

Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
March 13, 2007
HH 119

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

Senators absent –Talbert

1. Pres. Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:31; a quorum was present.
2. Corrections to the minutes – Sen. Khazeh suggested that when a particular senator's discussion item leads to a motion or withdraw of a motion, that senator should be identified by name in the minutes. Specifically in the Feb. 13 minutes, in the fourth paragraph under 5. New Business, a), "Suggestion to withdraw motion, let UCC do their job and forward to the Provost" should be changed to "Suggestion was made by Sen. Khazeh to withdraw motion, let UCC do their job and forward to the Provost". The minutes were approved as amended.
3. Announcements from President Mullins
 - a. Mullins asked Sen. Parker whether there were any developments regarding the issue of benefits for FTNTT faculty. Parker: Yes, the Chancellor has proposed that for Fall 2008, all FTNTT faculty at SU, Towson, Frostburg, Bowie and Coppin who have 10 or more years of continuous full time status will receive 7.25% of their salary to go into retirement accounts and in Fall 2009, all such faculty with 6 or more years continuous service will receive that benefit. The Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) is currently drafting a policy noting that as of Fall 2007 all FTNTT faculty in the system will have health benefits and as of Fall 2008, some will have retirement benefits as noted above. This is considered a "band aid" measure by CUSF and the CUSF plan is that by 2010 these faculty will be converted to PIN lines, which would provide the additional benefit of health coverage after retirement. The current situation, in addition to being grossly unfair to the faculty involved, is likely in violation of state law and could be prosecuted by the State's Attorney General's Office.
 - b. Mullins introduced Jack Lang, the SGA parliamentarian who attends our meetings and reports back to the SGA on senate events.
 - c. Dean Bahr sent Mullins an e-mail informing us of the library's effort to make the copyright statement in the faculty handbook more accurate. She would like faculty involvement in the working group; Mullins will send out an e-mail request for faculty volunteers. Sen. Shannon suggested that, if the policy includes non-print materials, a representative from the Learning Technology Committee should be on the committee.
4. A word from the administration – Interim Provost Jones
 - a. The legislative session is heating up and this is a particularly raucous year with a change of administration and the "structural deficit" the state is facing. Greig Mitchell is there much of the time. The House of Delegates slashed the higher education bill last week, but the outlook in the Senate is somewhat better, so it will

eventually go to conference committee for compromise. It will be April before we know what's what, so we can't make major decisions until then. The Chancellor, President and Regents are standing tall to resist cuts.

- b. Enrollment growth – We are currently planning on an increase of 150 students, but if the budget is cut it might be less. Student Affairs and Enrollment Management staff are ready to drop students, if necessary, in the least disruptive way. Sen. Shannon asked whether such a cut would affect hiring of new faculty. Jones thinks that this information will come too late to influence the searches (which are all at least at the interviewing stage). So we may be “flush” with tenure line faculty next year (if the increase is less than 150 students), but that may affect our need for NTT faculty next year.
- c. Pick-a-Prof.com is a web site that publishes grades assigned by faculty member (without identifying students receiving the grades). It has sued California and other states to have access to grades and has won those suits. Jackie Maisel has researched this, spoken to Ann Donohue and since we are a public institution we must do this, under the Freedom of Information Act. Other institutions in the system (including Frostburg and Towson) have already complied. Sen. Shannon suggested that if the grading of specific professors becomes public information, we might consider including the names of course professors on students' transcripts. Shannon asked if chairs could also have access to this information for their dept. faculty members. Jones said yes, and even more specific information through Peoplesoft and he will be talking to chairs about that soon.

