**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of October 7, 2011**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Beck Rooms**

**Agenda**

**1.    Sign in for quorum**

**In attendance:** David Beneteau, KC Choi, Mark Couch, Matthew Escobar, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Peter Reader, Thomas Rzeznik, Abe Zakhem, Cathy Zizik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim A. Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Jeffrey Levy, John Shannon, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, Michael Valdez, Ben Beitin, Pledger Fedora, William McCartan (representing Sandy Lee), Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Theodora Sirota, Eric Johnston, Tom Fortin, Assefaw Bariagaber, Phillip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Patricia Remshifski, Ellen Mandel

**2.    Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:01pm. The Chair thanked everyone for attending and welcomed the newly elected Senate members. Alternates who were at the meeting, representing a Senator, were asked to please sign in on the attendance sheet and indicate who they were representing.

**3.    Communications from Provost Robinson**

The Provost was welcomed by the Chair. The Provost proceeded: It is good to see all of you and I always enjoy coming to these meetings even for a brief time. There are a couple things I would like to talk about; first, the semester is off to a good start. Enrollment management is good; we did try to curtail and limit the entry of category 5 students. This was not reflected accurately in the Setonian. We still have issues with the budget and are trying to resolve the 4.5 million dollar gap. As for benefits, considerable effort has been made, and I strongly pushed for, the institute to step up and pay for half the $800,000.

Recently I have been advised on the resolution concerning the Core Curriculum and I encourage the development of the committee, but would like you all to consider the implications for the intent of the committee as the Core is in a fragile state. There are some organizational and structural issues that this office is dealing with in regards to the Core. Our office got involved because of the challenge of stability. The original design was for faculty to teach in loads, but this has proven to not always be practical. An annual budget of 1.5 million dollars was allotted to deal with the Core. I want to be certain that we attempted to stab the cost of the Core and we have been challenged at every aspect about the Core. We want to create stability for the Core as there has not been widespread agreement about the Core. The concern is the intent of the resolution for the Core. If the organization is concerning administration or a blurring of lines, it could create uncertainty. This is a critical time for the Core and I would like clarification about the Core and this resolution. The Core is fragile and there has not always been the support for something that we can benefit from. I wanted to share this and express to be diligent of the deliberation of the Core matters.

**Questions:**

**Ben Beitin:**  Thank you Mr. Provost for coming and for the proposal of the Graduate Studies advisory board. What is the intent of the board in terms of the aspects of the proposal? What would this board be looking at? The concern of the Graduate Studies Committee is that some pieces sound like issues that would be resolved by Faculty Guide. Can you please clarify on the purpose of this advisory board?

**Answer**: Dr. Travis once dealt with graduate issues, its procedures, and policies. An internal review of Graduate studies was completed and the office created an external review as well. We took information from Dr. Travis to respond to the middle states (2103-2014 we are dealing with this). We invited two graduate deans from other universities to assess their Graduate Studies structure and how they dealt with issues. Our institution has no centralization or standardization in Graduate Studies and our intent was to create a graduate council (made up of representation from each of the programs to come as advocates). My purpose for this board was to respond to the middle states with the creation of an equal representative body to look at graduate issues and to show that we the organizational capabilities to make assessments within the graduate program.

**Ben Beitin:** Is it fair to say there is flexibility on the proposal [advisory board responsibilities] as it stands?

**Answer:** Greg Burton is working with David Beneteau on this and we want to assess and address graduate issues from a central standpoint. We do not want an informal body to look at need, we wanted to ability to create a more formalized response. That is why there was an internal and external review. The array of responsibility is till up for discussion.

**Roseanne Mirabella:** Can we wait a month for the analysis of both issues, would there be harm to this decision postponement so we are better able to assess issues?

**Answer:** Yes, there can be a wait without harm.

**4.   Approval of agenda without objection at 1:16pm.**

**5.   Approval of the**[**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/minutes_September_9_2011.doc)**of the September 9 meeting without comments,**

**corrections, or amendments at 1:16pm.**

**6.   Executive Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/EC_report_Oct._2011.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:26pm.**

The Chair noted that health care costs are increasing in the long run and there a need of a discussion of how we are going to resolve this issue for the future.

**Question**: After hearing and reading your report, is it your opinion the Provost recommends committees to be formed and then decisions are made or are you [the Executive Committee] involved with the deliberation. Work has been put out to the committee and it is hard to argue against this, where is our shared governance in all this?

**Answer**: This is hard to answer- both. Tuition reduction was kept in the drawer to market surprise value. We were actually surprised to not be informed of it in advance at all. The Graduate proposal came from the Graduate committee and there was talk between the committee and the Provost for the creation of a council. More assessment is wanted because of fear of 2013-2014 with the middle states. The role of assessment (Mary Balkun) has something to the report. Interesting question, though thank you.

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees:**

1. **Academic Policy Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/APC_Report_10.7.11.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:27pm.**

**Question**: Is the 2nd sentence understood?

**Answer:** This is understood.

**b. Admissions Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/AdmissionsReport_to_Senate_October_2011-1.doc)**(an additional confidential presentation is located on Blackboard in the Faculty Senate Community,** **under**D**ocuments) was accepted without objection at 1:32pm.**

Brenda Petersen would like to draw attention to the fact that 38% of fall students are in the highest risk categories- pre-major, pre-science, and undecided. There is a need of faculty advisors to encourage the declaration of a major from these students. There is a big risk for student dropout. Petersen was not quite sure what the Provost was talking about regarding Tier 5 students, as there is interest in decreasing this enrollment. The greatest concern with these students is retention. There has been an increase in the rate of Tier 5 student enrollment as this number was 34% in 2010 and now it has increased to 38% for 2011. Overall profile of enrollment has decreased as well except for GPA.

**Answer:** The Provost meant the enrollment projections of Tier 5 students. He preferred to take/accept those better prepared and admission was not to reopen to those that were already rejected.

The admissions director is being replaced and hopefully with new employment, the numbers will increase.

**Question**: Do the students who have been enrolled violate any of Seton Hall’s admission standards? Is there a need for reevaluation of college admission standards?

**Answer**: There has never been a violation of the standards, except for anecdotal violations from Deans for students that do not make the standards.

**c. Calendar Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Calendar_Committee_Report_2c_October_2011.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:33pm.**

The committee would like to note that it does not have representation from the college of Education and the committee welcomes representation from this school in all forms.

**d. Compensation & Welfare Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Compensation_Committee_Report_October_2011.docx) **was accepted without objection at 1:38pm.**

Roseanne Mirabella wanted to add a few remarks regarding the Benefits Advisory Committee; the vast majority of faculty take OAP and if they choose to increase us, we will get back more of the $400,000 that we are contributing to. Our benefits are very rich and our health care benefits are one of the last remaining things that are very rich. Compensation and faculty life is not the best, so we will fight to maintain the OAP. Many faculty are in this group because we are in the age bracket for those who need the benefits and often even go outside to seek medical help.

Some people take the more expensive plans because they have needs that require more money. We are in the midst of creating some kind of fund to assist those faculty [some 5-10 people] that are really affected by the 30% increase.

In January, we are also going to try to do to a survey for the assessment of what is wanted in terms of health services. Another plan was been proposed to save money, but people did not want to switch insurance providers, wanted to stay with Cigna. We need to know what we should do for the long-term, in the future.

**Question:** Should this survey come from the Senate or human resources? One problem there is vacancy in HR.

**Answer:** There is a sliding fee scale for health care cost. We want to pull faculty on this. Those that make less will be hurt the most.

**e. Core Curriculum Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Senate_Report_10-11_CCC%20.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:40pm.**

Mary Balkun noted that committee did meet and it was agree the Core Curriculum Committee should still exist with faculty, staff, and administration. Reconstituting the committee will make it a committee that is a part of the Senate; one that is without the limited service. This would allow all Senate members and faculty members to serve on the committee. The committee is broken off from APC and it should remain separated to deal with specific issues. Everything else in the report is pretty clear.

**Question**: Was the reconstitution supported unanimously by the committee?

**Answer**: Yes it was.

**I.**  **Resolution: That the Core Curriculum Committee be reconstituted as a regular Senate Committee with the following charge: The CCC makes recommendations to the Senate on matters relating to the Core Curriculum of the University.**

**II. Resolution: That the number of required proficiency-infused courses remain at 10 for the foreseeable future.**

**III. Resolution: That transfer students again be exempted from the proficiency requirement for the 2011-2012 academic year.**

**IV. Addendum:**[**Approved Proficiency-Infused Courses**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Approved_Courses_For_Posting.xls)

**f. Faculty Development Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Committee_Report.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:42pm.**

**David Beneteau:** Is the committee working with URC for proposal? Faculty development and the Senate endorsed that URC proposals be moved up so that grant acceptance can be informed earlier.ac dev and senate endorsed that URC proposals be moved up so that grant acceptance can be informed earlier. As soon as the URC forms, we need to be on them to come to meetings.

**g. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/FG_Oct_report.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:44pm.**

Colleen Conway there is an addition to report as a matter was left off inadvertently. What was also discussed was the exception clause for the nursing line- deals with the number of credit hours accredited in light of clinical hours. There is unfair compensation for the number of clinical hours and faculty are not being reimbursed fairly. Faculty Guide piece (7.3.5.a) would only pertain to nursing and this discrepancy is just for your info.

**I. Second reading of proposed changes to**[**Senate Bylaw XII**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Sept_2011/7_h_III.doc)

**II. Second reading of new proposed revisions to Faculty Guide Articles**[**5.1.d and 10.3.b**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Sept_2011/7_h_IV.doc)

**III. Motion regarding the Clinical Faculty appointment for the**[**College of Nursing**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Motion_regarding_the_Clinical_Faculty.doc)

**h. Graduate Studies Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Grad_studies_committee_report--Oct_2011.docx) **was accepted without objection at 1:47pm.**

The co-chair of this committee is Ben Beitin.The primary issue that this committee faced was creating the advisory board. The committee was asked to comment on its structure.

There was a motion that was not approved unanimously to add under new business the Greg Burton’s position.

King Mott objected to discuss a colleague’s [Greg Burton’s] appointment; we can discuss the creation of a title. There was a proposal to a 5min discussion of the creation of the Greg Burton position.

**Question:** Is this a time sensitive issue, can it be discussed in November?

**Answer:** No, it can be discussed in November.

**The motion failed to add at 1:48pm.**

**Question:** Is the proposal that came to the committee changed in a substantive way from what was given by the Provost?

**Answer:** No, it talked about the parameters of responsibilities of the board**.**

**I. Motion on Graduate Policy**[**Advisory Board**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/motion_on_Grad_Board.docx)

**i. Library Commitee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Library_Committee_Report.doc) **was accepted without object at 1:49pm.**

  A statement for next meeting is in the works.

**j. Program Review Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Senate_Report_10-11_PR.doc) **was accepted without objection at 1:53pm.**

**Question:** Is the list of programs that are up for renewal posted?

**Answer**: No, we do need the list to be posted on the Faculty Senate homepage and we can work with Nicole to do this. We have posted the matrix there before and we need take down what is there now and replace it with a newer version.

For an assessment refresher, Mary Balkun wanted to clarify some statements. The provost instituted a new assessment policy and it involved people coming up for program review go to two meetings, come up with a plan, and show how plan was used. It was asked by Greg Burton to make this assessment plan put into guidelines for program view. We said no, we asked those that go through assessment be then given to self-study. For item #4 in the report, the committee is not ignoring this information; we want this information, but will not be acting on it.

**8.  Committees with no reports**

1. **Academic Facilities Committee** **report- no report**
2. **Grievance Committee report- no report**
3. **Instructional Technology Committee report- no report**

**d. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee report- no report**

**9.  Committee motions**

1. **Graduate Studies Committee**

**I. Motion on Graduate Policy**[**Advisory Board**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/motion_on_Grad_Board.docx)

David Beneteau: The Senate is not asked to give a vote if we think it is appropriate to form such aboard since the Provost has decided to make it. Is it appropriate to elect someone from the Senate as opposed to the Provost electing someone?

**Discussion:**

Roseanne Mirabella: I am a member of Grad Committee and was involved with the advisory board conversation. I have concerns and want to put off voting to next month. The issues I have are 3 fold; first, all members of the committee are from schools that have graduate programs and the Library does not have a seat on this committee and it is substantially affected by graduate students. The Executive Committee of this board is a two-two split and we need to know their power and what decisions they are making. Who is going to make the split? - Probably the Provost. I have a feeling that if this motion is passed without looking at issues and talking with the Provost first about these issues, we are not getting another shot. We should wait and talk to Provost about these issue that are pertinent to faculty and have the motion come back, looking the way we want it to.

Ben Beitin: Our intention is to support the idea of the advisory board and to have faculty representation on it- that is it. The Provost has probably not even read the motion; Dean Greg Burton was the one to probably look at it. There is flexibility to discuss the board’s responsibility and the Executive Committee. We are tired of waiting for graduate stuff to happen; we have continued to watch as Graduate Studies has been ignored on campus and a lot of others agree with this. This motion is for moving forward and working things out as we go. The Provost agreed to change its composition to a majority of faculty.

**Question**: Objection is favor of moving to this today?

David Beneteau: I objected to having equal numbers of Dean and faculty members on the advisory committee. However, the Provost can compose this as he wants. We wanted faculty to have an opinion and involvement with this committee. The Senate representative would be involved in negotiations (like terms).

**Question**: Does it actually say in the report that they wanted a meeting with Provost about the board’s responsibilities. The committee asking for a meeting with Provost before moving forward, what happened to this meeting?

**Answer**: We want to have a meeting with the Provost about its composition. The motion is to elect a Senate representation for the advisory board.

**Question**: So a meeting would happen post the creation of this board?

Roseanne Mirabella: We did not have a quorum for this meeting and we made electronic voting. It is still something that requires further consideration.

Assefaw Bariagaber: She is right; we only had 5 or 6 members present, but the committee justifies/advocates its use of electronical voting.

**Judith Lothian: I support the board and having a presence of an Executive Committee of this board. The detail about representation can be worked out later, either way the faculty will have a big say and the majority on this board.**

**Question:** Can you elaborate; we should be talking about graduate matters. I do not know how I feel about moving this today.

**Point of order:** There can be no discussion of a specific part of the motion. Allowing a committee to be formed, allows the committee to make their own opinions.

**Roseanne Mirabella makes a motion to change the last sentence of the Motion on Graduate Policy**[**Advisory Board**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/motion_on_Grad_Board.docx)**at 2:05pm. I don’t like that sentence, but don’t know how to change it.**

**Judith Lothian: In the sentence “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the formation of a Graduate Policy Advisory Board with the mandate that faculty academic rights and responsibilities remain as specified in the guide,” specified in the guide is strong, perhaps end with board and take out “in order to make suggestions with respect to the rest of the proposal.” Mary Balkun seconds the amendment.**

**Question:** What happens with this, do we vote? Discussing with the Provost about the scope of the board, where does this go after the discussion with the Provost. Do we get to vote?

