

Draft Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
April 10, 2007
HH 119

Senators present –Curtin, DeRidder, Egan, Groth, Hammond, Hopson, Lawler, Morrison, Mullins, Parker, Rieck, Ritenour, Robinson, Scott, Shannon, Shipper, Talbert

Senators absent – Khazeh

1. Pres. Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:32; a quorum was present.
2. The minutes from April 3 were approved as written.
3. New Business
 - a. Full Faculty Meeting/Vote on Proposed Fulton Curriculum Reform - Pres. Mullins received a petition signed by 70 faculty that calls for a full faculty meeting to challenge the Mar. 27th senate approval of the Fulton Proposal. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 24 at 3:30. Mullins asked for advice in how to organize & proceed with this meeting. After much discussion, it was agreed that Mullins will check with one or a few faculty who circulated the petition and ask whether the motion passed by the senate would be an appropriate starting point for the meeting. Mullins & Lawler will arrange for a room, with chairs and projection unit set up, and ballots with “Yes” and “No” printed on them (with room at the top to write in Motion1, Motion 2, etc if needed). They, with the help of Membership & Elections, will bring sign-in sheets listing all full-time faculty with columns for signing in and out and checking off when they vote (with enough columns in case there is more than one vote taken). Mullins will open the meeting and most likely someone will then make a motion. A quorum of FT faculty (minimum of 171) is needed for discussion to begin as well as to have a vote. For a motion to pass, the ayes need to be one more than $\frac{1}{2}$ the number of faculty attending. It will be advertised that the voting will take place at 4:30, or if the voting starts before that time, the ballot will continue to be projected and voting will continue until 4:30 in order to give faculty more opportunity to vote. But it will be suggested that in order to guarantee the ability to vote, a faculty member should be prepared to arrive at 3:30 and stay until 4:30. Voting by e-mail or proxy will not be allowed as it there is no stipulation for that in the bylaws. Paper ballots will be used for votes on motions, but, in the interest of time, not for votes on amendments, unless a motion is made requesting paper ballots.

Sen. Hopson requested future discussions about the fact that only 10% of the faculty need to sign a petition to challenge a senate decision. Sen. Shannon suggested that the discussion should also address the need for another means of referendum (for instance electronic voting). Shannon made a motion that the Senate President convene a meeting with a subgroup of senate volunteers to draft bylaw amendments to address the issue of only 10% of faculty needed to call for a full faculty vote and to discuss other options for referendum. Seconded by Sen. Scott.

Vote by hand, motion carries.

- b. Proposed Changes to Faculty Handbook – Sen. Shannon. Senators had received this proposal, regarding the Tenure Review Committee’s annual evaluation of tenure-track faculty, as an attachment to the agenda. Sen. Scott made a motion that the senate accept the recommendation from the Academic Freedom and Tenure committee. Seconded. Discussion included concerns that this has been changed 3 times in the last 3 years making it difficult for departments to follow, that the specific timing would further constrain chairs, who already have too many deadlines to meet, that departments with few tenured faculty and many untenured faculty would especially have problems with the change and that the timing requires that new faculty who start in January would be evaluated in their first semester. There also seems to be variation across campus as to whether the tenure review committee signs off on the chair’s evaluation for tenure-track faculty. The form for this is labeled as an appendix in the faculty handbook, so some consider its use optional while in other schools its use is required. Bob Tardiff mentioned that the whole tenure/promotion process was reviewed by the senate last year (in order to be consistent with BOR regulations) and that the version in the hard copy (with the green cover) has not been replaced with the new version which is on-line. Sen. Parker suggested that as it was not clear just what we are voting on, we should either defeat or table the motion. Scott made a motion to table the motion and send the proposal back to AFT. Seconded by Shannon.

Voice vote, motion carries. Any concerns on this matter should be sent to AFT committee chair, Liddell Madden.

- c. SU Policy on Hiring of Family Members – Sen. Robinson. Faculty Welfare Committee’s proposal for a change in the wording of this had been sent to senators as an attachment. Also a clarification to the wording of the proposal had been distributed prior to the meeting as well. Robinson said that when he checked the faculty handbook to send that clarification, he realized that the hard copy version used for the proposal was outdated; it differs from the newer on-line version. However this doesn’t change the content of the rest of the proposal, just the wording of the opening paragraph. Scott made a motion to table the proposal and send back to FWC. Seconded by Parker. Discussion included the question of what constitutes family (the default definition would be the State of MD’s definition) and the suggestion of a need for hard copies of the current version of the Faculty Handbook for the senate and committees, which was countered by the recommendation that committee members should print out relevant section of the on-line handbook prior to a meeting discussing handbook changes. Vote on motion.

