

Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
Sept. 26, 2006
HH 119

Senators present : Curtin, DeRidder, Egan, Groth, Hammond, Hopson, Howard, Lawler, Mullins, Parker, Rieck, Ritenour, Robinson, Scott, Shannon, Shipper

Senators absent: Khazeh, Morrison

1. Pres. Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM. A quorum was present.

2. Two corrections to the Sept. 12 minutes were made. 1) Under 5. Old Business, b. Faculty Welfare Committee workload issue, in the sentence: "Ann Donohue concurs with this and indicated that all grievances relative to the ART document should go to a single committee", the underlined portion was removed. 2) Under 6. New Business, b. General Education Assessment, the sentence "A pilot program to assess general education goals in a few courses that have common final exams has been initiated with Joaquin Vila working as Special Assistant for Assessment" was changed to "A pilot program to assess general education goals in a few courses that have final exams with common characteristics has been initiated with Joaquin Vila working as Special Assistant for Assessment.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Announcements from Pres. Mullins

- Requested that senators sit on the lower row of seats
- Reported on meeting with Gerry Wood.
 - The timing of the closing of the bookstore for inventory last summer was not the choice of the bookstore staff but due to factors beyond their control. Pres. Mullins will get more details on this by speaking with Lisa Gray.
 - The bookstore will be having an informational session for faculty regarding changes in ISBN numbers which may change the way we order books. Possible date is Oct. 17.
- With regard to a complaint the Faculty Welfare Committee brought to the Senate this past summer - a number of meetings have taken place and all involved parties are satisfied and the matter appears to be resolved.

4. A word from the administration – Provost Jones

- Although we might like to adopt a "Hell no, we won't grow" position, doing so would break our trust with the administration, system and state and, ultimately, hurt ourselves. The two schools (Towson and ourself) that were directed to increase our enrollments this fall both met the enrollment goals. Although the system is moving forward and wants us to grow by an

additional 400 students next fall, they are listening to us and may be willing to drop that increase to 300. The administration is currently working on a strong justification for that which needs to be ready by Dec. But ultimately the plan is for the university to grow by 1523 over the next 4 years. Even if we can convince the system to a 300 increase next fall, this increase will likely be felt more than this increase this past fall, in part because the TETC will not be completed. The provost and president will do all they can to direct the funds to enhancement, not simply maintaining the status quo. Pres. Dudley-Eshbach has indicated that we won't proceed with the increase unless the money is there. However, we won't know that until March (after the legislature has met). We will initiate some faculty searches in the fall (with "based on available funding" in the ad) but more will be started in spring. (Some of this may be influenced by results of the Nov. election).

- For a number of reasons, the administration is exploring the idea of making the submission of SAT scores as part of the freshmen application package optional. The reasons include: that we have been broadening our admission criteria over the last 5-10 years, that we (& other schools) experienced a 30 pt drop in SATs this year, that future enrollment increases may further decrease our SATs, and that there are increasing concerns from some educators regarding the validity of SATs (a recent article in the eChronicle). Janet spoke with the Chancellor about this and he thought we might be a good school to pilot this for the system. A complication, however, is that this would require an exception from the BOR policy dating from 1992/93. If we try this, it would be a two year pilot project and we would look to see whether it changed our first year retention rate and would compare the retention rates between the students that submitted SATs with those that did not. We would still be able to submit SATs to US News & World Report as they only require 50% of the SATs reported. Bob Tardiff will investigate whether other schools in the system submit all their SATs as we currently do. The administration wants faculty input – both pro and con. And if we are against it, they won't go for it. Unfortunately there is a need for haste. In order to be able to implement it for fall 07, Tom needs to bring this before the system provosts on Oct. 17, to get it to the Education Committee for their Nov. meeting. Pres. Mullins directed the Admissions and Readmissions Committee to examine the issue. Information on the issue will be distributed to the whole faculty who should send their opinions, pro and con, to Admissions & Readmissions. The committee will report back to the Senate at our next meeting (Oct. 12).

5. Old Business – Faculty Welfare Committee Proposal on Annual Evaluations – Kathleen Shannon. The FWC has concerns about the role of the chairs' annual evaluations of faculty and about the current Feb. 1 deadline. With regards to the deadline, it is rarely met, and since many faculty don't get their annual self evaluations to the chair in time, that is often not the fault of the chair. So chairs

are generally not held to this deadline, but it can become problematic when the evaluations are very late and merit is not recommended. With regard to the role of these evaluations, it is clear that they play a role in merit, tenure and perhaps promotions decisions, but whether they play a role in retention decisions is unclear.

For these reasons, the FWC presented a proposal to change the deadlines for the chairs' evaluations of faculty as follows: 1) the deadline for chairs' evaluations would be March 15 and faculty would be required to sign the evaluation form (acknowledging that they received it by Mar. 15, not that they agreed with the content), 2) include a deadline of Feb. 1 for faculty self evaluations to the chair to allow the chair adequate time to prepare his/her evaluations and 3) to include a deadline of Jan.10 for all required materials to be provided to faculty members so they can meet their deadline for self evaluations. These changes would provide a reasonable schedule which could be enforced and would also separate retention decisions from the evaluation process. (For complete rationale see the document submitted by the committee).

There was much discussion about the proposal. One concern was whether changing this deadline would affect other deadlines in the faculty handbook. A major concern was how these proposed changes would relate to first year tenure track faculty, since the current deadline for informing these faculty if they are not to be re-hired is March 1. Some argued that if this proposal passed, faculty in this situation may not receive any prior written documentation of a problem in their performance before they were informed that they were not to be retained. A suggestion was made to keep the deadline for evaluations of first year tenure track faculty at the Feb. 1 date, but make the change for all other tenure line faculty. Others held that the annual evaluations do not relate to retention decisions. There was also discussion as to what measures are possible in a situation in which a TT faculty member who was retained after year one does not perform adequately in year two. Some thought that it was possible to not retain that faculty member for a third year, as long as he or she was informed by Dec. 15. Others thought that if the initial contract is for three years, a new TT faculty member who is retained after year one, must be retained for the remainder of the initial contract and one additional year. There was also confusion as to whether the first year is considered "probationary" or not. Because of the confusion on these questions, it was decided to refer the matter to the provost to get a clearer picture of the way these decisions are currently handled.

6. New Business

a. Proposal for Final Payment for Winter/Summer and Part-time/overload Contracts – Bob Tardiff. The current delay in the final payment for summer or winter courses is related to the processing of paychecks and the need to validate the course enrollment, which has been done after final grades are turned in. By this proposal, faculty that certify their rosters (by an e-mail to the registrar stating which students on the roster have attended class at least once) at the end of the

Drop/Ad period will receive their final payment on the first paycheck date after the last date to post the grades for that session. Faculty who do not meet that deadline, will receive their final paycheck on the first pay period following the end of the contract (as in the current policy).

Mike Scott made a motion to pass this policy, seconded.
15 yes, motion carries

b. Proposal for Allocation of Faculty Lines – Frank Shipper – Shipper introduced a motion, seconded by Jerry DeRidder, to use a formula for the allocation of faculty lines among the four schools. The formula he presented was based on hours generated with adjustments for the Perdue and Seidel Schools for accreditation requirements. This formula did not include accreditations to specific programs in the other schools or consider contact hours. Discussion included the perspective that although recent enrollments have put an increased stress on certain schools and programs, a formula dictating hiring of new faculty is not desirable.

Mike Scott made a motion to call the question, seconded.
10 yes, 5 opposed, motion carries.

Dr. Shipper's motion.
2 yes, 10 opposed, 3 abstentions, motion fails.

Respectfully submitted, Ellen Lawler, Secretary