**Answer from Colleen Conway:** The faculty representative will be elected by colleges and would be involved with the discussion of the committee about the scope. We are to elect these representatives and in turn we trust them to do their job and to come to the Senate if there are issues. Let faculty do their work and trust they know how to do what they are going to do and that they will come to the Senate if there are issues. I have no opinion of amendment.

Phillip Moremen**:** I am against the amendment, propose an alternative. We could condition continued Senate support on the board.

**Amendment passed at 2:09pm to delete these words.**

David Beneteau: It is my hope that Senators would run for representation.

**Theodora Sirota motioned to add an amendment to include someone from the library to the representation. The motion was to add library to sentence “**The Board will consist of: The Dean of Research and Graduate Services, the director of Graduate Admissions, one representative of each college offering graduate programs (Arts and Sciences, Education and Human Services, Diplomacy, Business, Health and Medical Sciences, Nursing, Law, and Theology) and the library elected by the faculty of the respective colleges, an official representative of the Faculty Senate, two college Deans or their designees nominated by colleges and appointed by the Provost; at least one college represented should be different from the colleges represented the prior year.  **The motion was amended and passed at 2:11pm.**

Roseanne Mirabella: What is the rush of this if the Provost gave us time?

-No comment.

**Resolution for creating the board passes at 2:12pm.**

**b. Executive Committee**

**I. Second Reading of Faculty Guide changes (to Articles 4, 5.5.d, 7.3.a, 7.4.a-c [new edition], 9.1) regarding 3+3**[**course load**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Sept_2011/Proposed_Changes_Faculty_Guide.doc)

David Beneteau: A question, is it the will of the body we consider all Faculty Guide changes together or broken up?

**Point of Order**: Dr. Chair you are out of order; the second reading is as posted and if you want to break up into parts and a motion needs to be made and the reading will become a first reading.

David Beneteau: No, this will be considered as one change.

**Questions**:

No comments. The Senate was reminded that changes to the Faculty Guide require a 2/3 majority vote. Dr. Sandy Lee and Elizabeth McCrea alternates will be voting on their behalf on this reading.

**All were in favor of the Executive Committee’s motion to approving the second readings of Faculty Guide changes regarding 3+3 course load. The motion passed at 2:16pm by 2/3 majority.** David Beneteau would like to thank the Executive Committee for all of their assistance with this.

**Point of information:** Like to thank the help of previous Executive Committee members for their assistance with this as well.

**c. Core Curriculum Committee**

1. **Resolution: That the Core Curriculum Committee be reconstituted as a regular Senate Committee with the following charge: The CCC makes recommendations to the Senate on matters relating to the Core Curriculum of the University.**

It was noted that reconstituted means reformed. For clarification, the Core Curriculum Committee would become a regular senate committee any senate and full time faculty would be able to join. The committee would not open to administrators and should therefore be populated by a majority of sitting faculty. Meetings will occur and more members would be included.

The committee took a look at the existing language and placed the resolution here, not changing anything else

**Question**: Where would some of this go? Default where?

**Answer**: One of the things we decided, but it has not yet changed, was that no one looked closely enough at the department’s plan for the core; positions do not fit in the guide. The committee would look at the structure and work with others to see what issues in the core and be cleared by other committee; this will be the first order of the committee. Look at core department structure and see where language in the guide could include post-docs.

**Question:** Some matters should come to APC. We do regularly deal with resources and how changes affect other schools. We would like to see this more specific as it is appropriate for APC to view.

**Point of information**: Regarded what the APC deals with.

The committee was thinking in these terms; serve as the APC for the core departments as it does not have a college to go through. The Core Curriculum Committee would be the committee that farm things out to other committees.

**Question**: What exactly does the director of the Core Committee do?

**Answer**: The direction has nothing with this Senate committee. The chair of this Senate

Committee would serve as core advisory board—this where the connection would be.

**Question:** You [the committee] are going to evaluate the Core Curriculum. This is a resolution for a standing committee, if it does go through this committee, where does it go through afterward? We need a direct voice to the Senate.

**Question**: I have a question regarding the resolution. To me, this resolution is extremely vague. I need a little more clarity about what it actually means in the end with the language. “Making recommendations to the Senate” means many things. My concern is that language is so board that there no foothold to prevue what is actually in the language and what is not in the language.

**Answer**: The proposal is to reconstitute the committee as a standing committee and it will continue to do what it says it will.

**Question**: What are we voting on? Are we reconstituting it to make it a regular senate committee and will the current committee stand as it is with its members?

**Answer**: Yes

**Question**: With the Core, how will the faculty serve its function with its input? -A request for clarification.

**Answer**: The difference is that the department is outside the colleges. There is a need for joint appointments to the core department, once there is a department with joint faculty and post doc, proposal for curriculum changes can occur. We are not going to APC, the Core Curriculum Committee would serve to look at those issues. This creates a good structure and creates a differentiation from administration.

**The motion for the reconstitution of the Core Curriculum Committee passes at 2:28pm.**

**II.  Resolution: That the number of required proficiency-infused courses remain**

**at 10 for the foreseeable future.**

Eric Johnston: This resolution is vague about whether voting for proficiency-infused coursesto be kept or not increased. Amend that the proficiency remain no higher than 10 for the foreseeable future. The statement is ambiguous- make it clearer. The amendment seconded.

**Point of clarification**: Can proficiency-infused courses less than 10?

**Point of information:** This is transformative.

**Answer:** Yes.

Roseanne Mirabella: I speak against amendment, already at 10 and this would remain at 10. Not intended to push this down.

**Point of Information:** 10 proficiency classes, at to take one of each of proficiency. Keep at 10 regardless of proficiency.

Mary Balkun: The Senate previously voted to have it at 10, then 12 and then 15. We got a delay to get the courses to 12.

**Vote on the amendment for proficiency -infused courses to remain no higher than 10- motion failed to pass at 2:33.**

**Marta Deyrup motions for an amendment: Based on the prior senate decisions it is clear that the proficiency remains at 10 and “foreseeable future” should be deleted from the resolution. The motion was seconded and passed at 2:34.** **That the number of required proficiency-infused courses remains at 10 was voted and passed at 2:34pm without objection.**

**III.  Resolution: That transfer students again be exempted from the proficiency**

**requirement for the 2011-12 academic  year.**

Roseanne Mirabella: I speak in favor of the motion. It is related to item #2 and this body has looked at this before. We are doing a complete assessment of where we are in the proficiency.

No comments.

All in favor without objection of this resolution at 2:36pm.

**d. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee**

1. **Second reading of proposed changes to**[**Senate Bylaw XII**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Sept_2011/7_h_III.doc)

David Beneteau: These changes suggest that new senate may not vote and if this is the case, this is out of order.

Judith Lothian: I speak to the fact that this motion needs more clarification. This was not the intent of the committee. Motion to remand to the Faculty Guide committee was made at 2:38pm, it was seconded and all were in favor at 2:38pm of remanding this motion back to Faculty Guide.

1. **Second reading of new proposed revisions to Faculty Guide Articles**[**5.1.d and 10.3.b**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Sept_2011/7_h_IV.doc)

**For 5.1.d:**

Tom Fortin: I opposed to one line as it is redundant since the ballots will be there, but I understand why it was put there. **I propose to take out the line of “The department must approve the letter before it is sent forward.” This motion was seconded.**

**Question**: In agreement with these comments, please explain why this included?

**Answer:** To make the process transparent. I have seen some ballots that have one line and they are not necessarily fulsome. The chair needs to represent not just the ballot, but the conversation as well. This is in regards to the department’s recommendation, not the chair and the letter needs to reflect this.

King Mott: I speak strongly against this motion. We have been frustrated in seeing the letter when there is a contentious voting. When it is contentious, and the chair is in the majority and faculty will not see the letter.

Assefaw Bariagaber: I am in support of removing this amendment. The letter is represented by what each proxy writes and votes; don’t see the department chair adding anything. It would be hard to get the department to agree with a single letter.

Judith Lothian: I am not in support of this amendment. The sentence protects the department from misrepresenting even with ballots tacked on.

Ben Beitin: I speak in favor of the motion, deleting the sentence. I ask to consider an alternative; department can vote to approve the letter if they so choose.

Amy Silvestri Hunter: I speak against the motion of removing, incumbent for faculty to express themselves in more detail. I am concerned and that if the removal is approved word changes would change.

**The amendment for removing the department sentence: there was a request for a hand vote at 2:45pm. In favor of removing this department is at 19 and opposed is at 16. The motion to remove this sentence is approved at 2:46pm by vote of hand.**

Mary Balkun motioned for the addition: Department chair must send a copy of the letter to the voting members of the department before it is sent forward. Send it to the voting members to look at. There is a second to her motion.

Matthew Escobar: Regretfully, permitting the department to see the letter, but not giving give the department a mechanism to officially respond, it does not make sense. The department does need to be informed; either it requires departmental approval or it’s gone.

Some like this as it removes burden and requires accountability from the chair since it is going to be sent to the faculty.

Karen Boroff: If I respond to the letter and disagree, you create fragments.

Nancy Enright: We don’t need a mechanism; trust colleagues to come to the Senare if there is a discrepancy.

William McCartan: The letter varies department to department. With it being open, it makes it’s a more crucial letter. It could include commentary of the chair.

**Question for qualification**- Is it true that the department can set its own laws and bylaws?

**Answer:** Yes

King Mott: I speak in favor of this, reminding us that when it is contentious, more transparency is needed of the faculty and more protection for candidates going through this is needed.

**Point of Order:** This motion now becomes a first reading since of the deletion. The amendment passes at 2:52 pm for the addition.

Marta Deyrup: I think that it needs to be rephrased to be in aligment with what the department does.

Colleen Conway: This language is in the FG already, the lib as its own section.

**At 2:54pm, the first reading of 5.1d and 10.3b was completed. Second meeting will address the second reading.**

**Point of Privilege**: Since this is a first reading now and we didn’t talk about 10.3b, if there are objections for this language, please let Colleen Conway know now. If people suggest you to and are brought up for motion, it will make another first reading. For a second reading of this for November, we need motions now.

**Matthew Escobar : It makes sense to change “should” in the “department letter about the candidate should” to must. I propose this as an amendment Escobar and this was seconded.** No discussion took place, **all in favor of changing this agreed without objection at 2:57pm and the motion passed for this revision.**

There was a proposal for an amendment to specify the number of the days for the addition before it is sent forward; proposed 7 days.

People disagree: Peter: timeline is tight for tenure and promotion and I speak against the motion. The motion failed to add 7 days.

Bring proposed changes to the Faculty Guide.

**III. Motion regarding the Clinical Faculty appointment for the**[**College of Nursing**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Motion_regarding_the_Clinical_Faculty.doc)

Faculty Guide wanted to get the Senate’s sense of this line; a motion for “yes” would indicate support for the committee to move forward on this. The Senate retains its ability to vote “no” on changes when the line is brought back.

Roseanne Mirabella: I am in favor of creating a position the nursing college needs, but I have concern with creating a line that allows for untenured positions. We should examine this issue of tenure and see if there is a way to add this to the line.

Judith Lothian: The recommendation from faculty nursing is strongly opposed to this being a tenured position. Faculty associates will not be used in nursing if this line approves as it will provide a clinical track. These are people [who are opposed to this line being a tenured position] are faculty who do not meet or do not want to meet the standards we now have for tenure. HMS gets mentoring on clinical sites and it is different with nursing faculty-their license is on the line and requires faculty to be continuously current with what is going on with clinical. In excellent schools, this is not a tenured lined. The faculty who would be affected by the change have a strong commitment to SHU.

**Question:** Are we talking about faculty in the clinical setting doing work with students?

**Answer:** Yes, they are not in the classroom.

Brenda Petersen: This position would eliminate faculty associates in nursing and they would be transitioned to clinical.

**Question**: What about Faculty Guide changes?

**Answer:** The committee felt it was important to get the sense of the Senate before bringing changes to the Senate. We wanted to hear of the sense of the Senate first.

Mary Balkun: We spoke about in prior meeting about potentially creating a school as a certificate of continuous employment (which is granted to people primarily teaching). They are renewed and have permanent position of tenure without the word. Has this been brought back to the nursing?

Judith Lothian: We were reluctant to bring this to the Senate as a first read, need to work out language.

Colleen Conway response to Roseanne Mirabella’s concerns: I personally, and I can speak of the Faculty Guide committee as well, are invested in decreasing the amount of faculty who are not tenured, but this is not the place to fight the battle of tenure, nursing really needs this appointment. They really need this to happen and it would be good to support this.

Roseanne Mirabella: Read from AAUP website. There is concern of wanting to bring on a class of citizens that will not have that class. I want to figure this out.

Theodora Sirota: We are concerned about protection of a lengthy position as well, but there will be protection built into this; the language will be worked out. It is the will of the college of nursing faculty to not be granted tenure for what it now means.

**The Senate endorsed the continuation of the line and the motion passes at 3:09pm.**

**10.   New Business**

**I: Election for Senate representation to the Provost advisory board.**

Ben Beitin as volunteered to run as the representative of this board. No other nominees were seen and Ben Beitin was appointed to this position at 3:10pm. KC Choi is to send to the secretaries of the colleges to vote for their representatives.

**11.   Communications were read without objection or question.**

**a. Communications from Stillman School of Business**

**I. Faculty Guide**[**Revision**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Stillman_Communication_on_Faculty_Guide.docx)

**II.**[**Compensation**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Oct_2011/Stillman_Commication_on_Compensation.docx)

**12.   Adjournment**

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:13pm by David Beneteau; it was seconded and the meeting ended at 3:13pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of November 4, 2011**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Theatre-in-the-Round**

**Agenda**

**1.    Sign in for quorum**

In Attendance: David Beneteau, KC Choi, Mark Couch, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Peter Reader, Cathy Zizik, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim A. Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Bert Wachsmuth, Gita Das Bender, Elizabeth McCrea, Karen Boroff, Eunyoung Kim, Plegder Fedora, Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Theodora Sirota, Eric Johnston, Tim Fortin, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Patricia Remshifski, Irene DeMasi, and Deborah Welling

**2.    Call to order**

The meeting began at 1:06pm with the Chair welcoming the Provost.

**3.    Communications from Provost Robinson**

The Provost informed the Senate of the following items:

\*The Board of Trustees is meeting on November 30th and December 1st. The Provost plans to discuss formalizing the strategic plan, particularly matters relevant to enrollment management.

\*The first open house of the year had a 60% increase in student attendance from last year. Students currently applying have, on average, scored 20 points higher on the SAT than in the past. During our October open house, 652 prospective students attended and for this Sunday’s open house, 1200 students signed up to attend. Last year at this time, 652 students showed up to the November open house.

\*With regard to our tuition shortfall, we are currently operating at a $4.9 million deficit due to our current 975 freshmen class. However, we are running $1 million ahead of what was projected in graduate studies, which will alleviate some of the $4.9 million shortfall. We are currently trying to isolate where we can save money, and starting this academic year, with the Human Resources Committee, we are going to assess all appointments/hire requests. In the past, reexamining previous appointments has saved us 1.5 million dollars. We are trying to deal with the shortfall in different ways, and Administration is hoping not to pursue cutbacks this year. There is a finance meeting on November 11, and the meeting will address this year’s budget and begin planning next year’s budget.

\*Another issue of concern and importance is that of campus security. Administration is taking many steps to address this issue, including increasing and enhancing lighting on campus, the addition of security cameras, and greater communication and coordination with local police departments. The University has also added more rides for students. Both the President’s and Provost’s offices have been dealing with the issue of Pirate Alert and how it is being utilized (there is concern that we are overusing it). There have been complaints of parents who receive these alerts early in the morning, and there is debate about the use of this system.

Questions for the Provost:

\*A senator asked whether there have been efforts by the Administration to engage the larger community with respect to campus security issues.

Provost responded by reiterating his earlier remarks on campus security. He is in possession of a book on the type and number of crimes around the university and is willing to share that with the Senate. He made clear that he realizes this issue impacts the reputation of the school.

\*Another senator followed up by asking whether steps have been taken to address the issue of poverty in our area. The senator states that the Administration only seems to be addressingthe symptoms of poverty instead of directly resolving its roots (acknowledging that poverty is an important contributing factor to crime). The senator stated that we should begin engaging our neighbors (Rutgers-Newark, NJIT, and Newark communities) to address the issue of poverty and crime in our area.

Provost responded that the Administration is looking at every conceivable step that can be

taken to address the problem. There was a similar discussion at the Law School. This is definitely something the Administration is aware of and is seeking ways to address it.

**4.   Approval of agenda was approved without objection.**

\*Dr. Nancy Enright is the sponsor of the Commuter Benefits Resolution (under New Business). Its consideration requires a second. The motion was seconded by Dr. KC Choi.

**5.   Approval of the**[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/minutes_October_7_2011.doc)**of the October 7 meeting without objection.**

**6.   Executive Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/EC_report_Nov._2011.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

\*A senator asked about the nature of the responsibilities of the Senior Associate Provost.

The Chair of the Senate responded that the responsibilities are not yet definitive. Generally speaking, this position will serve as a kind of chief of staff for the Provost. The actual responsibilities will depend on who is hired and what their experience is. Areas of oversight will be assigned according to responsibilities.

\*Dr. Roseanne Mirabella, Chair of Compensation, remarked that with regard to benefits and compensation, there is a desire on the part of Administration to switch plans since our benefits are considered “too rich.” Dr. Mirabella disputed the claim and elicited support from all faculty to help maintain our current benefit package.

\*One last question from the Senate floor regarding the Executive Committee’s position on the proposed non-tenured Nursing Clinical Line.

Dr. David Beneteau, Chair of the Senate responded that the EC has deferred this conversation to the Faculty Guide Committee as the appropriate venue. He expressed hope for a vigorous debate at the Senate meeting today on this issue, and stated that the Executive Committee stands impartial with respect to the Faculty Guide Committee’s work.

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees:**

1. **Admissions Committee**[Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Admissions Committee Report to Senate November 4 2011.doc) **(an additional document from the Admissions Committee can be found on the Senate Blackboard site.  The document is titled The Application Processing Record for the Graduate Division).**

\*The Chair of the Committee underscored the Committee’s concern that changes to admissions policies have occurred without faculty participation. Today’s resolution expresses this concern.

\*The report was received without objection.

**I.** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_on_Enrollment_Services.doc) **on Enrollment Services**

**b. Calendar Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Calendar_Committee_Report_November 2011.docx) **was received without objection.**

**I.  Resolution: In order to enable advanced planning, the Provost's Office should ensure that by the start of each academic year, calendars for the two subsequent academic years be posted.**

**c. Core Curriculum Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Senate_Report_2011-11_CCC.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

\*A question from a senator on whether there has been any discussion about core courses for graduate students, especially given the number of class/course redundancies between graduate programs.

The Co-Chair of the Committee indicated that this has never been an item of discussion, but thought it was an interesting question.

**d. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/FG_November_Senate_report.doc) **was received without objection.**

**I.  Second reading of new proposed revisions to Faculty Guide Articles** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Proposed_changes_to_FG_Articles5.1.d&10.3.b.doc)

**II. First reading of proposed addition to** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/First_reading_of_proposed_addition_to_BylawXII.doc)

**III. By-Law XXVII - The committee proposes to remove the Senate Bylaw** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/BylawXXVII.doc)

**IV. First reading of the** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final 10312011.doc) **with the accompanying** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_to_proposed_CTNF_appointments.doc) **to proposed CTNF appointments**

**a. Clinical Track Nursing Faculty** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/RationaleforClinicalFacultyLine_Nov_1_2011.docx)

**e. Program Review Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Senate_Report_11-11_PRC.doc) **was received without objection.**

**8.  Committees with no written reports**

**a. Academic Facilities Committee report**

**b. Academic Policy Committee report**

**c. Compensation & Welfare Committee report—oral report was received without objection. (This oral report was submitted during the Senate meeting.)**

Oral Report: The committee met on Tuesday with the new Associate Provost for Finance, Dr. Nicholas Snow. The Committee shared a peer-institutions list with him for a new salary study and was informed that there was no money to complete this study. Moreover, the Provost Office cannot find prior discussions and agreements regarding the salary floors for faculty ranks.

Given Snow’s position on the salary study, the Committee is going to go ahead and work on this study. The Committee will work to see if SHU faculty salaries are comparable to peer institutions and see if a salary increase is in order.

\*A question was asked whether there was a subcommittee on compensation. The question was answered in the positive, and the following names were identified as members of this subcommittee: Carr, Balkun, Kim, Mirabella, Anne Marie Murphy.

**d. Faculty Development Committee**[**report**](../../../../Nov_2011/CommitteeReportOct..doc) **was received without objection. (This report was submitted orally during the Senate meeting, and a written report was submitted afterwards.)**

**e. Graduate Studies Committee**[**report**](../../../../Nov_2011/GradStudiesReport.doc) **was received without objection. (This report was submitted orally during the Senate meeting, and a written report was submitted afterwards.)**

\*A senator asked about the status of the Senate’s recommendation to include a Library faculty member on the Provost’s Graduate Policy Advisory Board. The Chair of the Senate stated that the Provost denied this request. The Chair of the Senate also noted that since the passage of the resolution establishing the Board, CEHS has requested three seats on the board. Also, the College of Arts and Sciences faculty passed a resolution reminding the Provost that all matters of faculty and curriculum must follow appropriate academic governance procedures.

**f. Grievance Committee report**

**g. Instructional Technology Committee report—oral report was received without objection. (This oral report was submitted during the Senate meeting.)**

Oral Report: The committee met yesterday and set up a blog for the committee. The Chair of the committee stated that he is happy to show other committees how to set one up for their own committee if they so desired. The committee would like to hear from faculty about what they would like to see on their faculty profiles websites. The committee would like to think of ways to allow faculty to add research and scholarship pages to their profiles on the SHU webpage.

**h. Library Committee report**

**i. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee report**

**9.  Committee motions**

**a. Admissions Committee**

1. [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_on_Enrollment_Services.doc) **on Enrollment Services**

\*This resolution was passed unanimously.

**b. Calendar Committee**

**I.  Resolution: In order to enable advanced planning, the Provost's Office should ensure that by the start of each academic year, calendars for the two subsequent academic years be posted.**

\*This resolution was passed unanimously.

**c. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee**

**I.  Second reading of new proposed revisions to Faculty Guide Articles** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Proposed_changes_to_FG_Articles5.1.d&10.3.b.doc)

\*Professor Thomas Rondinella moved to amend 5.1.d with the following addition: “the copy of the letter can be made available to the department who request it.” The motion was seconded. Professor Rondinella’s rationale: without this amendment, it would become too burdensome for the department chair to forward the tenure/promotion letter to all eligible faculty in the department for their approval.

Some senators spoke against the amendment, claiming that in particularly difficult departmental vote situations, for the department to see the letter will be helpful.

Some senators asked for clarification: Does the proposed Guide changes suggest that the chair’s letter cannot go to the Dean unless it is first sent to department members for their responses? According to the Chair of the Guide Committee, the answer is no. The proposed changes do not stipulate that the chair of the department must wait for the department to respond to his/her letter before sending it off to the Dean.

\*The amendment did not pass.

\*After further discussion of the proposed Guide changes, the second reading passed via voice vote, with a few “No’s” and 2 abstentions.

**II. First reading of proposed addition to** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/First_reading_of_proposed_addition_to_BylawXII.doc)

\*Since there were no objections to the first reading, the proposed addition will be presented as a second reading at the December meeting.

**III. By-Law XXVII - The committee proposes to remove the Senate Bylaw** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/BylawXXVII.doc)

\*Since there were no objections to the first reading of this proposed deletion,

the proposed deletion will be presented as a second reading at the December meeting.

**IV. First reading of the** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final 10312011.doc) **with the accompanying** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_to_proposed_CTNF_appointments.doc) **to proposed CTNF appointments**

**[**Dr. Colleen Conway, as Chair of the Guide Committee and Dr. Judith Lothian, on the behalf of the Nursing faculty, answered questions about this first reading, particularly questions over the non-tenured status of these new proposed lines. **Dr. Conway chaired the meeting for the discussion of the Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line.**]

\*Dr. Conway: The committee discussed the issue of the non-tenured nature of the proposed clinical lines and the committee recognizes the concerns of a number of senators on pursuing the creation of an untenured faculty line. This is why the proposed line is only for the College of Nursing at the request of that school. This kind of line will only be applicable to CON and not to other academic units. The intent of the line is to provide better conditions for faculty associates who will be transitioned to this line.

\*Dr. Lothian: Some of the points made by Dr. Conway were reiterated. CON has hit the limit for faculty associates. Current faculty associates will be able to transition into these new clinical lines, which are common at most nursing schools. These lines will come with multi-year contracts, which will afford the kind of protection tenure provides. As such, these lines will provide better working conditions to faculty associates who have transitioned into them. Lastly, at most nursing schools, clinical faculty do not necessarily desire tenure and the kind of research expectations that come with gaining tenure. Clinical faculty are primarily interested in teaching and maintaining their primary duties at the bedside in a clinical setting. Not only does the multi-year contract ensure academic freedom for these lines, nursing school accreditation requires that nursing school curricula cover very controversial issues. Thus faculty, whether tenured or not, must discuss issues openly and rigorously—again, accreditation requires it!

\*The first reading passed, and the proposed Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line will be presented as a second reading at the December meeting.

**a. Clinical Track Nursing Faculty** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/RationaleforClinicalFacultyLine_Nov_1_2011.docx)

\*This resolution was rescinded by the Chair of the Guide Committee, claiming that there is no need to take action on the resolution until the Clinical Track Faculty Line is voted on at the next meeting.

**10.   New Business**

**I.  Commuter Benefit** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Commuter_Benefit_Motion.doc)**.**

\*After discussion, this resolution passed unanimously.

**11.   Communications**

No communications.

**12.   Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:41 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of December 2, 2011**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Beck Rooms**

**Walsh Library**

**Agenda**

1. **Sign in for quorum**

In Attendance: David Beneteau, Matthew Escobar, Roseanne Mirabella, Peter Reader, Abe Zakhem, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim A. Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, M. Alper Sahiner, Lauren Schiller, Elizabeth McCrea, John Shannon, Karen Boroff, Jennifer Itzkowitz, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Plegder Fedora, Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Barbara Blozen, Eric Johnston, Tim Fortin, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Irene DeMasi, and Ellen Mandel

**2.    Call to order**

The meeting was called into order at 1:05pm. The chair welcomed the Provost for some remarks.

**3.    Communications from Provost Robinson**

**The Provost’s remarks were recorded as follows:**

“Good afternoon, I thought it would be appropriate to share the same remarks I shared with the Board of Regents concerning the new Strategic Plan. First, the Board has unanimously agreed upon the Strategic document. Since 2008, this plan has been [reviewed] by constituents across the campus. They, the Board, voted to support this, and its 32 members made a commitment to our efforts. They have since signed off on this document and encouraged a continued transformation to focus on stronger students, a stronger financial base, and raising $325 million for our endowment.

Prior to the Board voting, I made a few remarks…that I thought would be interesting to share [The Provost went on to tell the story of Northeastern University and how Seton Hall is confronted with similar strategic issues.] Northeastern ended up shedding ineffective programs and repositioned itself as a selective university worthy of the price it was charging. Northeastern also reevaluated faculty members and faced the challenge of becoming a top 100 university head on. At the time, Northeastern was ranked 162 in the nation and had to improve on [selectivity, research, and visibility]. There was a heavy focus on ranking and in order to achieve their goals, they established a scorecard each year that needed to be met. Year by year, inch by inch the status of Northeastern was raised and eventually became a top 100 ranked university. Its [value] increased as well. Essentially, ranking provided a guide to follow and the willingness for this also amplified fundraising, which ultimately increased the appeal of the school.

I wanted to remind you that this is our strategic plan, not mine. It was Seton Hall’s plan with a set of objectives and desired outcomes. Enrollment, marketing, and budgetary woes are among the issues we are currently facing and trying to resolve. Due to fiscal demand and changing markets, we have to eliminate waste and maintain a concentrated focus. This effort [the Strategic Plan] is going to produce change. This is a vitally critical time and I believe change is expected and anticipated. Hundreds of hours have been spent in order to guide us on this plan, and we must have a vision that derives from an appraisal of what the university needs and should do.

The Strategic Plan has created the opportunity to address and impact details and allows us to move forward in a more orderly manner. Prioritization will allow for reshaping, which will ultimately lead to institutional changes. Such change is critical and crucial. With prioritization, comes competition. I believe our efforts are shared under this shared governance, and it will require us to make decisions that will affect the future of the university. We share a common future and are under the same direction. I think we are on the threshold for making dramatic changes.

The Board of Regents voted for this plan and features have already been enacted. Such progress can be seen with our large early enrollment numbers and how accepted students have increased SAT scores by 25 points from last year. The board is committed to increasing endowment for scholarship and faculty. We will be doing a wealth search to plan for this development that will involve reallocation and reexamination of programs and incoming revenue.We need to decide whether to invest in weaker programs- should we spend the money to make such programs successful or reallocate the money to something else? Do we continue to invest in graduate programs to strengthen what we currently have? I would say we need all of these programs. We need to look at how we financially support these programs and see if these are things we need to continually do. We need to do a better job of support and perhaps doing more with less. This is part of a common discussion that we need to have. We need to look at our entire campus organization; how we are structured, how we are using our resources, do we need consolidation.When I make these points, I am not just focusing on academics, but the entire campus. I believe that every unit needs to be reexamined and discussed. I think we need to prioritize. Part of our responsibility is to see how we can impact this campus and the students who spend their money here. It is within our grasp to become a top 100 university, and with this responsibility, it is an exciting time. I see the passion and willingness of the Board to contribute to this effort. We are all excited about what the future holds.”

