

Senate Meeting 3/24/09

Senators attending: Wood, Curtin, Clarke, Welsh, Rieck, Khazeh, Gilkey, Weaver, Walton, Scott, Roebeck, O'Loughlin, Ludwick, DeWitt, Street, McDermott, Parker

Senators absent: Shannon

Quorum was present, President gaveled open at 3.32 pm

1. Announcements from the Senate president.

We have a hefty agenda, and we will adjust it somewhat. We will discuss today, but not move to accept the revision of the University Forum's Constitution.

2. Remarks from the President, Janet Dudley-Eshbach & Provost, Tom Jones

President: As the legislative session is winding down - here is the update (somewhat bleak). As a new building is coming through the line, usually money is given at one time. This year, there is some difference. We were originally supposed to get 54 million this year for the Perdue School. The legislature said give 50% one year and 50% the next. We asked for 60% the first year because of issues with keeping this on track. The good news is that all is in place. Salisbury has the largest capital project of all the universities in this year's budget. That is moving forward. We anticipate we will get probably 42 million this year and the remainder the next year. This project is possible because of an \$8 million grant from the Perdue Foundation. We have \$2 million, will get more in other \$2 million segments and are trying to get \$4 million from other sources. We have been given less lately because of the economy.

The operating budget - more that we don't know than what we do. The General Assembly presented its version of the budget - Governor had given his version and between the two, more cut-downs of the state budget - so the house recommended an additional reduction of over \$10 million in general funds and \$10million in fund balance & some others smaller amounts. In general scheme, this isn't great, but spread among the universities, if this is the extent, it's not terrible - we are about 4%. Dudley-Eshbach doesn't see a doomsday scenario. The Fund Balance reduction will also be shared across the campuses. We have given reasons on why Salisbury should be spared, but we'll wait and see. The

Senate still has to present its version of the budget. Compared to other states, this isn't so bad. The other positive (see Baltimore Sun on Saturday) - the governor is softening his position on tuition. It is hard to see how one can argue another year of a tuition freeze. Dudley-Eshbach has been supportive of the governor who put in his budget \$16million for universities (House kept that while taking out the \$10 million). Chancellor has come out strongly stating if the \$10million sticks, tuition must be on the table - and Dudley-Eshbach has argued that our tuition deserves more raising than others because it is currently so low.

The Foundation -Dudley-Eshbach met with Jane Dane this morning. Our admissions are strong, applications are up, entry GPA is higher than last year. What is most worrisome is financial aid. We don't have many extra resources for financial aid - we have been arguing that more private resources should go to financial aid (currently our private resource/financial aid is now 3rd in system) - but in this economy, many of the scholarship funds aren't making money & that source of financial aid is drying up so we might not be able to offer as much as over the past years.

Closing by publically thanking Tom Jones and saying that it has been a pleasure working with him. Also thanks Senators for involvement of them in the Search process. Dr. Allen had not complete, but close to unanimous support across campus. She thinks we will all be pleased.

Sen. Wood asks - with possible tuition increase - is 4% the number?
Answer: currently there will be no tuition increase. We are hoping the \$10million (or \$20million) won't happen - we keep our fund balance to ensure no layoffs and also to reimburse the foundation for property purchases, so fund balance may hurt us. Right now, no tuition increase is on the table, & we support the governor's desire to keep tuition at same rate, but we will need to see what happens with the budget and what the house and senate come up with in Annapolis. Many in Senate seem supportive of tuition increase. We don't want to make Maryland families pay more, but we also don't want to give them a lesser educational experience. We are currently bare-bones. We are projecting no real growth for the next year (maybe some with transfers, but not with freshman) because of faculty hiring issues. We are designated growth institution, but we have to keep brakes on with current situation. If House money isn't restored or Senate takes more, we'll probably have tuition on the table.

Provost, Dr. Tom Jones.

TOM JONES: Just got back from Shady Grove where Provosts had monthly meeting mostly about financial issues just addressed by Dudley-Eshbach. Nothing major to report, though they discussed legislative issues. Including Textbook issue and the Collective Bargaining of graduate students and adjunct faculty. We should be aware of this. Question of lumping adjuncts in with graduate students, which is very different here from College Park. If Collective Bargaining is allowed, it may have a big effect here. We should stay on top of this. Most still hanging in the legislature. Partner Benefits looks like it will be moving forward

3. Approval of minutes from Senate Meeting of February 17, 2009

Curtin moves, seconded

President O'Loughlin: Sen. Zaprowski is on sabbatical – Sen. Parker is present, McDermott's name misspelled & Sen. Clarke, not Craig.

Approved as amended.

4. Committee Reports.

a. University Academic Assessment Committee, Nicole Munday. Faculty retreat on course mapping of Gen. Ed courses. (Proposal distributed to the Senate)

Munday:

Presents Assessment Committee's idea of creating an Assessment Retreat over 2 days (possibly June 2 & 3) this summer in order to discuss issues with less burden on faculty time.

