have long provided, or

- 2) faculty and staff will devote considerably more time to the student-related tasks they have long performed.

The meeting did end on a positive note, suggesting there are some constructive possibilities. Sandra requested that each participant submit to her our five most pressing PeopleSoft problems. These will be reviewed and responded to at a later meeting. This is an excellent first step. The Faculty Senate asked that this committee be formed to provide precisely that input, and it may happen as a result of Sandy's request. However my impression from this meeting is that Jerry and Jane were overwhelmed and not able to help with the faculty and

departmental PeopleSoft problems at the present time. Thus, in spite of Sandy's efforts, this meeting of the committee totally failed to meet the purpose for which we requested it be formed.

Conclusion and Recommendation:

If the next meeting of this committee fails to begin resolving the major faculty and departmental PeopleSoft concerns, I will recommend that the Faculty Senate abandon this committee and find another means by which we address our PeopleSoft difficulties. However, it is only appropriate that we see how the solicitation and compilation of our most pressing concerns is reflected in actions before we take that step. Consequently I will attend the next meeting of the committee, and I will remain at the meeting as long as I feel my participation is both meaningful and worthwhile. I will report to the Faculty Senate again after that meeting. I truly hope my report at that time is more positive than is this one.