

DRAFT

SU Faculty Senate Meeting 12 October 2004 HH 119

Senators present: Groth, Hopson, Howard, Matthews, McDermott, Morrison, Muller, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Parker, Pereboom, Shannon, Venso, Whaley

Senators absent: DeRidder, Diriker, McKenzie, Rieck,

0. Mike O'Loughlin called the Senate to order at 3:31 pm. A quorum was not yet present.
1. Mike had two brief announcements:
 - A. The last meeting of the semester will (tentatively) be on 7 December rather than on 14 December.
 - B. Ron Dotterer will attend the next meeting to discuss our Middle States Review. There will be an open meeting to discuss Middle States on 14 October in HH 243.
2. Dave Buchanan had no announcements. In response to a question he said he would prepare a statement concerning whether or not faculty really have contracts. Additional questions followed concerning the period faculty are actually "under contract." How accessible must faculty be during that period? Why can't people submitting grants have 9-month contracts in order to increase the amount of salary paid by the grants? He agreed to address all of these issues as soon as possible.
3. Mike announced that a quorum was present, and he welcomed the President to your meeting.
4. Janet had several announcements and responded to a number of questions.
 - A. The President's Advisory Team met that morning. A "dip" in SAT scores among entering students was observed, both at SU and throughout the System.
 - B. Fund-raising: It is vital that we increase scholarship funds for our students. We are actively engaged in fund-raising. Planned giving is expected to provide \$10 million upon the deaths of the donors. There is a major \$7 million gift which she hopes to be able to announce soon. Our fund-raising goal is \$30 million, a conservative target.
 - C. She addressed the faculty workload and teaching load issues being discussed within the System. She expressed concern that there isn't much we can do in the present climate. The Regents want more faculty productivity, and we can probably accomplish what they expect without major changes.
 - D. She is chairing the Middle-States Team doing the College of New Jersey's ten-year reaccreditation review. CNJ is one of our aspirational peers. She challenged the Senate to consider some of that institution's policies. In particular CNJ changed from a credit-hour approach to faculty and student loads and instituted a three-course per semester faculty load. Rather than complete 120 credit hours,

students must complete a specified number of courses. She also noted that we should examine the tuition model used by Miami of Ohio. Finally she proposed that SU establish a study group to see if the CNJ policies could be adopted here. Perhaps the group could visit CNJ. How did they effect the change? How satisfied are they with the results? Should we consider doing the same? What would be the costs and benefits? Are there other models which we could adopt? The officers of the Senate agreed to immediately consider her proposal, and they will bring this matter back to the Senate as soon as possible.

- E. Finally, she pointed out the Chivas Regal effect: If we raise tuition we appear to be better, and we can discount the price of attendance by offering most students “scholarships.” We have been losing good students to other institutions whose tuition amounts are higher than ours because those institutions offered large scholarships, even though it would be less expensive for the same students to attend SU. She expressed concern that the “middle students” would end up paying the most if they attended SU since they would not receive as much scholarship aid, either need-based or merit-based.
5. The minutes of 28 September 2004 were approved as distributed.
6. Arlene White presented a proposal concerning Fall Convocation. Rather than have it on the second Tuesday of the fall semester, could it not be scheduled on Friday (next fall on 26 August) on the day the freshmen move into the dorms. She received a basically positive response to the proposal.
7. Diane Hayes presented a detailed set of proposed bylaws changes from the Faculty Welfare Committee. Two issues were addressed independently: First, to exclude members of the Committee from applying for sabbaticals, and second, to include members from all four schools on the committee. The following motion was moved, seconded, and passed with one vote in opposition:

The Faculty Senate requests the Membership and Elections Committee to conduct a referendum on the following two proposed amendments to the bylaws:

Change the membership of the Faculty Welfare Committee to exclude members applying for sabbaticals by inserting the following sentence into the description of the Faculty Welfare Committee as noted below: **“In addition, faculty members serving on this committee shall not apply for sabbaticals during the period of their service on the committee.”**

Change the membership of the Faculty Welfare Committee to include school representation by deleting one phrase and inserting the following phrase into the description of the Faculty Welfare Committee as noted below: **“four elected by and from their respective schools and two elected at-large,”**

It was agreed that the faculty would be provided a listing of the four possible outcomes which would result from votes affirming or defeating each of the above proposals. For convenience what appears below shows how the present

bylaws would be changed if both of these proposed changes were approved by the faculty:

“The committee shall have six voting members: six members of the faculty (excluding librarians) ~~elected at large~~ **four elected by and from their respective schools and two elected at large**, serving three-year terms, two retiring annually, no fewer than two of whom are tenured. **In addition, faculty members serving on this committee shall not apply for sabbaticals during the period of their service on the committee.** Should an elected faculty member not be the Designated Senator, a non-voting Designated Senator shall also serve on the committee. The committee shall elect its chairperson annually.”

There was discussion concerning the effect of one or more schools failing to elect a representative to one of the committees, and Dave Parker promised to submit a proposed change in the bylaws to the Senate officers. It will likely be presented to the Senate in the near future.

8. A proposal to change the bylaws of the Membership and Elections Committee was presented to the Senate. The conversion to on-line voting has considerably reduced the need for faculty to serve on this committee. After discussion, the following proposed amendment to the bylaws was approved unanimously by the Senate and forwarded to the Membership and Elections Committee for referendum by the faculty:

“The Committee shall consist of ~~seven~~ five voting members: The Vice President of the Senate who shall be the Designated Senator on this committee; and ~~six~~ four members of the Faculty serving three-year terms: ~~four~~ elected from and by their respective schools. ~~, and two elected at large, two retiring annually.~~ The Committee shall elect its chairperson annually.”

9. Mike O’Loughlin adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Parker, Secretary