Discussion follows. Determined that dates are proposed, but not in stone and anyone who would like to change them should let the committee know.

Also stated that the Retreat would just map and develop outcomes. The process would not end there, but would then move to departments, Senate, and Provost council. Provost Jones states that this was one of the biggest findings on the Middle States report so it is a good move.

Discussion continues re: role of Perdue. Response that the retreat would need to involve those in Gen Ed classes, but anyone is allowed to attend.

The process is to make sure students are achieving the goals we set for them.

Provost Jones - says we'd had a huge task force over 4-5 years that created these goals for general education. They are in the handbook. We also need to reacquaint Gen-Ed teachers with the goals. We may need to tweak the learning goals, who knows, but we need to make sure that the students are assimilating the goals. This will help us determine how well we are achieving our goals.

More Discussion, over the Gen Ed program and possible financial literacy course, et al., whether students should be involved, increasing the role of Perdue, out to make sure we are addressing not just goals but outcomes, et al.

Other comments can be sent to Munday directly.

5. Old Business: None.

6. New Business:

a. SU textbook policy: SGA

No student present at the meeting to discuss. President O'Loughlin gives overview - the SGA has taken upon itself to create a policy that would be acceptable to themselves and the faculty. They are taking surveys of faculty and students & plan to write a policy. The SGA, though, did not come today.

Provost Jones: The Board of Regents passed a policy we must adhere to on textbooks. He doesn't know if the policy has been transmitted across campus or not, but they will get it out soon. The Maryland legislature has BILLS being put forward to deal with the question of textbooks, our policy is one to state that we don't need bills or legislation but can deal with this within the USM. Question of where "shoulds" and "shalls" exist. The SGA document would be on how SU would deal with the policy from the Regents. By May 1 the Bookstore will need to have some policy.

b. Revision of the University Forum's constitution: Report on the

document entitled, "Bylaws of the University Governance Association."

Sen. Clarke takes over the gavel so that President O'Loughlin can present the new Report, not motion, for Bylaws, of the government. (Report distributed to the Senate)

President O'Loughlin: Gives overview of changes to the Forum. 3 Bodies, Staff, Faculty & Student representatives remain in place; Executive Committee becomes new Association Coordinating Committee (hereafter "ACC"); will be more defined re: regularity of meetings and specificity of position. Primarily the new Bylaws would sharpen the line of communication between the committees, the ACC, and the Administration. The new form of the University Governance Association will clarify the role of committees and increase lines of communication. The biggest change is the restructuring of some committees – some have been eradicated, others folded together. We wanted to get rid of duplication of effort. Finally, the Forum will now become the University Assembly ("UA") as the Forum had basically become defunct. The UA will be called only by the President, Provost or ACC. Sen Shannon has sent one proposed amendment to the original document.

Discussion Follows on role of the UA and changes: the UA has no new power. In addition, the ACC does not have veto power over committee reports, though it could submit an additional report. The disappeared committees are Student Affairs and the Judicial Board which have changed for legal reasons and will be under Student Affairs, no longer the UA/old Forum.

c. Distance Education charge.

Sen. Clarke opens the Distance Education Charge

Discussion. The discussion questions the way in which the charge was written and the general process for charges being written and handed out by the President.

On the Charge: Question on how the charge itself was worded and whether the 21 April gives sufficient time to address the questions. The questions are complex and will need much contemplation time. Melissa Thomas says there are currently 2 policies on on-line programs that have been put into place on campus, the most recent by an ad hoc committee under Buchanan. Also on charge seeming to accept that on-line learning

was changing the education system here at SU. Not necessarily the case, but we need to ask whether we need to limit it, what type of assessment is available, and do we just need an all campus discussion on on-line learning. Also questions curriculum committee and process of on-line learning. Finally, questions of intellectual property were also addressed.

Determined charge says that only a REPORT is to be given on 21 April. President O'Loughlin agrees to contact the committee chair directly so as to make the chair aware that all that the Senate needs is a committee report regarding on-line learning. Sen. Roebeck says that anyone with comments or suggestions should contact Brian Dean and the committee.

On the Process of making charges: President asks a committee to discuss a matter, looking at facts & giving recommendations. What the committee does is up to the committee. The President of the Senate is responsible for making sure the appropriate committees look at the appropriate issues.

On the process of charges, discussion of traditions in which the presidents write charges as good faith representations of the will of the Senate and officers, but traditionally, officers/Senate have not analyzed the text of the charges. Hope that, for sake of efficiency this continues. Discussion on who should have input, but in general, agreement stands at although input may be good, there is not a need to approve charges to committee as written by the president as we elect a president to write these charges.

7. Adjournment. 4.57 p.m.

Attachments:

Draft Senate Meeting minutes for February 17, 2009.
Charge to the Long Range Academic Planning Committee
Charge to the Learning Through Technology Committee
Charge to the Promotions Committee
Draft Bylaws of Salisbury University Governance Association
Bylaws of Salisbury University Forum