

**DRAFT**

**I haven't done minutes for a meeting in a very long time. Please look over carefully for any problems.**

**SU Faculty Senate Meeting**

23 November 2004

HH 119

**Senators present:** Groth, Hopson, Howard, McDermott, McKenzie, Muller, Mullins, Morrison, O'Loughlin, Pereboom, Rieck, Shannon, Venso, Whaley

**Senators absent:** DeRidder, Diriker, Matthews, Parker

1. **Mike O'Loughlin called the Senate to order at 3:32 pm. A quorum was present.**
2. **Mike had one announcement:**
  - a. A charge to the Academic Policies Committee regarding University CLEP policy:
    - i. Elizabeth Curtin conveyed the troubling practice of a large number of SU students taking CLEP exams to receive credit for English 101 and 102. It is mostly disconcerting because these CLEP exams do not test the material taught in English 101 and 102 especially in terms of writing composition. What is needed to do to officially change the policy so SU can stop accepting these exams for college credit?
    - ii. Discussion Points in regard to the CLEP Charge were as follows:
      1. Curtin: Can faculty decide what scores and CLEP exams are acceptable? There are CLEP exams that are acceptable that include a required written essay. Can the CLEP credits be suspended for next semester?
      2. Mullins & Shannon: Can't the senate decide to support the decision not to accept the CLEP exams without going to a committee.
      3. McKenzie: Curriculum Committee & SU Administration might decide CLEP/AP can apply to credits but not for credit taught for a specific course. In addition, faculty control of curriculum should give faculty control over acceptance or non-acceptance of CLEP exams.
      4. Pereboom: Maybe every department should look at CLEP/AP to determine needed score to pass and get course credit applied. The catalog CLEP statement is too vague.
      5. Whaley: A careful exploration of the CLEP rules should be done to iron out potential problems between the SU & MD System schools.
    - iii. The CLEP charge will be sent to the Curriculum Committee for quick action and will be forwarded for a more in depth investigation by the Academic Policies Committee at a later time. A rough draft will appear before the senate.
3. **Sandra Cohea-Weible is present today for Provost Buchanan who could not attend.**
4. **The approval of the minutes from 9 November 2004 were postponed until the next senate meeting.**

5. **Salisbury University Budget Overview for Fiscal Year 2005 presentation by Grieg Mitchell and Allan Selsor:**
- a. O’Laughlin: An effort to make the monetary budgeting process transparent to the SU community is being made in the idea of shared governance, so the process does not seem to secretive.
  - b. Mitchell: Gave a basic overview of the SU budgeting process for fiscal 2004 and estimates for fiscal 2005.
    - i. Fiscal 2004 Budget: State Appropriations (~27%), Tuition & Fees (~38%), Auxiliary Services (~29%), State & Federal Grants (~7%) for a total revenue & expenditures around 95 million.
    - ii. Fiscal 2005 Budget Request: (Currently being held up at the state level) Percentages to remain about the same, with a reduction in state appropriations and increase in tuition and fees. Total Forecasted revenues & expenditures around 101 million dollars Total increase in expenditures \$5,988,013. Most of the increase is going towards auxiliary services and instruction.
    - iii. SU Tuition: last (10<sup>th</sup> out of 10) in state support appropriation. The \$4546 is the lowest in peer MD universities. There is an ongoing attempt to close the tuition gap by lobbying dollar amounts rather than percentage increase.
    - iv. Future Budget Considerations:
      - 1. Mandatory Obligations: increases in energy and building costs, bonds, etc...
      - 2. University Increases: New Buildings to support long range plan, benefits of full-time contractuels, professional development & travel monies, IT revolving equipment purchases, accreditation costs, etc...
      - 3. Other: Board of Regents EE initiatives (1% yearly reduction), strategic plan, enrollment growth costs, and tuition differential between residents/non-resident students.
  - c. Mitchell: The university can’t grow without more support which is at odds with the regent’s push to grow enrollment with the EE idea to decrease budgets 1% a year.
  - d. Issues Discussed in Response to the Budget Report:
    - i. Hopson: Conversion of contractuels versus faculty staff positions to “PIN” positions with benefits.
    - ii. Mullins: The need to recruit top-notch faculty requires an examination of a quality salary plan at SU. Is faculty salary part of future budget considerations?
    - iii. McDermott: Faculty travel money was “temporarily” cut 50% in the last budget as a “one time deal.” But, the cut is still occurring, when will the money be reallocated and brought back?
    - iv. Shannon: There has been lots of growth in students in the math department. The added students required more faculty and more resources. In addition, the math department added the computer science program. There was no increase in the operating budget at all for the math department to parallel this growth in the department.
    - v. Mullins: The new financial system runs without deficits because the budgets are flat. In some cases, departments might face the need to shut down as the monies run out (in support of the programs and their growth).

6. **Committee Report: Faculty Welfare Committee:**
- a. Final Report of the investigation of Physics/Engineering Faculty Search during the 2003-04 academic year.
    - i. Diane Davis: Once is a aberration, twice is a trend. Since no trend is noted at this time, the faculty welfare committee makes no specific recommendation at this time accept to caution all parties involved in a search to communicate and to follow the current traditional search policies carefully.
7. **New Business:**
- a. McKenzie: Proposed Resolution, "The Faculty's Authority Regarding the University's Curriculum",  
  

*"The Faculty of Salisbury University objects to any attempt by any entity, including but not limited to the Salisbury University administration, the University of Maryland System administration and the Board of Regents, to interfere with the Faculty's traditional and historical right to determine the Curriculum in both content and method of delivery."*

**Motion carried unanimously.**

    - i. McDermott: Is the curriculum a CUSF issue? Do we have issue with the provost or president in this area?
    - ii. Reick: The right to determine curriculum message does need to get to CUSF.
    - iii. Whaley: Faculty own curriculum and should take every opportunity to remind faculty, administration, and government entities of this right to determine curriculum and its delivery.
    - iv. Shannon: *Motion to relay the McKenzie motion to CUSF for consideration. **Motion carried.***
8. **Mike O'Loughlin adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:46 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Joseph Howard, Faculty Senate Web-Master.