5. New Business

- a. Discussion of Fulton Curriculum Reform Proposal as it relates to COMAR Regulations: Jones has discussed this with them and is willing to put into writing and sign that the proposal meets with the COMAR regs. He doesn't think we will have any problem with MHEC. Sen. Scott, who requested this discussion item, was satisfied with Jones' assurances and the latest version of the proposal, which clearly addresses these concerns, and so he withdrew his request. Once UCC has completed it's work and sent a final report to Mullins, we will have a one-issue meeting, in a larger venue, to discuss the proposal. Sen. Shannon would like to see a future discussion of the curricular review process in general, as it currently is a deterrent to making curricular changes.
- b. Compromise on Timeline for Posting Final Grades – Sen. Rieck, who originally brought this matter to the senate, appreciates the compromise and finds most of it acceptable, with the exception of parts of bullets 2 and 3. Bullet 2 indicates that chairs will receive the final exam schedule in time for class scheduling and suggests that they should adjust their schedules to minimize the number of finals any one professor will have on the last day. However, scheduling classes is already very difficult and to introduce one more criteria will make it even more so. He also is opposed to the section in bullet 3 that states that a “chair will document why multiple finals at the end of the examination period were unavoidable”; saying chairs should be trusted they had a legitimate for such scheduling. Shannon agreed and suggested that one way to avoid this situation is to not schedule any “common finals” on the last day. Sen. Khazeh indicated that the wording of the first bullet should be changed from “Final grades are due in the Registrar's Office

72 hours” to “Final grades must be posted on-line with approved status 72 hours”. After more discussion, Parker made a motion that the senate endorse the compromise with the following amendments – the change in Bullet 1 suggested by Khazeh, the removal of the second sentence in Bullet 2 and the removal of “The chair will document why multiple finals at the end of the examination period were unavoidable” from Bullet 3. Suggestion that it could be tried this way and if there are too many requests for extensions by faculty the issues can be addressed again. Motion seconded by Rieck.

Voice vote, motion carries.

- c. First Year Experience Program – Sandra Cohea-Weible sent information about this to the senate officers last semester and the report of the task force is on the web page (the site address was included with today’s agenda). Senators reading the report had concerns about certain aspects including: the resources necessary (both faculty time and other costs), overlap between this and Gen Ed, how it relates to the Success and Writing Centers, whether some of the items are impinging on academic freedom (rewarding teaching new students, using certain pedagogies and interacting with students outside the classroom). Since some senators had not yet read the report and the leaders of the task force were not present, Sen. Scott made a motion that the discussion be tabled. Khazeh seconded.

Voice vote, motion carries.

**Pres, Mullins will send an e-mail soliciting concerns about this and senators with specific concerns should reply (with “reply to all”). Mullins will forward the concerns to Ellen Neufeldt who will share them with the task force members.

- d. Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Policy – Sen. Shannon said that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee had a hard time figuring out what to do with this and thought some aspects were outside their purview. Discussion included: since the policies come from the BOR we are bound by those, whether we should seek clarification as to exactly what “1 day per week” means, whether there were differences among the 4 schools regarding the reporting of this, and the suggestion that if too many things are specified it may become more of a problem. Scott made a motion that we accept the committee’s report and forward it to the administration. Sen. Hopson seconded.

Voice vote, motion carries with one abstention.

- e. Proposed Bylaws Change for International Programs Committee – Len Robinson and Brian Stiegler. (Senators had received a copy of Stiegler’s message and the IPC Bylaws with the agenda). Shannon pointed out that Stielger’s proposal is not a Bylaws change, but rather a change in procedures. Scott made a motion to direct UCC and IPC to meet and discuss this and to determine whether to follow the proposal. If the two committees are in agreement, it does not need to come back to the senate. Hopson seconded the motion.

Voice vote, motion carries.

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:47 PM.

Motions made and passed at the meeting:

1. A motion that the senate endorse the Compromise on Timeline for Posting Final Grades with the following amendments – the change in Bullet 1 suggested by Khazeh, the removal of the second sentence in Bullet 2 and the removal of “The chair will document why multiple finals at the end of the examination period were unavoidable” from Bullet 3.
2. A motion that the discussion on First Year Experience Program be tabled.
3. A motion that we accept the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee’s report on Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Policy and forward it to the administration.
4. A motion to direct UCC and IPC to meet and discuss Stiegler’s proposed change in procedures and to determine whether to follow the proposal. If the two committees are in agreement, it does not need to come back to the senate.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary