

Draft Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
November 8, 2005
HH119

Senators present: DeRidder, Groth, Hopson, Howard, Lawler, McKenzie, Morrison, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Parker, Ritenour, Robeck, Shannon, Shipper, Pereboom, Talbert

Senators Absent: Danny Ervin

1. Maarten Pereboom called the Senate to order at 3:30pm. A quorum was present.
2. O'Loughlin & Parker presented a donation of Policy & Document Report Books from the AAUP for faculty Senators.
3. Motion seconded to accept minutes of October 25th as written.
4. Remarks from Provost Buchanan:

-In response to a request from University of Student Council to institute a week-long fall break the week of Thanksgiving, the Vice Chancellor said it is not feasible.

-The last chance to give input for the MHEC Mission Statement - is Friday, November 11 – please send to Ellen Zinner.

-The self study for the Middle States visit is close to final draft form and will soon be available on the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, & Accountability web site. Hard copies (140 pages) will also be distributed to presidents of all governance groups. The target audience for the self study is the visitation team and it is intended to be an analysis not a description. Although the report will be used as the primary document, when they visit campus they will ask for supporting information and hold interviews with groups on campus looking for feedback. The Provost thanked Ron Dotterer for his efforts and encouraged faculty to forward feedback directly to Dotterer.

-A different and new direction on the budget was shared than what was reported about a month ago. The update includes a 7% increase in current appropriation across the board - campuses are asked to hold tuition increases to a system average of about 5%. We are proposing 5.8%. The new part involves the requesting of an additional 2% of system-wide funding to fund enrollment growth. Only certain universities are going to be targeted for this additional funding based on growth between Fall 05-06. Each institution will be given a growth number and how much additional money per FTE student will be based on that growth.

For us, we are asked to grow by 323 students, 5% more than we are right now, proposing \$5,500 per additional FTE student. This growth would involve more faculty pin lines and staff support positions. It's up to us to get these students and we can do so by increasing retention rate, increasing number of students enrolled in graduate programs off campus, offering more financial aid (from tuition increases), being more aggressive in our recruiting, etc. Towson University was given this same opportunity. Thus, we need to put courses in place and assess faculty needs now - somebody is getting this funding and we need to go for it.

-Senate discussion included how this is disastrous for planning, therefore, we need as early a start

as possible to hire faculty, perhaps by posting advertisements contingent on funding. Pereboom asked the Provost for clarification that the \$5500 is a bonus per FTE student (which is correct).

5. Donna Ritenour presented an update from the University Curriculum Committee about the online course policy (see attachments: chapter 9 special courses and SU online learning policy)

- The intention of the committee is to bring back a policy as a motion for senate approval.
- Discussion focused on the quality of the checklist questions, the level of detail, and how the checklist differs from information sought about regular courses that go to the UCC. An idea to create a shorter checklist for old courses and another for new courses was mentioned. Senators also debated whether or not a change in the delivery system results in a change in the course.
- There was some question about whether the list is for a new course or just to change an already existing course.
- Senators noted that the percentage of courses taught online may be something for further discussion - as is, the policy says that it's up to each department. Questions included whether degrees should be offered without personal interaction, what percentage of courses should students take online, whether or not online courses are equivalent to in-class, and how department chairs should monitor their courses and student outcomes.
- Oversight is needed in terms of online delivery, not course content. There needs to be more of a focus on the technology side.
- Although Pereboom noted that "word is out" that online courses can be an easy A, it was also noted that we have a similar concern for courses taught by adjuncts.
- Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

6. Susan Muller presented an update from the Ad Hoc Committee on Curriculum Change (CCC).

- The committee is working on faculty development day (Friday, January 27th). Mark Frana reported that representatives from the College of New Jersey will attend and will include reps who have different reviews about the changes they instituted (in other words, not all positive reviews).
- A FAQ site is posted online. Three of the four possible models are online as well.
- December 6th is a general faculty meeting (DB 123).
- Muller noted that General Education has been a stumbling block in their progress. Senator feedback included having the committee articulate just enough detail in a few disciplines for faculty to get a concrete sense of the results of the change, perhaps starting with programs that have little flexibility.
- Senators discussed how to decide on decision-making. Whereas Shannon shared that we need to have a better idea about what we are voting on before we vote on a process, O'Loughlin disagreed and believes that we need to get very clear this semester. The matter will be put on the next meeting agenda.

7. Pereboom adjourned the meeting at 4:48pm.