**Questions:**

**Question from a senator: “**I am excited that this plan is moving forward, and I commend the efforts that have been made. However, I am discouraged about the lack of movement in compensation. We have compared salaries and found that we are behind, by 3%, in federal increases for the cost of living. Faculty are [struggling] to live in the surrounding area. We came up with a list of peer institutions and list of things that can be done (i.e. increase lower salaries) so faculty can live closer to campus. How will you be allocating money so that a fair enough amount goes into faculty salaries?”

**Provost’s response: “**I hear you passion. The President and I wanted to come up with the 2% raises despite many opposing reasons, which included a need to close a 4 million dollar deficit. I am on the Human Resources committee and since the beginning of the year I have approved a lot of positions across the board. As a result, $1.5 million had been generated to alleviate this debt. There is no insensitivity toward the issues you speak of, but we have to think about how we are spending money. I am talking about priorities because I do not think we can continue to do what we are doing. We cannot spend money without having more money coming in. In 2008, we reached a point to where I assessed revenue with the President. When I went to the board, cutting around $1 million was discussed to get things in order, which would have involved lay-offs, and I did and do not want to do that [again]. I think when SIBSON was completed it had one common effect, which was the elimination of revenue while increasing spending. I know we need to do a better job assisting faculty, but we cannot do it in a reckless way. I need to be responsive and we need to restructure. You will be hearing [about] a task force, chaired by me, to look at each unit on this campus. We will be looking into how things are currently being run and seeing what needs to be changed. I know faculty drives this institution, and I think this represents the boards continued commitment. We are spending too much money in certain areas and we need to restructure, which can be done quite easily. We are re-budgeting this year and are going to look at next year’s budget. Part of the challenge is that there will be $6-7 million deficit going into next year; that is the reality we have. Your passion to do something is well deserved and I don’t feel any different than you do, I really don’t. We, I think, are regrettably not equipped as an institution to resolve those issues right now. We don’t have the capacity to do this, and we need to find a way to move forward and I am not trying to be insensitive to what you are saying.”

**Follow-up question/comment: “**I believe you can appreciate the history of this university with faculty salaries, and I know salaries are tied closely with the fiscal health of this institution, but there has to be a way to fix that. We essentially got the 2% raise and are giving it right back through health insurance. We want faculty salaries to be addressed on a consistent and constant basis, as other issues are.”

**Provost’s response: “**I have one final comment; I know we have some challenges here, but I see evidence that things are improving now (i.e. visitation rates are up 60%). Our financial health is not good, but it can be easily turned around. Salaries are tied to this health and we need to have market strength, which is something we are on track with and is within our grasp. In the not too distant future, the track we are on will produce $8-10 million reserves. When we take back what we are shelling out in financial aid, it will hold. There are pieces falling into place and changes are being made in management to correct issues. I think there are a number of things going forward and I am excited about this. I am convinced that this will be a good place to continue your career and to contribute to your discipline. I want you to feel this too. We have 8 new members [on the Board] and the President is meeting with more people. There is a $2 million reallocation just to academics. Again, there is a need to prioritize where we invest in.”

**4.   Approval of agenda, unanimously.**

Dr. Amy Hunter was thanked for filling in for Dr. KC Choi, who just welcomed the birth of his new child, Samantha.

**5.   Approval of the [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/minutes_November 4_2011.doc) of the November 4 meeting, without objection.**

**6.   Executive Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/EC_report_Dec._2011.doc) was accepted without objection.**

**a. Provost’s [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Provost_Response_to_Senate_Resolutions_Oct2011.pdf) to Senate resolutions passed in October 2011 was read without questions.**

\*The Senate Chair asked senators if they know of any faculty teaching 4 courses next semester. If so, it is officially against the guide and will need to be corrected.

\*The Senate was informed that Dr. Holtzman from Stillman has resigned due to Sabbath obligations and perhaps the Senate can consider proposals regarding the time the meetings are held.

\*A senator asked about the status of the SHMS shared governance document that was delivered to that unit’s dean. The Senate Chair responded that an outside attorney has been brought in to assess the issue. He then assured the Senate that the question will be followed up by the EC.

\*A senator asked about any updates regarding the A&S dean search. The Senate Chair responded that the application deadline was December 1, which was later than expected. Hopefully faculty will have a chance to meet the finalists in January 2012.

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees:**

**a. Admissions Committee report was accepted without objection.**

**I. A Report on retention is available on the Senate Blackboard site, under Course Documents.**

**II. An additional report from Senate Admissions, titled Faculty Senate Data,**

**is available on the Senate Blackboard site, under Course Documents.**

\*This data on this document is preliminary and is based off of the applications we have right now. The data may be skewed as a result of changes (in tuition) and there will be changes to this data once new numbers come forward, later in the academic year.

\*The Senate was reminded that documents I and II above (posted on blackboard) are confidential documents.

**b. Academic Policy Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/APC_minutes_12.2.11.doc) was approved without objection.**

**I. APC New Program [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/APC_new_program_proposal_guidelines.doc)**

\*This document contains new guidelines for submitting proposals, to replace guidelines currently posted. The rationale for this: current guidelines unnecessarily create more burden on programs. They also did not align with current APC bylaws. No substantive changes are proposed in the new guidelines but they do align better with what is practiced already by the committee.

\*The Senate Chair asked ifit is the will of body to accept these changes now or to have them put up for discussion and vote? The Senate wanted to reflect on the proposal and vote on it during committee motions.

**c. Calendar Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Calendar_Committee_Report_December_2011.doc) was accepted without objection.**

**I. [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Calendar_Committee_Resolution.doc)**

**II. Accompanying [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Letter_to_Provost - Calendar_Committee.doc) to the Provost**

\*Nancy Enright gave the report in place of Thomas Rzeznik, and the Executive Committee accepted to talk about the proposed resolution and letter with the Provost at the Post-Senate meeting.

**d. Compensation & Welfare Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Compensation_Committee_Report_December_2011.docx) was accepted without objection.**

**e. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/FGBL_Dec_Senate_Report.doc) was accepted without objection.**

**I. Second reading of proposed addition to [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Second_reading_of_proposed_addition_to_BylawXII.doc)**

**II. Second reading of By-Law XXVII  -  The committee proposes to remove the Senate Bylaw** [**XXVII**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/BylawXXVII.doc)

**III. Second reading of the** [**Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final%2010312011.doc) **with the accompanying** [**resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_to_proposed_CTNF_appointments.doc) **to proposed CTNF appointments**

**a. Proposed [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final_112811.doc) by the FGC** 

**f.  Faculty Development Committee [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/CommitteeReportOct..doc) was accepted without objection.**

**8.  Committees with no written reports**

\*There was no report from Graduate Policy Advisory Board. The EC is not entirely sure if membership for the Board is complete. The Board has been called, however, to meet.

**a. Academic Facilities Committee—no report**

**b. Core Curriculum Committee—no report**

**c. Graduate Studies Committee**

\*Dr. Assefaw Bariagaber, Chair of the committee, made the following oral report: **“**Last time the committee said they wanted to talk, as a whole, with Greg Burton, who didn’t see a reason for that. We made a case to meet as a committee to the Provost and nothing has been done. My assumption was that the Provost would go to Greg and then a meeting would occur with the committee. There was an email from Greg about the Board and we are trying to establish a meeting date and what to talk about.”

\*The EC informed the committee that the Provost was informed of the sensitivity of this issue and that Associate Provost Greg Burton is eventually to meet with the Grad Studies Committee. Dr. Bariagaber was encouraged to email Dr. Burton to schedule a meeting.

**d. Grievance Committee—no report**

**g. Instructional Technology Committee—no report**

**f. Library Committee report**

\*A resolution concerning funding was passed by the committee via e-votes and will be discussed with the Senate in January.

**g. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee—no report**

**h. Program Review Committee—no report**

**9.  Committee motions**

**b. Academic Policy Committee**

**I. APC New Program [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/APC_new_program_proposal_guidelines.doc)**

\*It was noted that the proposed guidelines are a clarification of the current policy. They provide a framework for program structure and content. The committee has worked on this for a while and has even been in contact with other colleges about it. The idea was that these new guidelines would provide a flexible framework and, if more specification was desired, this could be used to create more detail. The intention of this document was to provide a structural basis for programs.

**Question from a senator**: “Is there going to be a standard to define significant resources (in reference to sections 5-6)?”

**Answer from APC chair**: “We have been discussing this and we decided we would like to take program applications on a case by case basis, which is consistent with how things have been done in the past. We do not yet have a firm criterion to what constitutes significant resources.”

**Question**: “We have problems with colleges not needing resources, and then all of a sudden needing them. Is there something in place to specifically assess need?”

**Answer**: “We do agree that need should be assessed and as of now we intend to look at the basic planning of each program: what are the stated goals and needs. We felt that budgetary needs should come from the schools and Deans and we will have to trust them to do their [due] diligence on this. The programs we do have will require that kind of analysis. If there are issues with resources terminating, then proposers can come back to the committee and try to prevent this from happening. Any resource change that deviates from what the proposal dictates needs to come back to the committee as well.”

**Question: “**on section 2: Why does it mention current student population? Are we not always targeting newer students?”

**Answer**: “Well, that depends on resources. For example, the BS in Psychology is being offered to the current student population and the department is not spending additional resources to attract other students.”

**Question**: “How are we ensuring linkage between this and the new Strategic Plan? There should be something that specifies this connection before effort goes into making new programs.”

**Answer**: “You are right, but I believe that has to come from the Provost.”

“It seems to be that the APC deals with things from the faculty perspective, not the Provost and, in the future, coordination between the APC and Provost could be developed. The currently existing guidelines are vague and overly complex at the same time; these newer guidelines would be the frame to work from.”

\*A discussion regarding current paperwork for proposals ensued. Currently, there is no official form that exists for this process; there are different conflicting checklists and we are working to resolve this.

**\*Point of Clarification:** Accepting this proposal would only do away with the current guidelines. No form is being introduced and all the committee would like is for the guidelines to be replaced. At a later time, other supporting documents to flesh this process out will be discussed.

**\*Motion passes to accept the APC guideline changes.**

1. **Calendar Committee**

These documents were already approved.

**I. [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Calendar_Committee_Resolution.doc)**

**II. Accompanying [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Letter_to_Provost - Calendar_Committee.doc) to the Provost**

**b.      Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee**

**I. Second reading of proposed addition to** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Second_reading_of_proposed_addition_to_BylawXII.doc)

\*This is an addition to the Bylaws that would change the current practice of the newly elected Executive Committee members to allow for a transition/training month between May and June. Since this is a change to the Bylaws, it requires as 2/3rds majority.

**\*Senate approves the addition without objection.**

**II. Second reading of By-Law XXVII  -  The committee proposes to remove the Senate Bylaw** [**XXVII**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/BylawXXVII.doc)

**\*Senate approves this removal without objection.**

**III. Second reading of the** [**Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final%2010312011.doc)

\*This is, technically, a second reading of CTN Faculty line, but there is an additional amendment from the Faculty Guide committee, which would make it a first reading if accepted.

1. **Proposed [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../Documents/My Web Sites/Senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Dec_2011/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final_112811.doc) by the FGC**

\*This is an additional change to Article 3.4. The committee agreed to add this statement to the current Guide language in section 3.4.l. This particular Guide article concerns the balance of faculty associates to tenure-track faculty. This amendment comes with the proposed changes to the guide.

**Question**: “Why was the September date chosen?”

**Answer**: “September 1st is when the contract year begins.”

**Judith Lothian:** “I propose to amend the amendment by removing the first sentence”“Given the existence of the Clinical Track Nursing Faculty line, faculty associate positions are not permitted in the College of Nursing.” Her reason was because the second sentence already stated it and it is therefore unnecessarily redundant.

**Roseanne Mirabella**: “I prefer to keep that sentence for clarification,” and Mary Balkun agreed. The committee wanted to make sure uncertainty was eliminated as much as possible.

**Point of clarification**: Are there any changes to the beginning of this document?

**Answer**: “No, there are no changes. We are only talking about the amendment.”

**Elizabeth McCrea**: “I support the amendment, it sounds too chastising.”

**\*The motion fails to strike the sentence and amendment remains the same.**

**\*Now, the Senate is voting on the proposed amendments by the FGC.**

**Marta Deyrup**: “The Library has an appointment and I would like our positions (i.e. associate professor with Library rank 1, 2, 3) to be added to this document.”

**Colleen Conway**: “If you would like to give revision recommendations, please do so through the Faculty Guide committee. We are currently revising the Guide.”

**Ben Beitin**: “I do not like the word ‘replace.’ However, no amendment was proposed.”

**Question**: “Why is the Clinical Faulty Nursing Line the only listed position that is capitalized?”

**Answer**: “This is a mistake,” and it was changed.

\*The Senate was reminded that an amendment to the Guide needs only a majority vote. The proposed amendment was to simply add the final paragraph to the same document that was presented to the Senate at the last meeting.

\***The motion for the amendment passes, with 1 objection. Now the Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line proposal becomes a first reading as a change to the Guide. (It will become a second reading at the January 2012 meeting.)**

**\*Roseanne Mirabella:** “I would like to propose an amendment; I would like to add a sentence that states this position is eligible for tenure. I propose striking out the sentence “ClinicalTrack Nursing Faculty appointments do not involve the granting of tenure” and replacing it with the sentence “Faculty promoted to the rank of clinical associate professor will be eligible for tenure.”The motion was seconded by Mary Balkun.

**\*At this point the Senate Chair passed the gavel to Dr. Colleen Conway, FG Committee Chair, for her to moderate the discussion on Dr. Mirabella’s amendment.**

**Roseanne Mirabella**: “The reasons why I want this addition were discussed at the last meeting. The AAUP strongly recommends not creating contingent faculty and what we are doing with this untenured line is increasing part-time and untenured faculty. Right now, more than 50% of faculty hold such positions. The excessive use of these positions and with their inadequate compensation and support lead to the exploitation of these faculty. These positions have their costs and ultimately it does hurt our students as these faculty often feel less involved with the University. I feel strongly that academic freedom is weakened when faculty do not have the option of tenure. I have no problem with the line if there is tenure potential.”

**Judith Lothian**: “We did discuss this at the last meeting and I can assure you, we and other universities do not look at this position as contingent faculty. I do get that there is sense that other people will, but remember this line is a faculty initiative and there is no dissention among the nursing line for this line. This line is essential and does not need tenure. It would also have the upmost respect of the College of Nursing. The faculty associates currently in place are being abused without this line.”

**Brenda Petersen**: “Remember, a practicing doctorate does not equate to a research doctorate. Such a line does not want tenure.”

**Eric Johnston**: “I think it is important that we defer to nursing on matters of nursing and listen to what they want and need.”

**Point of Clarification: “**Why have a separate Clinical Nursing Line instead of just tenure?”

**Roseanne Mirabella**: “As Brenda said, these are practicing and research professors. This line is a clinical track instead of research and therefore the requirements for promotion are different. This line is based on clinical.”

**Tim Fortin**: “I speak against the amendment. It seems to me that Nursing has expressed a clear position of why they don’t want tenure and they have addressed your primary concern about compensation and exploitation. In Theology, we don’t have tenure, but yet all those issues you bring up, I have not felt. It seems like an imposition from an exterior body to say they want tenure especially since they have addressed [the issue of exploitation].”

**Barbara Blozen**: “Roseanne, your point is well taken, but it doesn’t necessarily apply to Nursing. It is important to note that a doctorate of nursing practice is clinically focused. They do not fit in the researcher’s role as they have not been trained or educated in this role. This was discussed in College of Nursing and we need this to move forward. The number of adjunct faculty is extremely high and those are the people who need your concern. This would eliminate some need for adjunct faculty, which is in the 40-50s in the College of Nursing. We need this and it is, again, not a research focused line as the faculty that would sit in these positions are not educated in this way.”

**Mary Balkun**: “I think we are going down a really dangerous road if we are saying we cannot talk about certain school issues. I think we know that things can happen within colleges that the university would be appalled by. Maybe this could be the time to be ground-breakers. I do think that we have been having many conversations about what it means to have tenure and what it is. Bottom line is it means job security. There are many positions that don’t base tenure on scholarship. We are ultimately concerned about our colleagues.”

**Judith Lothian**: “In response to job security, this will be one of the only non-tenured in position in the university that will have a multiyear (a 2-2-5) contract. No one, expect SHMS, has a multiyear contract; this is how the line is ground breaking. It also eliminates the need for faculty associates and the term line hires. There will be a research or clinical track (with multiyear contracts). Our protection is our accreditation, is that we need a certain percent (60) for full-time faculty.”

**Roseanne Mirabella**: “The AAUP recommends that 20% are only supposed to be non-tenured. I see the passage of this track without tenure as a continuation toward a path we want to get away from.”

**Question**: “Because tenure here requires scholarship, the College of Nursing cannot entertain that a clinical track be tenured because they are not scholarship oriented. If these faculty go up for tenure, they will be automatically shut down.”

**Roseanne Mirabella**: “This is where the line could open the door as it would allow tenure to be possible without scholarship; it would allow tenure to be looked at a different way.”

**Question:** “If the line is looked at in this way, would the College of Nursing accept it?”

**Answer**: “No, we don’t need tenure in this line. If a program is accepted that the College of Nursing does not need, it will not work out in the end.”

**Question**: “We would have to have a cultural change within the whole university in order for such tenure to be accepted. These positions would be turned down for tenure due to the lack of research and publishing. I would like to faculty associated situation to be further discussed.”

**Colleen Conway**: “My intention is to go forward with no more inappropriately hired faculty associates and this was the intent of the Nursing.”

**\*Control was returned to the Senate Chair and there were no further questions.** The vote for this amendment was by secret ballot, which was called by the Senate Chair. The Senate Chair was asked to please specify what the Senate was voting on, which was the amendment that Roseanne Mirabella proposed. A vote of “yes” would accept the changes and allow for tenure. A “no” vote does not allow for clinical faculty to apply for tenure.

**\*Voting on the amendment: 17 Senators vote “no” (against the amendment), 4 members vote “yes”, and 1 abstention. The amendment fails.**

1. **Accompanying** [**resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Nov_2011/Resolution_to_proposed_CTNF_appointments.doc) **to proposed CTNF appointments**

\*This resolution was ruled out of order since its meaning is already contained in the first reading and is now clear based on the amendment.

**10.   New Business**

No new business.

**11.   Communications**

      No communications.

**12.   Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of January 20, 2012**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Beck Rooms**

**Walsh Library**

**Agenda**

**1.    Sign in for quorum**

In Attendance: David Beneteau, KC Choi, Vicente Medina, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Peter Reader, Thomas Rzeznik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim A. Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Jeffrey Levy, Lauren Schiller, Elizabeth McCrea, Penina Orenstein, Michael Valdez, Ben Beitin, Dan Katz, Eunyoung Kim, Sandy Lee, William McCartan, Martha Loesch, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Theodora Sirota, Barbara Blozen, Eric Johnston, Tim Fortin, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Patricia Remshifski, Irene DeMasi, and Ellen Mandel.

**2.    Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:08 pm. Dr. David Beneteau welcomed the Provost for some remarks.

**3.    Communications from Provost Robinson**

\*The Provost reported the hire of John E. Buschman as the new dean of University Libraries. Within the next two weeks, candidates for A&S dean will arrive on campus. The Stillman School of Business is expected to narrow down their dean candidates to three individuals soon.

\*The Provost then reported that, according to Dr. Alyssa McCloud, SHU has received so far 9,464 applications for undergraduate admissions. That number compares with 6,500 for last year at the same time, a 45% change. Right now, 6,534 are completed, compared to 3,008 that were completed at this time last year—that is a 117% increase. Our deposits are up as well. The average SAT score is now 1119, as compared to 1110, the score reported at this time last year.

\*After the Provost’s remarks, a senator asked whether there has been any concerted effort to recruit students from Latin America and from certain counties in Florida. The Provost responded that while efforts have been made, it has yet to be robust and sustained. That is a future goal, so long as the university’s financials are stabilized and more resources can be allocated for such efforts.

**4.   Approval of agenda, without objection.**

**5.   Approval of the**[**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/minutes_December_2_2011.doc)**of the December 2nd meeting.**

\*Senators agreed to have the December 2012 draft minutes revised and to have the revisions approved in the February meeting.

**6.   Executive Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/EC_report_Jan_2012.doc) **was approved without objection.**

**a. Provost's Response to Senate Resolutions (**[**Set 1**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Provost's%20Response%20for%20January%202012%20Meeting.pdf)**)**

**b. Provost's Response to Senate Resolutions (**[**Set 2**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Provost's%20Response%20for%20January%202012.Second%20Set.pdf)**)**

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees**

**a. Academic Policy Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/APC_minutes_Jan_2012.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

**I. Laura Schoppman's NCAA**[**report to APC**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/NCAA_academics_report_to_APC.docx)

\*Dr. Philip Moremen agreed to co-chair the APC, given Dr. Abe Zakhem’s resignation while on sabbatical this semester. Dr. Ellen Mandel is considering co-chairing the committee.

**b. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee report was accepted without objection.**

**I. Second reading of the**[**Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final_with_amendment_passed_dec_2011.doc)

\*In response to a question by a senator regarding faculty reviews and course evaluations, a discussion ensued regarding whether faculty course evaluations should be available to all chairs of departments, and whether there should be a provision on this matter in the Faculty Guide. A number of senators noted that the practice of releasing course evaluations to chairs varies from unit to unit. The chair of the FG committee noted that this issue will be taken up in the next FG committee meeting. The FG committee chair also noted that the committee is in need of representation from Stillman.

**c. Instructional Technology Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/IT_report_2011_12_08.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

**d. Library Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Library%20Committee%20meeting.12-9-11%20(1).doc) **was accepted without objection.**

**I. Library resources**[**resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Senate_Library_Committee_Resolution.doc)

**e. Program Review Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Program_Review_Senate_Report_1_2012.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

**f.** **Report from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board**

\*The Senate rep reported that two meetings in February have been scheduled (first and third Wednesdays of Feb.). So far, the main issue for discussion is the selection of graduate assistants. There is concern that when students apply for GA positions there is no way of determining their status within their programs. The Provost Office believes that it would be helpful if there were to be an indicator of some sort regarding how students’ programs view them academically. Another issue under consideration is possibly developing a graduate admissions benchmark (or what that might even look like).

**8.   Committees with no written reports**

**a. Academic Facilities Committee**

**b. Admissions Committee**

**c. Calendar Committee**

**d. Compensation & Welfare Committee**

**e. Core Curriculum Committee**

**f. Faculty Development Committee**

**g. Graduate Studies Committee**

\*Dr. Assefaw Bariagaber, chair of the GS committee, provided the following oral report during the Senate meeting. He reported that he has invited Associate Provost Greg Burton to meet with the committee. The response he received from the Associate Provost was that he did not see the need to meet with the committee, but was willing to meet with the committee’s chair. The GS committee’s hope is that such a meeting will take place after the two scheduled February meetings of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board.

**h. Grievance Committee**

**i. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee**

**9.  Committee motions**

**a. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee**

1. **Second reading of the**[**Clinical Track Nursing Faculty Line**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Clinical_Faculty_Line_Final_with_amendment_passed_dec_2011.doc)

\*Since this proposal is an addition to the Faculty Guide, it requires a 2/3rds

majority vote for passage. A vote via secret ballot was requested and approved. The second reading passed with 33 votes in favor of the creation of the newly proposed clinical lines, and 5 votes against the proposal.

\*The chair of the FG committee then asked the Senate whether it would endorse having the Senate EC forward a “statement of understanding” to the Provost regarding the just approved clinical line proposal and the status of current Faculty Associates in the College of Nursing. The statement appears in the FG report and reads:

“Our understanding is that those currently employed as faculty associates would transition into the Clinical Faculty line without loss of years in service, or loss of time on a current contract. We understand that this may mean some deviation from the proposed two year contracts as the College of Nursing undergoes this transition and eliminates the faculty associate position. At the end of the two year transition period, all current faculty associates will have been moved to Clinical Faculty lines and there will no longer be faculty associate lines within the college.”

The Senate, without objection, approved the FG chair’s request.

**b. Library Committee**

1. **Library resources**[**resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Jan_2012/Senate_Library_Committee_Resolution.doc)

\*Some senators expressed in principle support for the resolution. However, they also expressed concern that approval of the resolution would, perhaps, signal Senate support to only one part of the Strategic Plan over and against the other many important parts.

\*After further discussion, the resolution failed.

**10.   New Business**

       \*No new business

**11.   Communications**

       \*No communications

**12.   Adjournment**

\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of February 10, 2012**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Beck Rooms**

**Walsh Library**

**Agenda**

1. **Sign in for quorum**

In Attendance: David Beneteau, KC Choi, Mark Couch, Matthew Escobar, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Peter Reader, Tom Rzeznik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Lauren Schiller, Henry Amoroso, John Shannon, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, Michael Valdez, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Pledger Fedora, Lauren McFadden, Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Eric Johnston, Tim Fortin, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Patricia Remshifski, Ellen Mandel, Tom Mernar

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm. The chair welcomed the Provost for some remarks.

1. **Communications from Provost Robinson**

\*The Provost updated the Senate on matters related to the university budget. Because of the smaller class this year, the university will continue to face a budget shortfall again in the coming year. The shortfall, however, is being minimized to the best extent possible by controlling costs (for instance, limiting replacement hires to only four, primarily based on strategic interests). But the Provost reminded the Senate that budget pressures are exacerbated by the fact that revenue is not keeping pace with expenditures. Longer-term measures include working on reducing the university’s financial aid ratios. Also, the Provost reported that he would like to see our transfer numbers at around 300 to 450 students. With stable enrollments and thus a robust budget, he hopes to institutionalize a more formal program—similar to those at some peer universities—to admit and retain students whose SAT scores are below SHU averages but show academic promise.

\*Lastly, the Provost reported that the dean’s search committee of Arts & Sciences submitted two finalists, and they are currently under review by the Provost’s Office. One Stillman dean candidate has been interviewed to date, and three more candidates will be interviewed over the remainder of February. And, the search for a new CFO for the university commenced recently.

1. **Approval of agenda without objection.**
2. **Approval of the**[**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/minutes_December_2_2011.for_feb_2012_meeting.doc)**of the December 2nd meeting without objection**

**Approval of the**[**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/minutes_January_20_2012_for_February_2012_meeting.doc)**of the January 20th meeting without objection**

**6. Executive Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/EC%20report%20Feb.%202012%20(3)-POST.doc) **was accepted without objection.**

\*The Senate Chair solicited a volunteer to serve on a university standing committee for a legally-mandated audit of our pension provider TIAA. If you would like to nominate someone, please contact Dr. KC Choi, Senate Secretary.

\*In reference to the EC report’s comment on the APC inquiry into the Stillman core, the Senate was notified that the Stillman faculty requested a meeting with the APC over the question of jurisdiction.

\*In reference to the EC report’s comments on the progress of the academic integrity policy, Dr. Amy Hunter and Dr. Phil Moremen reported in more detail that the Provost’s Office would like to see more specific definition of terms with respect to the draft of the policy. Also, streamlining the reporting process as outlined in the policy draft was discussed with the Provost’s Office.

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees**

**a. Academic Policy Committee report was accepted without objection (an oral report was given)**

**I.**[**National Survey of Student Engagement**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/NSSE11%20Executive%20Snapshot_Seton%20Hall.xls)**(NSSE) and**[**Results of the NSSE**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/NSSE%20results-%20GB.doc)

**II.**[**Revision of Course Evaluations**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/REVISION%20OF%20COURSE%20EVALUATIONS.doc)

\*Dr. Phil Moremen is chair and is looking to have Dr. Ellen Mandel as co-chair. Her nomination as co-chair will be sent to the committee for a vote. He also indicated that the committee is short on Senate members and would appreciate additional members on the committee.

**b. Admissions Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/Admissions%20Committee%20report%202-10.doc) **was accepted without objection**

**c. Calendar Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/Calendar%20Committee%20Report%20February%202012.doc)**was accepted without objection**

**I. AY 2014-2015 Calendar**[**proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/AY%202014-2015%20Proposal%20(2).doc)

**d. Compensation & Welfare Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/Compensation%20Committee%20Report%20February%202012.docx) **accepted without objection**

**e. Faculty Development Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/Fac%20Devel%20Committee%20Report.doc) **was accepted without objection**

\*In response to a question about the University Research Council, the FDC Chair stated that the URC has met this year and received 26 applications for URC funding. URC hopes to distribute 15 awards, but the award amount is at this time unknown since a detailed awards budget has yet to be provided to the Council.

**f. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/FG%20Feb%202012%20Senate%20Report.doc) **was accepted without objection**

\*FGBC Chair indicated the need for greater Stillman representation on the committee. Stillman is the only college/school without senate representation on the committee.

**g. Graduate Studies Committee** [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](../../../../../../../../Users/Senate Meeting Agendas/Feb 10/Graduate Studies Report -- to the Senate (2).doc)

**h. Grievance Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/Grievance%20Committee%20report%202-10.doc) **accepted without objection**

**i. Instructional Technology Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/IT%20report%202-10.doc) **accepted without objection**

**j. Report from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board**

**8. Committees with No Written Reports**

**a. Academic Facilities Committee**

**b. Core Curriculum Committee**

**c. Library Committee**

**d. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee**

**e. Program Review Committee report**

**9.  Committee motions**

**a. Calendar Committee**

**I. AY 2014-2015 Calendar**[**proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Feb_2012/AY%202014-2015%20Proposal%20(2).doc) **is approved**

\*CC Chair explained that the calendar proposal is a compromise that recognizes the Provost’s Office’s wish for a regularized pre-Labor Day start, while also preserving the faculty’s desire for a Fall break and a Spring semester start date after the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday.

\*The proposal passed without objection.

**10.   New Business**

**I. Discussion regarding possible changes to Senate governance structure**

\*Senate Chair solicited Senate perspective on the formation of a Senate Budget Committee. Many senators expressed support but had reservations about whether faculty involvement in budget matters would be possible unless university administration was willing to provide up-to-date budget data. Others wondered if the Senate would be able to provide an opinion on budget data with the necessary level of financial expertise and competence. Other senators wondered whether a Senate committee is the appropriate venue for faculty participation in the budget process—perhaps a Senate representative dealing with budget matters in the Provost’s Office or on the Board of Regents is more feasible or useful?

\*Senate Chair also solicited Senate perspective on the creation of a chair-elect position. This would require a change to the Senate bylaws on the configuration of the Executive Committee and would change the way we would conduct elections for Senate leadership. While some senators wondered if this was necessary, some senators expressed support. In conjunction with this consideration, a couple of senators suggested that the Senate think about streamlining some of its committees, especially since the work of some committees overlap. Given the relative support of the chair-elect position, the Senate chair requested the FG committee to explore this idea and offer proposals for the Senate to consider. No objections were raised regarding this request.

\*During this discussion, a number of senators indicated that any future discussion of Senate governance revisions should include a reconsideration of how senators are apportioned from the various colleges and schools. Some expressed the need to have more equal representation from the professional schools given that the divide between undergraduate admissions and graduate admissions has decreased significantly over the past several years. The FGBC Chair reminded senators that they will have an opportunity to discuss this matter next year when the current apportionment agreement expires.

**II. Senate webpage change**

\*Senate Secretary communicated the possibility of transferring the current Senate website to a new platform supported by TLTC. It is a blog platform, powered by Wordpress, that is being used by a number of groups on campus already, including a journal sponsored by the Diplomacy School, the Student Government Association, College of Arts & Sciences, the Religion Department, and many more. The benefit of this blog platform is that it allows viewers to search all pages and linked documents. Also, the blog platform allows space for committees of the Senate to post their minutes and any relevant committee work/documents. The current Senate webpage would remain but serve as an archive primarily. If the Senate agrees to this web transfer, the Senate GA and Senate Secretary will work to have the new Senate web page operating soon, by the March or April Senate meeting. The Senate had no objections to this proposal and instructed the Senate GA and Senate Secretary to work on the new webpage for the Senate.

\*After discussion of Senate Governance and the new Senate Webpage, Dr. Roseanne Mirabella requested that the Senate discuss the relationship between the Graduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Policy Advisory Board. The motion was seconded and approved without objection.

\*Some senators expressed concern that the Provost’s Office is only interested in working with the Graduate Policy Advisory Board on graduate studies issues and not with the Senate. With support from the Graduate Studies Committee Chair, the Senate encouraged the Executive Committee to communicate to the Provost the GS Committee’s desire to meet with him. The Executive Committee agreed and stated that the matter would be brought to the Provost at their next post-Senate meeting with him.

**11.   Communications**

**No communications.**

**12.   Adjournment**

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.**

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of March 2, 2012**

**1:00 p.m.**

**Beck Rooms**

**Walsh Library**

**Agenda**

**1.    Sign in for quorum**

In attendance: David Benteau, KC Choi, Mark Couch, Matthew Escobar, Vicente Medina, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Peter Reader, Tom Rzeznik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Gita Das Bender, Jeffrey Levy, Manfred Minimair, Lauren Schiller, Henry Amoroso, Elizabeth McCrea, John Shannon, A.D. Amar, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, Ben Beitin, Dan Katz, Eunyoung Kim, Pledger Fedora, Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Josephine DeVito, Eric Johnston, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel

**2.    Call to order**

\*The meeting was called to order at 1:07 pm.

**3.    Communications from Provost Robinson**

\*No communications. The Senate Chair reported that the Provost was unable to attend the meeting.

**4.   Approval of agenda without objection**

**5.   Approval of the**[**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/minutes_February_10_2012_meeting)**of the February 10 meeting without objection**

**6.   Executive Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/REVISED%20EC%20report%203%20Mar%202012.doc) **was accepted without objection**

**I.**[**Provost's response**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Provost's%20Response%20to%20Nursing%20Clinical%20Track%20Line%20Proposal%20(1).pdf)**to Senate approved proposal for CoN clinical track line**

**II. Motion to remand Senate-approved CoN**[**clinical track line proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Nursing%20Clinical%20Line.doc)**to the CoN Faculty Assembly**

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees**

**a. Academic Policy Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/REVISED%20APC%20Report%203.2.12..doc) **was accepted without objection**

**I.**[**Resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Resolution%20on%20APC%20Curricula%20Review.doc)**on APC curricula review**

**b. Admissions Committee report (recent admissions data available on Blackboard) was accepted without objection**

\*A senator asked for the definition of a competed undergraduate admissions application. Answer from the Admissions Committee Chair: a completed application is one that includes all necessary component parts and is ready for review by admissions officials.

**c. Compensation & Welfare Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Compensation_Committee%20Report%20March%202012.docx) **was accepted without objection**

**I.**[**Resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Compensation-%20Resolution%20on%20Faculty%20Salary%20Study.doc)**on Faculty Salary Study**

**d. Core Curriculum Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Core%20Curriculum%20Committee%20Report%203.2.12.doc)**was accepted without objection**

**e. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/FG%20March%202012%20Senate%20report.doc) **was accepted without objection**

**I. First reading of changes to Faculty Guide**[**3.2 and 6.1**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/3.2%20and%206.1%20proposed%20changes--FG.doc)**(tenure-track faculty contracts)**  

**f. Library Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Library%20Committee%20Meeting3-1-12.doc) **was accepted without objection**

**g. Program Review Committee**[**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Program%20Review%20Committee%20Report%203.2.12.docx)**was accepted without objection**

**h.**[**Report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Graduate%20Policy%20Advisory%20Board%20Report%20March%202012.docx)**from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board**

**8.   Committees with no reports**

**a. Academic Facilities Committee**

**b.** **Calendar Committee**

**c. Faculty Development Committee**

**d. Graduate Studies Committee**

**e. Grievance Committee**

**f. Instructional Technology Committee**

**g. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee**

**9.  Committee motions**

**a. Executive Committee**

**I. Motion to remand Senate-approved CoN**[**clinical track line proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Nursing%20Clinical%20Line.doc)**to the CoN Faculty Assembly**

\*This motion passed without objection.

**b. Academic Policy Committee**

**I.**[**Resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Resolution%20on%20APC%20Curricula%20Review.doc)**on APC curricula review**

\*The APC Chair provided a brief summary of the APC’s rationale for this resolution. The rationale focused on a reading of Faculty Guides articles 12.2 and 12.3. Much of the ensuing discussion of this resolution revolved around the proper interpretation of the following provisions in the Faculty Guide:

(1) “The entire full-time faculty of the university shall have primary responsibility for recommending academic policy to the Board of Regents, through the provost and the president, for the following…Review and coordination of all college curricula and academic programs, including continuing education; Review and approval of all university degree programs, existing and proposed.” (12.2.e and 12.2.f)

(2) “…the Faculty Senate, whose Charter is article 12.6 below and whose duties include monitoring matters listed in articles 12.2a through 12.2g above. In its operations, the Faculty Senate shall not replace, modify or assume any of the internal governance prerogatives of the South Orange campus units identified in Article 1.” (12.3.c)

(3) “[The Educational Policy Committee] shall be responsible, consistent with established university academic policies, for recommending academic policy to the faculty of its respective college. Such policy shall include, but not be limited to, the college core, and department or interdepartmental programs, majors, and courses.” (11.2a.2)

(4) “[The Faculty Senate] represents that faculty in matters of academic policies and procedures as well as matters of faculty welfare. It has the right and duty to represent that faculty on all matters which affect the South Orange faculty as a whole and to help inform faculty opinion on matters of campus-wide importance.” (12.6.a)

\*Discussion also involved proper interpretation of APC by-law 3.h, which states that APC review includes the “[r]eview of entirely new or highly revised school/college core curricula, for issues of resources and coordination with other campus units.”

\*The APC’s position is that the Senate has a monitoring function and should be able to make inquiries into curriculum changes across all academic units—otherwise, the Guide’s language of Senate curricula-monitoring responsibilities would be meaningless.

\*Dr. Roseanne Mirabella proposed the following amendment to the resolution: “Resolved: That the Stillman School’s modification of its College Core curriculum is a proper subject of inquiry by the Senate, and hence, the APC.  Under the Faculty Guide article 12.3 and 12.2, the Senate monitors ~~the review~~ and ~~coordination~~ coordinates ~~of~~ all college curricula, among other items, and may potentially produce resolutions regarding those items.  In order to fulfill its monitoring function, the Senate and APC are entitled to seek information from a College regarding a College’s curricular change. This inquiry by itself does not constitute a determination that the matter is an appropriate subject for further APC or Senate action.”

\*After discussion of the amendment, Dr. Roseanne Mirabella withdrew her amendment and proposed an alternative amendment: “Resolved: That the Stillman School’s modification of its College Core curriculum is a proper subject of inquiry by the Senate, and hence, the APC.  Under the Faculty Guide article 12.3 and 12.2, the Senate monitors, reviews ~~the review~~ and ~~coordination~~ coordinates ~~of~~ all college curricula, among other items, and may potentially produce resolutions regarding those items.  In order to fulfill its monitoring function, the Senate and APC are entitled to seek information from a College regarding a College’s curricular change. This inquiry by itself does not constitute a determination that the matter is an appropriate subject for further APC or Senate action.”

\*The alternative amendment failed, and Senate discussion returned to the original APC resolution. A vote on the original APC resolution was conducted by secret ballot. The resolution passed, with 30 senators voting in favor of the resolution, 9 senators voting against the resolution, with no abstentions.

**c. Compensation Committee**

**I.**[**Resolution**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/Compensation-%20Resolution%20on%20Faculty%20Salary%20Study.doc)**on Faculty Salary Study**

\*The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

\*The Senate Chair noted that the EC is meeting with President Esteban on March 23, 2012 and will forward this resolution to him at that time.

**d. Faculty Guide Committee**

**I. First reading of changes to Faculty Guide**[**3.2 and 6.1**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Mar_2012/3.2%20and%206.1%20proposed%20changes--FG.doc)**(tenure-track faculty contracts)**

\*The Senate Chair noted that this first reading pertained to a substantial revision of tenure-track faculty contract structure. There are a number of changes in the proposal that the Provost requested regarding mentoring of tenure-track faculty

\*Senators discussed the pros and cons of a multi-year contract for tenure-track faculty. Some senators asked for names of other Catholic schools with similar contracts. The Chair of the Faculty Development Committee noted Notre Dame, Villanova, and Boston College. Most of the discussion of this first reading focused on the possible liabilities of the proposed mentoring provisions and the new pre-tenure sabbatical proposal.

\*Professors Peter Reader and Jeffrey Levy proposed the following amendment to the proposed revisions of 6.1.d.1 of the Faculty Guide: “Salary payments during sabbatical leave shall be three‑quarters (3/4) pay if the leave is for one (1) year, and full pay if the leave is for one‑half (1/2) year, except in the case of pre-tenure sabbaticals. Salary payments for faculty who take a pre-tenure sabbatical semester will be ~~three-quarters (3/4)~~ full pay for one semester and three-quarters (3/4) pay for one semester after six full years of service. Salary payments are calculated only on the faculty member's base salary.

\*This amendment to the proposed revisions of 6.1.d.1 of the Faculty Guide passed. The second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide 3.2.and 6.1, with this amendment, is scheduled for the May Senate meeting.

**10.   New Business**

\*No new business

**11.   Communications**

\*No communications

**12.   Adjournment**

\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of April 13, 2012**

**1:00 p.m.**

**JUBILEE HALL AUDITORIUM**

**Agenda**

1. **Sign in for quorum**

In attendance: David Beneteau, KC Choi, Vicente Medina, Roseanne Mirabella, King Mott, Tom Rzeznik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim Quizon, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Gita Das Bender, Jeffrey Levy, Manfred Minimair, Lauren Schiller, Henry Amoroso, Elizabeth McCrea, A.D. Amar, Karen Boroff, Michael Valdez, Ben Beitin, Pledger Fedora, William McCartan, Marta Deyrup, Martha Loesch, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Judith Lothian, Eric Johnston, Victor Velarde, Assefaw Bariagaber, Philip Moremen, Catherine Maher, Patricia Remshifski, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:09 pm.

**3.    Approval of agenda** without objection

**4.   Communications from Provost Robinson and Drs. McCloud and Gottlieb**

Provost Robinson introduced Dr. Alyssa McCloud, Vice President of Enrollment Management, and Dr. Tracy Gottlieb, Vice President for Student Services. All three guests outlined the General Studies (GS) initiative, which is to begin Fall 2012.

Dr. McCloud reported that undergraduate admissions trends for the upcoming academic year is positive, especially compared to last year. SAT scores are generally higher, as well as open house numbers and deposits. (Specific data she presented on undergraduate admissions during the Senate meeting can be viewed on the Senate Blackboard site.) Dr. McCloud indicated that General Studies is an additional tool that Administration hopes to use to continue this upward trend in undergraduate admissions.

Dr. Gottlieb informed the Senate that General Studies will track students who have traditionally been admitted as “Tier 5” students. (These students typically hold SAT scores well under the majority of Seton Hall undergraduate admits; they also have a lower retention rate.) She expects the GS student total to be around 50 to 150 students in any given year. The intent of GS is to provide additional academic services to this population of students. Moreover, GS students’ SAT scores will not be included in the calculation of SHU’s average SAT score.

The GS Program will be modeled after the Seton Summer Scholars Program, which will now become an optional summer program. Those who would register for SSS would be given the chance to enroll as a full-time undergraduate student in the General Studies track. This would allow them to take college-level courses under strict advisement and supervision for two years (freshman and sophomore years) with the hope that they will gain the skills to continue at Seton Hall within a specific major for the remaining two years (junior and senior years). If they are unable to continue for the remaining two years, then they would be given the opportunity to receive a Seton Hall Associate of Arts degree. (Please note: The General Studies Proposal, with the AA provision, has been submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences EPC. If A&S EPC and subsequently the College of Arts and Sciences approve GS, with an AA degree, then the Senate would proceed to consider the proposal’s merits.) Dr. Gottlieb noted that the advantage of allowing SSS students to matriculate as a regular undergraduate under the GS track is that these students would now be eligible for state and federal financial aid (grants and loans), both of which are unavailable for students in the summer program. Additionally, it gives such students an improved chance of succeeding in college.

Dr. McCloud further noted that the AA degree provision of GS would not be “marketed.” The hope is that GS students will in fact continue their studies within a specific major program at Seton Hall. The AA degree provision is simply for the student who for one reason or another is unable to continue beyond their first two GS years. The intent is not to enroll increasing numbers of students for the AA degree.

**5.   Approval of the** [**draft minutes**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/minutes_March_2_2012.doc) **of the March 2 meeting** without objection

**6.   Executive Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/EC%20report%204%20Apr%202012.doc)acceptedwithout objection

**I.** [**Academic Integrity Policy**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Academic_Integrity_Mar_15_2012.doc)

**7.   Reports of standing and special committees**

**a. Academic Facilities Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Report%20from%20the%20Academic%20Facilities%20Committee%20-revised%20April%202012.doc)acceptedwithout objection

**b. Academic Policy Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/APC%20Report%204.12%20Final.doc) accepted without objection

**I.** [**Motion**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/APC%20Resolution%20for%20April%2013%202012.doc) **on SSOB Core**

**II. General Studies Program** [**proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/General%20Studies%20Program%20(1).docx) **from the Provost's Office**

**III. General Studies** [**questions**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/APC-GS%20ProposalQuestions.forApril13meeting.doc)

**c. Admissions Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Admissions%20Committee%20Report%20to%20Senate%20April%202012.doc)accepted without objection **(latest admissions data documents available on the Senate Blackboard site)**

**d. Calendar Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Calendar%20Committee%20Report%20(April%202012).doc)accepted without objection

**e. Faculty Development Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Faculty%20Development%20Committee%20April.doc)accepted without objection

**f. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/FG%20April%20Senate%20report%20(1).doc) accepted without objection

**I. Second reading of changes to Faculty Guide** [**3.2 and 6.1**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/2nd%20reading--3.2%20and%206.1%20proposed%20changes%20(1).doc) **(tenure-track faculty contracts)**  

**II. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article** [**10.1.a**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Faculty%20Guide.Proposed%20language%20on%20Chair%20election%20(1).doc)

**III. First reading:** [**proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Faculty%20Guide.Motion%20regarding%20probationary%20versus%20tenure%20track.doc) **to replace "probationary" with "tenure-track"**

**g. Graduate Studies Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Graduate%20Studies%20Report%20--%20April%203,%202012.%20(1).doc) accepted without objection

**h. Instructional Technology Committee** [**report**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/IT%20report%202012-03-08.doc)accepted without objection

**i. Oral Report from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board** accepted without objection

According to the Senate Rep, the Advisory Board met on March 28. The Board discussed developing a GA survey in order to gain a better sense of the kind of work GAs perform, and the kind of hours they in fact put into that work.

\*A senator noted that some of the issues under consideration by the Advisory Board are also under consideration by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee. This senator suggested that the two groups should hold a joint meeting. The Senate Rep to the Advisory Board agreed to communicate the suggestion to the Advisory Board.

**8.   Committees with no reports**

**a. Compensation & Welfare Committee**

**b. Core Curriculum Committee**

**c. Grievance Committee**

**d. Library Committee**

**e. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee**

**f. Program Review Committee**

**9.  Committee motions**

**a. Executive Committee**

**I.** [**Academic Integrity Policy**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Academic_Integrity_Mar_15_2012.doc)

Discussion on the latest draft of the Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) centered on the merits of the following provision:

4. Engaging in scholarly and academic activities for which one has a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest occurs when an individual’s existing or potential interest impairs his or her objectivity with respect to scholarly activity.

Dr. Anthony Sciglitano moved to strike #4 of the AIP entirely, questioning the usefulness of the provision given the way it is currently worded (i.e., lacks clarity on what an academic conflict is). After discussion, the question was called, and the motion failed.

Dr. Mary Balkun moved to replace the second sentence of #4 with the following: “A conflict of interest occurs when an individual fails to reveal a conflict of interest in scholarly and academic activities.” After discussion, the question was called, and the amendment passed: 17 votes in favor, 12 against.

Then a vote was called for the entire AIP draft. The draft was approved unanimously.

The Senate Chair noted that the revised AIP will be brought to Associate Provost Nick Snow on April 18, 2012.

**b. Academic Policy Committee**

**I.** [**Motion**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/APC%20Resolution%20for%20April%2013%202012.doc) **on SSOB Core**

Discussion of this motion centered on whether the number of credits SSOB has allocated to the liberal arts is sufficient. With the newly adjusted SSOB core, 36 credits are allocated for required liberal arts courses, including the University Core. Some senators noted that this is the lowest number of required liberal arts credits at the university. (Diplomacy is next, with 42 credits, while other colleges/schools are in the 50s.) It was also noted that it is inappropriate to include University Core credits in the total count for required liberal arts courses insofar as University Core courses are not in A&S. SSOB senators responded that the changes are in line with accreditation standards for business schools. It also allows for more flexibility for SSOB students, to allow them to take courses offered in other units, other than simply in A&S. The Co-Chairs of APC also noted that in 2008—the last time when SSOB reduced their required liberal arts credits—the Senate vetted the reduction and approved the SSOB core. What SSOB has done with its current core is not necessarily out of line with the 2008 changes. Other senators suggested that perhaps faculty leaders from all academic units should meet to discuss their college cores and liberal arts requirements.

After further discussion on the role of liberal arts education at Seton Hall and on the question of how many liberal arts credits ought to be required of all Seton Hall undergraduates, the question on the motion was called. The motion passed: 19 votes in favor, 12 against.

**c. Faculty Guide Committee**

**I. Second reading of changes to Faculty Guide** [**3.2 and 6.1**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/2nd%20reading--3.2%20and%206.1%20proposed%20changes%20(1).doc) **(tenure-track faculty contracts)**

The second reading passed, with 1 vote against.

**II. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article** [**10.1.a**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Faculty%20Guide.Proposed%20language%20on%20Chair%20election%20(1).doc)

After discussion of the proposed changes, the FG committee chair withdrew the first reading for Senate consideration. She stated that she would discuss alternative proposals with the FG committee and submit them to the Senate when the time is appropriate.

**III. First reading:** [**proposal**](http://academic.shu.edu/senate/Meeting_Documents_and_Minutes_11-12/Apr_2012/Faculty%20Guide.Motion%20regarding%20probationary%20versus%20tenure%20track.doc) **to replace "probationary" with "tenure-track"**

There were no objections to the first reading of this proposal. There will be a second reading of the proposal at the May 4 Senate meeting.

**10.   New Business**

No new business.

**11.   Communications**

No Communications

**12.   Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of May 4, 2012**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

In attendance: Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim A. Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, David Beneteau, Matthew Escobar, Kelly Goedert, Marianne Lloyd, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, John Saccoman, Mehmet Alper Sahiner, Arline Lowe, Vicente Medina, Lauren Schiller, Mitra Shojania-Feizabadi, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, A.D. Amar, Michael Valdez, John Shannon, Elizabeth McCrea, Pledger Fedora, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Lauren McFadden, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Alan Delozier, Sulekha Kalyan, Judith Lothian, Theodora Sirota, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Josephine DeVito, Tim Fortin, Eric Johnston, Philip Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Deborah Welling

2. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm.

3. Communications from Provost Robinson

After thanking faculty senators for their service, the Provost reported that SHU has received over 1600 undergraduate deposits thus far. The profile of this coming year’s class is much stronger compared to last year. At this point, the anticipated actual enrollment for the Fall is somewhere between 1350 and 1400 freshpersons. Due to this high projected enrollment, the President has agreed to review the budget for flexibility in the Fall—but this review would be contingent on whether the higher enrollment actually materializes in September.

The Provost has indicated that he is receptive to aspects of the tenure-track faculty multi-year contract proposal passed by the Senate at the April 2012 meeting. He is reviewing the proposal and will share his decisions with the Senate soon.

The Board of Regents has asked us to look seriously at criminal background checks. A large part of the SHU population undergoes this already (many administrators and several professional school faculty). With respect to faculty, the Provost stated that he has recommended only incoming faculty hires undergo criminal background checks. The background check will review the past 7 years. If the criminal background check reveals a criminal arrest, conviction, or plea bargain, then HR quarantines the issue immediately and it is referred to the Provost, the relevant Dean and Department Chair. In other words, only academic affairs will be allowed to determine whether or not the matter is relevant to the successful academic performance of the faculty hire. The only immediately disqualifier is if the faculty hire appears on a sex offender registry.

A senator asked whether one of the budgetary issues that will be reconsidered in the Fall, depending on enrollments, is compensation. The Provost responded in the affirmative.

After the Provost’s remarks, the Senate Chair indicated that in order for the items under “New Business” to be considered today, it must be approved by the Senate body. The Senate approved unanimously via voice vote the items under “New Business.”

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/minutes.April_13_2013_meeting.doc) of the April 13 meeting without objection

A Senator asked whether, as the April minutes indicate, if it is indeed true that the General Studies initiative will begin this Fall. The Senate Chair reported that 140 students have already been coded for GS for next year. It will begin on a pilot basis in Fall 2012.

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/EC-report-5-May-2012.doc) was accepted without objection

7. New Executive Committee election

Nominations:

Chair:

Dr. Amy Hunter. She did not accept the nomination.

Dr. David Beneteau. He accepted the nomination.

Dr. Beneteau’s nomination was uncontested; re-elected as Chair

Vice-chair:

Dr. Judy Lothian. She accepted the nomination.

Dr. Lothian’s nomination was uncontested; elected as Vice-chair

Executive Secretary and Treasurer:

Dr. Marianne Lloyd. She accepted.

Dr. Lloyd’s nomination was uncontested; elected as Executive Secretary and Treasurer

Two Members-at-Large:

Dr. Phil Moremen. He accepted.

Dr. Ellen Mandel. She accepted.

Dr. Ben Beitin. He accepted.

The Senate voted by secret ballot for two members-at-large: Drs. Phil Moremen and Ellen Mandel were elected.

\*The 2012-2013 Faculty Senate commenced, with a new Executive Committee\*

The Senate Chair then appointed Dr. Judy Lothian as parliamentarian, and welcomed all newly elected senators.

8. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/APC-Report-5.4.12-Final.doc) accepted without objection

I. Resolution 1: The Senate requests success rates of students entering the General Studies program, both within this cohort (summer program vs academic year program only) and compared to prior cohorts of the Seton Summer Scholars program.

II. Resolution 2: The number of students enrolled in the General Studies program shall be limited to a set percentage of the incoming freshman class, to be determined in consultation with faculty.

III. Resolution 3: Faculty should participate in the design and operation of the General Studies curriculum and, in particular, should be involved in the design and operation of any cohort teaching model for these students.

IV. Resolution 4: Faculty are concerned about the adequacy of the resources dedicated to the success of the General Studies Program and seek to consult about the nature and development of the program’s resources.

b. Admissions Committee report accepted without objection – no written report (Latest Undergraduate and Graduate Application Processing Reports available on the Senate Blackboard Site. Go to Blackboard>Community tab>Faculty Senate link.)

c. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/CCC-Senate-Report-5-12-1.doc) accepted without objection

I. Resolution: That the Senate Core Curriculum Committee represents the Faculty Senate and is the primary reviewer on all matters pertaining to the University Core Curriculum.

d. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/FDC-April.doc) accepted without objection

e. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/FG-Senate-report-May-2012.doc) accepted without objection

I. Second reading: [proposal](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Faculty-Guide.Motion-regarding-probationary-versus-tenure-track2.doc) to replace “probationary” with “tenure-track”

f. Instructional Technology Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/IT-report-2012-04-26.doc) accepted without objection

A couple of questions regarding the student technology fee in relation to the new Samsung computers to be given to all incoming students in the Fall—whether it is fair that some science students, honors students, and some Stillman students will be receiving the Samsung tablet while other students will not be given the choice even though all undergraduate students will pay the same technology fee. The IT Committee Chair acknowledged the discrepancy, but noted that this arrangement is on a pilot basis and the hope is that all undergraduates will be given the choice of either a Samsung tablet or Samsung laptop.

g. Program Review [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/PRC-Senate-Report-5-12.doc) accepted without objection

I.  Asian Studies [Program Review Committee Final Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Asian-Studies-Final-Report-22.doc) and Original Asian Studies [Self-Study Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Program_Review_Template__Jan-30-2011.doc)

II. Chemistry [Program Review Committee Final Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Chemistry-Committee-Report-4-12.doc) and Original Chemistry [Self-Study Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Chemistry-Self-Study.pdf)

h. Report from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

A brief oral report was given. The Rep reported that the Board did not meet since the last Senate meeting. The Board has, however, discussed electronically the survey for GAs.

The Senate Chair indicated that the Rep’s term has expired. The Senate will vote for a new Senate Rep at the June meeting.

9. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Compensation & Welfare Committee

d. Graduate Studies Committee

e. Grievance Committee

f. Library Committee

g. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

10. Committee motions

a. Academic Policy Committee

With respect to the following APC resolutions on the General Studies Program, Dr. Mary Balkun moved to call them out of order on the grounds that according to the Faculty Guide, only academic departments or units can propose new academic programs. By decision of the Senate Chair, the Senate adjourned for 5 minutes to confer with the parliamentarian about the motion. The Senate was called back to order at 2:42pm, and the Senate Chair, citing Senate Bylaw XVII, decided that the resolutions are in order on the grounds that the 2011-2012 Executive Committee received the GS program proposal, remanded it to APC, and then APC brought the following resolutions.

I. Resolution 1: The Senate requests success rates of students entering the General Studies students program, both within this cohort (summer program vs academic year program only) and compared to prior cohorts of the Seton Summer Scholars program.

Dr. Judith Lothian moved to strike the word “program” from the resolution since it is not a program per se. GS students are simply being tracked. Her amendment: replace “students entering the General Studies Program” with “students being tracked as General Studies students.” The amended was seconded, and after discussion, this amendment passed unanimously by voice vote.

Resolution 1 now reads: The Senate requests success rates of students being tracked as General Studies students both within this cohort (summer program vs academic year program only) and compared to prior cohorts of the Seton Summer Scholars program.

Dr. Mary Balkun then moved to table this resolution on grounds articulated earlier. The motion was seconded, but the motion ultimately failed, via hand vote, 14 votes in favor, 21 against, no abstentions.

After further discussion on the amended resolution, the resolution passed via voice vote, with 1 vote against, 0 objections, and 4 abstentions.

II. Resolution 2: The number of students enrolled in the General Studies program shall be limited to a set percentage of the incoming freshman class, to be determined in consultation with faculty.

Dr. Kelly Goedert moved to remand Resolution 2 to the Admissions Committee. The motion was seconded, and after discussion, the motion failed.

Dr. Judy Lothian moved to replace “students in the General Studies program” with “students being tracked as General Studies students.” The amendment was seconded, and passed unanimously via voice vote.

Dr. Anthony Sciglitano moved to amend the resolution with the following deletion and addition: “shall be limited to a ~~set~~ percentage of the incoming freshman class, to be determined **yearly** in consultation with faculty.” This amendment was seconded, and after discussion, this amendment passed via voice votes, with 2 votes against, and 5 abstentions.

Resolution 2 now reads as follows: The number of students being tracked as General Studies students shall be limited to a percentage of the incoming freshman class, to be determined yearly in consultation with faculty.

After further discussion of the amended resolution, the resolution passed via voice vote, with 3 votes against, and three abstentions.

III. Resolution 3: Faculty should participate in the design and operation of the General Studies curriculum and, in particular, should be involved in the design and operation of any cohort teaching model for these students.

Dr. Jon Radwan proposed the following amendment: replace “should” with “must” as follows, “In accord with the Faculty Guide, faculty must participate in the design and operation of the General Studies Curriculum and, in particular, must be involved in the design and operation of any cohort teaching model for these students.” The motion was seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed unanimously via voice vote.

Dr. C.Lynn Carr proposed the following amendment: to insert at the beginning of the resolution, “The Faculty Senate is concerned about the lack of faculty involvement in the initial planning of the General Studies curriculum.” The motion was seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed via voice vote, with 3 votes against, and no abstentions.

Resolution 3 now reads: The Faculty Senate is concerned about the lack of faculty involvement in the initial planning of the General Studies curriculum. In accord with the Faculty Guide, faculty must participate in the design and operation of the General Studies Curriculum and, in particular, must be involved in the design and operation of any cohort teaching model for these students.

Discussion returns to the resolution as amended. The amendment passed via voice vote, with 1 vote against, and no abstentions.

IV. Resolution 4: Faculty are concerned about the adequacy of the resources dedicated to the success of the General Studies Program and seek to consult about the nature and development of the program’s resources.

Dr. Amy Hunter proposed the following amendment: to insert and delete as follows, “**being tracked as General Studies students** ~~in the General Studies Program~~ and seek to consult about the nature and development of **available** ~~the program’s~~ resources.” This amendment was seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed unanimously via voice vote.

Dr. Teddy Sirota proposed the following amendment: to insert and delete as follows, “**must be consulted** ~~seek to consult~~ about the nature and development.” The amendment was seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed unanimously via voice vote.

Dr. Marianne Lloyd proposed the following amendment: to insert at the end of the resolution, “beyond those dedicated to the success of students being tracked as GS students such as resources for additional faculty and ARC support.” The amendment was seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed unanimously via voice vote.

Resolution 4 as amended now reads: The Faculty Senate is concerned about the adequacy of the resources dedicated to the success of students being tracked as General Studies students. Faculty must be consulted about the nature and development of available resources beyond those dedicated to the success of students being tracked as GS students, such as resources for additional faculty and ARC support.

Discussion returns to the resolution as amended. The resolution passed via voice vote, with 1 vote against, and no abstentions.

b. Core Curriculum Committee

I. Resolution: That the Senate Core Curriculum Committee represents the Faculty Senate and is the primary reviewer on all matters pertaining to the University Core Curriculum.

The Senate Chair ruled that this resolution is out of order, since Senate Bylaw XIX already states as much.

c. Faculty Guide Committee

I. Second reading: [proposal](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Faculty-Guide.Motion-regarding-probationary-versus-tenure-track2.doc) to replace “probationary” with “tenure-track”

The Senate Chair indicated that as a second reading of the Faculty Guide, passage of this proposal requires a 2/3 majority vote in favor. The question was called. The second reading passed unanimously via voice vote.

d. Program Review Committee

I. Asian Studies [Program Review Committee Final Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Asian-Studies-Final-Report-22.doc) and Original Asian Studies [Self-Study Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Program_Review_Template__Jan-30-2011.doc)

The Program Review Committee Chair noted that Dean Joan Guetti of A&S had provided suggestions for the final report, and the PR Committee received them positively. The PR Committee’s decision is to have Asian Studies send a five-year strategic plan to the PR Committee by May 2013 so that the PR Committee have submit it to the Senate by the June 2013 Senate meeting. The PR Chair then welcomed Dr. Shigiru Osuka of Asian Studies to the Senate meeting to answer any questions. One question was asked, about why Asian Studies hopes to regain departmental status. He answered that Asian Studies’ status change to program diminishes its market strength, at least compared to the other Asian Studies departments in the tri-state area (Princeton, Columnia, and NYU).

The Program Review Committee recommendations on Asian Studies passed unanimously via voice vote.

II.Chemistry [Program Review Committee Final Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Chemistry-Committee-Report-4-12.doc) and Original Chemistry [Self-Study Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Chemistry-Self-Study.pdf)

The Senate Chair inquired about the PR Committee’s recommendation #4 in their final report. The PR Chair indicated that she would be open to an amendment that Chemistry report back in 2 or 3 years on the matter of recommendation #4. In response, Dr. Judy Lothian proposed the following amendment: to insert at the end of “Approval Status” the following, “However, recommendation four must be addressed and reported upon to the Program Review Committee by 2014.” The amendment is seconded, and after discussion, the amendment passed unanimously via voice vote.

The wording under “Approval Status” now reads:

“We approve this program with the understanding that the recommendations will be addressed by the time of the next self study. However, recommendation 4 must be addressed and reported upon to the Program Review Committee by September 2014.”

After further discussion of the PR Committee’s final report on Chemistry, the final report passed unanimously via voice vote.

11. New Business

[Resolution](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/04/Liberal-Arts-Task-Force-Resolution.doc) on the creation of a Liberal Arts Task Force

Dr. Assefaw Bariagaber moved to table this resolution until the next meeting (June 2012).

This motion was seconded, and passed unanimously, via voice vote.

b. Open discussion of priorities for the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate

The Senate Chair moved to table this discussion until the next meeting (June 2012) and proposed that the discussion should be part of committee reports on their agenda plans for the 2012-2013 Senate session.

The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

12. Communications

No communications

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:11 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Minutes of the Meeting of June 1, 2012**

9:30 am

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

1. Sign in for quorum

In attendance: Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Thomas Rondinella, Anthony Sciglitano, Marianne Lloyd, King Mott, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, Gita Das Bender, Arline Lowe, Arundhati Sanyal, Lauren Schiller, Mitra Shojania-Feizabadi, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, A.D. Amar, John Shannon, Dan Ladik, Dan Katz, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Martha Loesch, Alan Delozier, Judith Lothian, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Eileen Toughill, Eric Johnston, Phil Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski

2. Call to order

This meeting was called to order by the acting chair, Judith Lothian, at 9:30 am.

3. Communications from Provost Robinson

In the Provost’s absence, Dr. Lothian read an e-mail communication from him. The e-mail contained information comparing the new class to those previous ones to explain why the profile of GS students was not different from classes in recent years. In addition, the e-mail contained details regarding the profile of students for the honors program.

The faculty discussed further concerns and the EC agreed to bring these to the Provost at their next meeting.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/minutes.May_4_2012_meeting-1.doc) of the May 4 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/FINAL-EC-REPORT.doc) accepted without objection

I. Resolution to create an Intellectual Property Task Force

The Executive Committee moves that a task force be appointed to explore issues of intellectual property and policy.  The Executive Committee will accept nominations and make appointments to the committee.

II. Motion to make the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee ex officio Senate

Representative on the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

The executive committee moves that the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee should serve as the Senate Representative on the Graduate Policy Advisory Board.

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Facilities Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Academic-Facilities-Committee-report-6-2012.doc) accepted without objection

b. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/APC-Report-6.1.12-Final.doc) accepted without objection

Martha Loesch: What is an honor code?

Phil Moremen: It is separate from academic integrity. It’s a pledge students sign not to plagiarize or cheat. Disciplinary measures accompany this.

c. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Admissions-Committee-Report-to-Senate-June-2012.docx) accepted without objection

There was discussion regarding degree audits and other concerns with the Registrar’s office. The Admissions Committee will work on this and the Executive Committee offered to bring the concerns to the Provost.

d. Compensation & Welfare Committee

A question was raised about birth control coverage and it was agreed this would be brought to the BAC.

e. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/CCC-Senate-Report-6-12.docx) accepted without objection

I. Motion to approve the following University Core Proficiencies Transfer Policy:

*Students entering with 29 or fewer credits must complete the full requirement of 10 infused courses by graduation.*

*Students entering with 30 to 59 credits are required to complete 5 infused courses by graduation.*

*Students entering with more than 60 credits are required to complete 3 infused courses by graduation.*

*[Transferred courses will not be counted toward the core proficiency requirement.]*

There was discussion about the motion and the implications for transfer students.

f. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Faculty-Development-report-June12.doc) accepted without objection

g. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/NEW-FG-REPORT.doc) accepted without objection

I. First reading of changes to Article 10.1a (re: Selection of Chairpersons)

**Motion** : Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of all full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year.

This replaces*: Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of the full time tenured faculty members of the department, the probationary faculty members in their second year who have been renewed for the following academic year, and faculty associates in their third year of faculty service.*

II. Motion to change the Resolution of Dec. 2, 2011 regarding the clinical line in the College of Nursing

The Faculty Guide Committee continues to believe that there is no need for a faculty associate line in nursing if the clinical line is approved. The Faculty Guide Committee suggests this compromise on the language of the resolution of Dec. 2, 2011:

**Motion:**To change the Resolution of Dec. 2, 2011 to read as follows:

Clinical faculty in the College of Nursing who hold a rank of Faculty Associate or Senior Faculty Associate will be given the opportunity to transfer to the appropriate equivalent clinical faculty line upon final adoption of the clinical faculty line. These faculty members will retain their current contract status when transferring from Faculty Associate or Senior Faculty Associate to clinical track faculty.

Clarification was requested and received regarding when the faculty guide committee or the Provost interprets ambiguity in the guide.

h. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/GradStudiesReport_June2012.docx) accepted without objection

i. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Library-Committee-report-June-1.doc) accepted without objection (Updated [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Library-Committee-UPDATED.doc) received during the June-September recess)

j. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/05/Prog-Review-Senate-Report-6-12-1.docx) accepted without objection

I. Motion to approve Dr. Ellen Mandel as the chair of the Program Review Committee

8. Committees with no reports

a. Calendar Committee

b. Grievance Committee

c. Instructional Technology Committee

d. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

e. Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

9. Committee motions

a. Core Curriculum Committee

I. Motion to approve the following University Core Proficiencies Transfer Policy:

*Students entering with 29 or fewer credits must complete the full requirement of 10 infused courses by graduation.*

*Students entering with 30 to 59 credits are required to complete 5 infused courses by graduation.*

*Students entering with more than 60 credits are required to complete 3 infused courses by graduation.*

[Transferred courses will not be counted toward the core proficiency requirement.]

There was discussion about the motion.

The question was called.

Vote: With one abstention, the motion passed.

b. Executive Committee

I. Resolution to create an Intellectual Property Task Force

The Executive Committee moves that a task force be appointed to explore issues of intellectual property and policy.  The Executive Committee will accept nominations and make appointments to the committee.

There was discussion about the purpose and scope of the resolution.

Vote: the motion passed unanimously.

II. Motion to make the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee ex officio Senate Representative on the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

The Executive Committee moves that the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee should serve as the Senate Representative on the Graduate Policy Advisory Board.

Vote: the motion passes unanimously.

c. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee

I. First reading of changes to Article 10.1a (re: Selection of Chairpersons)

**Motion** : Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of all full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year.

*This replaces: Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of the full time tenured faculty members of the department, the probationary faculty members in their second year who have been renewed for the following academic year, and faculty associates in their third year of faculty service.*

There was discussion regarding how the change in language negated previous attempts to ensure that faculty who would not be continuing for more than one more year were ineligible to vote.

The motion to remand to committee to address concerns regarding continuing faculty was approved by voice vote.

II. Motion to change the Resolution of Dec. 2, 2011 regarding the clinical line in the College of Nursing

The Faculty Guide Committee continues to believe that there is no need for a faculty associate line in nursing if the clinical line is approved. The Faculty Guide Committee suggests this compromise on the language of the resolution of Dec. 2, 2011:

**Motion:**To change the Resolution of Dec. 2, 2011 to read as follows:

Clinical faculty in the College of Nursing who hold a rank of Faculty Associate or Senior Faculty Associate will be given the opportunity to transfer to the appropriate equivalent clinical faculty line upon final adoption of the clinical faculty line. These faculty members will retain their current contract status when transferring from Faculty Associate or Senior Faculty Associate to clinical track faculty.

Discussion about the implications of the change of wording to the resolution occurred.

The question was called.

Vote: The motion passed by voice vote.

d. Program Review Committee

I. Motion to approve Dr. Ellen Mandel as the chair of the Program Review Committee

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

10. Old Business

a. Motion to enter the changes to Bylaw 19 into Faculty Senate Bylaws

Dr. Lothian requested unanimous consent.

The motion was approved unanimously.

11. New Business

a. Election of the Senate Representative to the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

The motion was approved earlier.

b. Resolution on the creation of a Liberal Arts Task Force

Whereas discussions in the academy over the past few years have increasingly raised concerns about the strength of Liberal Arts education in American colleges and universities,

Whereas the recent discussion over the revised Stillman School of Business core’s general electives raised questions about the state of Liberal Arts education at Seton Hall University specifically,

And whereas the quality and strength of Liberal Arts education at Seton Hall University should be an ongoing concern for all who teach and study here,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the ~~Provost~~ Senate in collaboration with the Provost and the EC create a Task Forcethat shall include equal representation from each school to ~~consist of an a representative chosen by the faculty by each school and college, Associate Dean for Academics from each school and college, the chair of the EPC of each school and college (or a designated representative), the members of the Senate Executive Committee, the Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, and the Chair of the University Core Committee to~~ begin discussions about ~~the state~~ what constitutes the Liberal Arts and the state of the Liberal Arts at Seton Hall University. ~~The structure of this task force must be approved by the Faculty Senate.~~

There was discussion regarding the motion.

Dr. Balkun amended the motion to include the phrase “what constitutes the Liberal Arts and the state” after “begin discussing.”

The question was called for this amendment.

Vote on the first amendment: with two abstentions, the amendment passed by voice vote.

There was an amendment to the motion to include language regarding collaborating with the Provost.

The question was called.

Vote on the second amendment (to add “the ~~Provost~~ Senate in collaboration with the Provost and the EC” before “create a task force”): with 7 nays and no abstentions, the amendment passed.

Dr. Balkun: I proposed an amendment to add a line at the end saying “the structure of this task force must be approved by the Faculty Senate.”

The question was called.

Vote on the third amendment: the amendment failed by voice vote.

Dr. Moreman proposed a fourth change to include the language: “that shall include equal representation from each school.”

The question was called.

Vote on the third amendment: with three nays, the amendment passed.

The motion now reads: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the Senate in collaboration with the Provost and the EC create a Task Force that shall include equal representation from each school to begin discussions about what constitutes the Liberal Arts and the state of the Liberal Arts at Seton Hall University.

The question was called.

Vote by secret ballot: 17 in favor, 10 opposed and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

12. Communications

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.