Vote by hand, motion carries.

- d. Permanent Committee Status for University Academic Assessment Committee Pres. Mullins. The attachment sent with the agenda was the original charge for the current ad hoc committee. Concern was expressed about adding another senate committee, and whether it could be a sub-committee of an already standing committee. But this is an issue that is beyond our control and likely to stay; if we don’t take an active part in this, others will impose their ideas on us. Also, the most related standing committee is Curriculum and they are extremely busy already. Sen. Scott made a motion to direct the ad hoc committee to draft bylaws for becoming a standing committee of the senate. Seconded.

Voice vote, motion carries.

4. Words from the administration – Interim Provost Jones.
 - a. Budget - In Annapolis, the legislative session ended last night and Higher Education did very well, with one exception. The appropriations bill said that USM institutions will retain their enrollment targets for the fall (ours is 150 additional students), but will receive a 20% cut on the appropriations for the additional students. Pres. Dudley-Eshbach has not discussed this with the Chancellor yet and the Executive Committee needs to discuss this as we had originally said we would only take the additional students if we received full funding for them. On the capital side this was a very good year for us; we received everything requested for the TETC and new Perdue building. The fact that we are a designated “growth institution”, probably influenced this. Locally - The VPs met last Thursday to review the financial situation for the remainder of this year and FY 08 and discuss the money available after all fixed costs have been met. We are in better financial shape than we have been in a number of years. Jones met with the Academic Deans yesterday and the Fiscal Advisory Committee will be meeting this coming Friday to start their deliberations regarding the supplemental funds. He suggested faculty should keep their ears to the ground and let their needs be known if they haven’t been already. Some things that will be funded (although perhaps not at 100%) are :
 - i. Administrative structure for grad programs – an Associate Provost, a new full-time position, will be added; will probably do some things in addition to grad programs.
 - ii. Faculty/staff equity money.
 - iii. Chair’s compensation – addition of money to the base. Jones hopes to have another Deans/Chairs workshop by the end of April.
 - iv. Teaching/Learning Center – additional resources for Melissa Thomas, Jane Ma and their operation for on-line, on-campus and distance learning.
 - v. Center for Student Success – working with Student Affairs; need to renovate the GUC, a new staff position (in part to do the early warnings that Agata Liszkowska did; she is now full time in International Programs). Plan is to have a faculty member with reassigned time to direct the center, perhaps on a rotating basis.
 - vi. Faculty Development & Travel money - _to get back to 2001 levels, at least.
 - b. Status of Deans
 - i. Henson – Mike Folkoff has agreed to serve a second year as Interim Dean; a search will begin in the fall.
 - ii. Perdue – Jones has received a number of nominations and applications, they will be contacted soon; the successful candidate will serve as Interim Dean for 2 years.
 - iii. Fulton – an e-mail will be sent out soon soliciting nominations for a 1 year Interim Dean, a search will begin in the fall.
 - c. Faculty Searches – Of 38 tenure track searches initiated this year, 29 have been successful, 3 have failed and the remaining 6 are close to either being filled or failing.
 - d. Facilities – A glitch in the progress of the parking garage; but the buildings on that site will remain up for a year and will be used for office space for this coming year.

The decision has been made to renovate Caruthers Hall and continue to use it until the new Perdue building opens in Fall 2011. May have to do battle with the system to get approval for this.

5. Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Motions made and passed during the meeting;

1. A motion that the Senate President convene a meeting with a subgroup of senate volunteers to draft bylaw amendments to address the issue of only 10% of faculty needed to call for a full faculty vote and to discuss other options for referendum.
2. A motion to table and send back to Academic Freedom and Tenure the proposal for a change in the faculty handbook regarding the Tenure Review Committee's annual evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Any concerns on this matter should be sent to AFT committee chair, Liddell Madden.
3. A motion to table and send back to Faculty Welfare Committee the proposal to change the faculty handbook wording of the section regarding SU Policy on Hiring of Family Members.
4. A motion to direct the ad hoc University Academic Assessment Committee to draft bylaws for becoming a standing committee of the senate.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary