**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of September 7, 2012**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

In attendance: Mary Balkun, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, David Beneteau, Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, Jon Radwan, John Saccoman, Mehmet (Alper) Sahiner, Jeffrey Levy, Karen Boroff, Michael Valdez, John Shannon, Elizabeth McCrea, Pledger Fedora, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Judith Lothian, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Tim Fortin, Justin Anderson, Phil Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm.

The Senate welcomed two student representatives: Drew Holden, the Academic Affairs committee chair from the Student Government Association and Lindsay Rittenhouse from the Setonian.

Dr. David Beneteau welcomed the Provost for some remarks.

1. Communications from Provost Robinson

\*The Provost recognized the demands placed on faculty members and extended his appreciation for their part in a good beginning to 2012-2013 academic year. He updated the Senate on enrollment; there are 1,464 registered students as of Fall 2012. This compares with 996 students last year. He predicts the number will drop to 1,450 or a little over; last year it dropped to 982. The Provost acknowledged the stresses accompanying such robust enrollment numbers, but also considers a success, since it alleviates budget pressures to an extent. He stressed that the University is in a better position now than it was a year ago. Fall 2013 target enrollment numbers are 1,250 to 1,275 students. As of now, there are 373 transfer students; there were 264 this time last year. The Provost believes the number will level off at around 360. He reported that graduate numbers are down; there are 985 graduate students this year and 1,067 last year. Revenue from graduate students represents about one third of the University budget. There were 224 law school applications this year and 273 last year (this means about 208 or 209 full-time applications).

\*The Provost reported that he will meet with the President toward the end of September or beginning of October and ask that they review the budget based on the enrollment information. There is added flexibility with the budget because of transfer and undergraduate enrollment. The Provost emphasized that this years’ efforts must be duplicated to continue this success.

\*The Provost has established a task force involving Stephen Graham, CFO, and Dr. Gottlieb to address the challenges the University faces as a result of the enrollment numbers. They will look into available space and re-capture classroom space. Retention is up one point to 84%. The Provost believes this will continue to evolve. He reported that the Provost’s Office has received feedback and a variety of recommendations as to how to handle classroom space issues. There are 85 classrooms. In the fall of 2011, there were 1,630 sections. This fall, there are 1,720 sections. The University has created the aforementioned task force, added temporary staff and met with the Board to address this issue. Although trailers were recommended, the Provost reported that he was not persuaded this was necessary. The University promises full-time students they can take between 12 and 18 credit hours; the Provost conveyed that when a problem with space was anticipated administrators reached out to faculty members, who were very responsive. He reported overscheduled ratios in regard to block schedules. In some class hours, 110 sections were scheduled when only 80 to 85 could actually be accommodated. He indicated an additional level of review may be necessary. The administration is in the process of correcting the ratios. He believes the University’s technology is not being utilized to the fullest extent in some areas and wants to change that. There will be clear allotments and the University will offer additional classes online.

\*Lastly, the Provost relayed that there was never an attempt to create hardship for faculty members regarding the spring schedule and that there was interaction with faculty regarding this matter. He cited a lack of organizational discipline which needs to be examined and corrected. He plans to work with Dr. Guetti, Dr. Beneteau and staff in the Registrar’s Office to look at features of the schedule about which they have received good feedback. They will re-examine the schedule. He wants to move quickly on refining and developing the spring schedule. By spring, he hopes to have three more online classes than the University currently offers.

**Questions:**

\*A senator asked if there is a target number for graduate students next year. The Provost expressed that he has asked each dean to re-examine their graduate numbers and look at what their goals should be. The goal is to sustain and enhance our numbers. He will encourage deans to work with department chairs in developing programs that will help graduate enrollment grow and evaluating programs that are not where they need to be. He would like to see the financial aid ratio decrease by one percent this year. By the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, the Provost hopes the University will be in a position to shift the financial aid discount rates back. Sustaining graduate enrollment will allow the University to move back more quickly on the ratios; the goal is to sustain good students who will make it at Seton Hall. The SAT score of the freshman class has increased by 25 points this year. Revenue from graduate programs is also crucial. If the University reaches the goal of 1,250 students next year, the retention rate will be at about 87%. The Provost stressed the importance of growing, rather than front-end loading. These components will allow the administration to address the financial aid discount rate.

\*The Provost clarified that the spring schedule will be revised. He also clarified that transfer students do not get the Rutgers tuition rate.

\*The Chair welcomed new senators.

1. Approval of agenda

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/June-1-Meeting-Minutes-REVISED.doc) of the June 1 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/EC-Report.doc) was accepted without objection

\*The Chair asked that senators let him know when they are in charge of reporting to their respective colleges to make sure they have the information they need.

\*The Parliamentarian read and interpreted Bylaw XXI. Committee chairs should come to the October meeting with set rosters for Senate approval.

\*The Chair reported that the Board is working to enhance teaching; this is an opportunity to improve and it is not meant to be a punitive measure.

1. Provost’s [responses](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Provosts-Responses.pdf) to resolutions

i. Program Review of Asian Studies

ii. Creation of Intellectual Property Task Force

iii. Probationary Terminology

iv. SSOB Core Changes

v. University Core Proficiencies Transfer Policy

vi. [Program Review](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Program-Review-Chem-and-Biochem.pdf) of Chemistry and Biochemistry

7. Reports of standing and special committees

1. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/CC-Senate-Report-9-12.doc) was accepted without objection

\*The Chair clarified that the document published in the Chronicle of Higher Education referenced in the report is on the Senate Blackboard page and this publication is available in the library databases.

\*Dr. Mary Balkun is seeking members with a business background for the budget sub-committee.

1. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-Sept.-7-2012-11.doc) was accepted without objection

\*This committee will meet every other Tuesday from 11:30 am to 1:00 pm. The next meeting is on September 18.

1. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/GradSenateReport_Sept2012.doc) was accepted without objection

\*This committee will meet on select Wednesdays (TBA) from 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm.

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

The Board has not yet met.

1. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Library-Committee-report.doc) was accepted without objection

\*Meeting dates are TBD.

1. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Program-Review-Senate-Report20120907.docx) was accepted without objection

\*Dr. Ellen Mandel reiterated that this committee requires representation from all schools; representatives from several schools indicated that they are still in the process of electing chairs for/finding out who was elected as chair of their EPCs.

1. Intellectual Property Task Force [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Senate-Report-from-the-IP-Task-Force.docx) was accepted without objection

Dr. John Shannon reported that the task force will work with the Provost and report back to the Senate. The committee recommended that the Senate create a standing committee to continue this work. The EC will take this under advisement and bring its recommendation to the October meeting. The Chair clarified that the task force is in effect through the May 2013 Senate meeting.

 8. Committees with no reports

1. Academic Facilities Committee
2. Academic Policy Committee

\*Dr. Phil Moremen reported that the first meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 18 at 4:00 pm. He will notify members of the location via e-mail. They will discuss the status of the General Studies situation and how to move forward.

1. Admissions Committee

\*Professor Brenda Petersen reported that the committee anticipates a report from Dr. McCloud regarding the new class profile

1. Calendar Committee
2. Core Curriculum Committee
3. Faculty Development Committee

\*The committee will meet on September 14 at 3:00 pm (before convocation) to set the agenda for the coming year.

1. Grievance Committee
2. Instructional Technology Committee

\*The committee will meet on Tuesday, September 11 at 1:00 pm.

1. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

 9. Committee motions

No committee motions.

10. Old Business

 No old business.

11. New Business

1. Motion regarding changes to teaching schedules

The Faculty Senate objects to the lack of faculty consultation on the proposed class schedule changes to take effect for the spring 2013 semester.  This lack of faculty involvement constitutes a violation of the spirit of shared governance since the new schedule will have a direct impact on instruction and on faculty life.  We are asking that a working group that includes faculty and student representatives be formed to consider scheduling options that respect the pedagogical needs of the various disciplines and that no schedule changes be put into effect until the group’s recommendations have been approved by both the Senate and the Provost.  We propose that this group begin its work immediately and submit its recommendations by Oct. 1, 2012.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Ben Beitin.

\*Discussion ensued regarding the impact of the new schedule structure on students’ ability to intern and complete degree requirements.

\*Dr. John Shannon proposed an amendment to alter: “We propose that this group begin its work immediately and submit its recommendations by Oct. 1, 2012” and add: “Suspend the emergent response and defer implementation of scheduling changes to Fall 2013. In the development of the Spring 2013 schedule, we recommend the Provost enforce organizational discipline and require compliance with the existing scheme.” The motion failed via voice vote.

\*The Senate discussed the formation of the working group and Senators agreed that the EC will appoint three faculty members and a student representative to the group. It was recommended that faculty members from each school draw up concerns specific to their schools/colleges and send that information to the three representatives.

\*Dr. John Shannon introduced the following amendment: delete “We propose that this group begin its work immediately and submit its recommendations by Oct. 1, 2012” and replace it with “Suspend the emergent response and defer implementation of scheduling changes to Fall 2013. In the development of the Spring 2013 schedule we recommend the Provost enforce organizational discipline and require compliance with the existing scheme.” The amendment failed with a vote of 1 in favor and all others opposed.

\*Dr. Phil Moremen introduced the following amendment: to alter the second-to-last sentence of the motion to read: “We are asking that a working group that includes faculty and student representatives be formed to consider scheduling options that respect the pedagogical needs of the various disciplines and that no Spring 2013 schedule ~~changes be put into effect~~ be developed until the group’s recommendations have been approved by both the Senate and the Provost.” The amendment was approved unanimously via voice vote, with one abstention.

12. Communications

1. [Motion](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Communications-from-SSOB1.doc) passed at the April 27, 2012 meeting of FASB
2. [Letter](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/06/Theodora-Sirota-Ph4.docx) from Dr. Sirota

13. Adjournment

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

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of October 12, 2012**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

David Beneteau (chair), Mary Balkun, C. Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Matthew Escobar, Kelly Goedert, Marianne Lloyd, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, John Saccoman, Mehmet (Alper) Sahiner, Cathy Zizik, Gita DasBender, Lauren Schiller, Mitra Shojania-Feizabadi, Karen Boroff, A.D. Amar, John Shannon, Elizabeth McCrea, Pledger Fedora, Dan Katz, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Lauren McFadden, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Eileen Toughill, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Tim Fortin, Eric Johnston, Phil Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers, Deborah Welling

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 pm. The Chair welcomed the Provost for some remarks.

1. Communications from Provost Robinson

\*The Provost announced that 1,000 students were scheduled to be at the October 14 Open House; two years ago we had about 50% of that number. He reported that he has advised Dr. McCloud to try to hold the enrollment profile to about 1,250-1,275 students for next year.

\*The Provost spoke of the Middle States self-study, saying good progress is being made. One hundred people are working diligently on the self-study. He identified assessment as an area to which we must be particularly sensitive. He said this year we will prepare the self-study and next year we will prepare for the Middle States visitation. It is not uncommon for institutions to have difficulties with regional accreditation, according to the Provost. He emphasized that few institutions escape assessment, but that faculty and administrators involved with Middle States are making good efforts with assessments on our campus.

\*The Provost shared information from his morning meeting with President Esteban and the Executive Committee. He said that we are at a point in the semester where administrators are assessing the budget and that we have netted enough revenue that the President is receptive to a recommendation to make an adjustment in compensation for faculty and staff this fall. He hopes to determine whether or not his can be done within the next two weeks. The Provost also spoke about release time, saying he hopes to have a process in place (as per the strategic plan) going into the Fall 2013 semester where faculty can petition for release time (for research reasons). The administration is taking intermediate steps regarding the strategic plan and this is one of them. They will be soliciting feedback on this matter. The Provost hopes to have something in place in the spring so faculty can petition for release time for the fall.

\*Lastly, the Provost spoke about the Board retreat two weeks prior to the October Senate meeting. He said the Board signed off on a major capital campaign and that they are entering a year and a half-long silent phase of that plan. The plan involves $300 million.

Questions:

\*A senator asked who the contact is to find out more about background checks for new hires. The Provost said to contact Human Resources about this matter and reiterated that the new policy is reasonable and not unprecedented. He emphasized that the policy applies to incoming faculty and staff and that it is not retroactive. This has not yet been approved by the Board, though some schools already have a background check policy in place. An Academic Affairs sub-committee, Human Resources and the legal department have looked at the policy already.

\*The Provost clarified that the release time policy will not start in the spring; it will be effective as of the Fall 2013 semester.

\*A senator inquired about whether a compensation increase must be approved by the Board and also asked if this issue will be discussed at the November Board meeting. The Provost said he has already advised the Board that if there are enough funds in the budget, this is something the President wants. The Provost believes we have the capability and feels good about making that recommendation. He announced that there will be three additional classrooms available for the spring semester and that there will be between 10 and 15 new classrooms by next fall.

The Chair announced that Dr. Phil Moremen would stand in for Dr. Judith Lothian as parliamentarian and vice-chair for this meeting.

1. Approval of agenda without objection
2. Approval of committee rosters without objection

\*Dr. Assefaw Bariagaber moved to approve the committee rosters. The Chair requested unanimous consent. The Senate approved committee membership by unanimous consent.

1. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Sept-7-revised-minutes.doc) of the September 7 meeting were accepted without objection
2. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/2-EC-Report-Oct-12.doc) was accepted without objection
3. Reports of standing and special committees
4. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/APC-Report-10.12.12-Final.doc) was accepted without objection

Questions:

\*A senator clarified that the General Studies designation is not a degree program or course of study; it is a new way to track the same high-risk students we have always had. This designation is only a category for tracking students in order to offer them increased support and mentoring.

\*A senator asked about the timeline for the undergraduate student evaluation form. Phil Moremen clarified that the College of Arts and Sciences is in conversation about chairs having access to evaluation forms. He hopes to resolve this issue by the end of the committee’s business this academic year.

1. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Admissions_Committee_Report-to-Faculty-Senate_October-2012.doc) was accepted without objection

\*It was clarified that “CLEP” stands for “College Level Examination Program.” The program allows students to take an exam in exchange for college credit. As it stands, Seton Hall will accept up 45 credits. In order to receive these credits, students must pay $75 to take the exam and must score above a certain level.

\*Senators discussed the issue of sharing Admissions information posted on the Faculty Senate Blackboard page with colleagues. The Chair of the committee indicated that the information can be shared with colleagues. The Senate resolved to ask Dr. Alyssa McCloud whether it is allowable for the Senate to post these documents on the Senate website.

\*The committee Chair invited representation from the library on her committee.

1. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Comp-Comm-Report-10-12.doc) was accepted without objection

\*The Chair of the committee announced that the cabinet’s opinion on benefits is unknown. There were four proposals, two of which were considered (Verizon and CIGNA). Healthcare costs would not increase if Seton Hall stays with CIGNA, nor would faculty experience service disruptions.

\*The committee Chair announced that she has found a Compensation proposal from 2006 that addresses priorities (compression, minimum salaries, adjunct stipends etc.). The committee will consider this document in addition to a three-phase plan created a few years ago. This document will be sent to the Senate Secretary.

\*There is a link to the Chronicle on Higher Education article referenced at the last Senate meeting in the committee report.

\*CUPA codes that matched Seton Hall librarians were found and sent to Dr. Nick Snow. They should appear with the rest of the codes on the master list.

1. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/CCC-Senate-Report-10-12.doc) was accepted without objection

\*The committee expects to present its bylaws for approval by the next meeting. The invitation for representation from every school and college stands.

1. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Faculty-Development-Committee-10-12.doc) was accepted without objection

\*Faculty Development is holding a series of colloquia in conjunction with TLTC to address how to engage with technology and how to use it in our pedagogy.

1. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-Oct.-12-2012.doc) was accepted without objection

\*The report was delivered by Dr. Colleen Conway, who was standing in for Dr. Judith Lothian.

\*Senators discussed the definition of “rigorous” with regard to the motion to change Article 10.1.a. It was clarified that, if the proposal is approved, departments would define what it means and to decide what constitutes a “rigorous third-year review.”

g. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/GradStudiesReport_October2012.docx) was accepted without objection

h. [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/PGABreport_October2012.docx) from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board was accepted without objection

1. Instructional Technology Committee report was accepted without objection

\*A senator inquired about the beta version of Windows 8 and its compatibility with printers on campus. Windows 7 drivers should work.

j. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/library_report_9_28_12.docx) was accepted without objection

k. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Program-Review-Senate-Report20121010.docx) was accepted without objection

9. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Grievance Committee

d. Intellectual Property Task Force

\*Dr. Ellen Mandel reported that she and Dr. Marta Deyrup had a productive conversation with Senior Associate Provost Guetti, who is interested in developing a policy. The task force will research best practices from other schools that might be suitable for Seton Hall.

e. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

10. Committee motions

a. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee

I. First reading of the motion to delete Article 4.7.d

Article 4, 7, d. In the field of nursing, a total of 60 post baccalaureate credits which includes a master’s degree in nursing may be substituted for the doctoral requirement for the rank of assistant professor.

Motion: Delete Article 4, 7, d.

\*The Senate discussed whether this was brought to the committee by the College of Nursing and whether its faculty voted on this matter. The Senate will request written confirmation from the College of Nursing, stating that this deletion from the Guide is something they want.

II. First reading of the motion to change Article 10.1.a regarding the “Election of Department Chairs”

Article 10, 1, a. Election of Department Chairs.  This currently reads “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”

Motion: To replace Article 10, 1, a with:

Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of faculty members (including full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates) who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year. Faculty members on a terminal contract are not eligible to vote.

\*Dr. Kelly Goedert proposed an amendment to add “of the department,” so the motion would read: “Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of faculty members of the department (including full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates) who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year. Faculty members on a terminal contract are not eligible to vote.” This motion to amend passed unanimously.

\*Senators discussed the concern that if a faculty members next contract was a terminal one, he/she should not be able to vote (e.g. if one fails the third-year review and is not yet in his/her fourth/terminal year yet). Senators resolved that if a faculty member still has one more year in a department, even if it is his/her terminal year, he/she should have a say.

11. Old Business

12. New Business

a. Motion regarding the creation of a student honor code

**Given the growing instances of plagiarism, the fact that research shows an honor code greatly reduces the instances of plagiarism, and its compatibility with our Catholic mission, we ask that the Senate charge the Academic Policy Committee to work on the creation of an Honor Code that would apply to all students at Seton Hall University.**

\*The motion was seconded by Dr. Kelly Goedert. There was a lively discussion about the proposed motion.

\*Dr. Mary Balkun moved to amend the proposed motion by changing “plagiarism” to “cheating.” This amendment was seconded by Dr. Kelly Goedert. The amendment passed with two votes against it.

\*The motion now reads “Given the growing instances of cheating, the fact that research shows an honor code greatly reduces the instances of cheating, and its compatibility with our Catholic mission, we ask that the Senate charge the Academic Policy Committee to work on the creation of an Honor Code that would apply to all students at Seton Hall University.”

\*The motion passed unanimously.

13. Communications

\*No communications.

14. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 pm.

**Committee Reports for Cancelled November 2, 2012 Meeting**

**November reports:**

Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/11/APC-Report-11.2.12-Draft.doc)

Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/11/Faculty-Development-Committee-Report-Nov.doc)

Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/11/ProgramReviewSenateReport_InLieuOfMeeting20121111.pdf)

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of December 7, 2012**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

David Beneteau (chair), Mary Balkun, C. Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Cherubim Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Kelly Goedert, Ellen Ma ndel, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, King Mott, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, John Saccoman, Cathy Zizik, Jeffrey Levy, Mitra Shojania-Feizabadi, A.D. Amar, Michael Valdez, John Shannon, Elizabeth McCrea, Dan Ladik, Pledger Fedora, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Lauren McFadden, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Judith Lothian, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Eric Johnston, Ellen Scully, Philip Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski

2. Call to order

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

3. Communications from Provost Robinson & President Esteban

\*President Esteban wished everyone Happy Holidays, a Happy New Year and Merry Christmas. He expressed that he is cautiously optimistic about the goal of 1,250 freshmen next year.

In light of the following projects, the University Center project will be postponed for two years; it will start in summer 2016 and the target opening will be fall 2018. The President discussed the following projects:

1. Adding classroom space through rebuilding Stafford Hall. This would create 10 or 11 35-seat classrooms, plus two seminar rooms of about 16 seats each. If this is approved by the Board, construction will begin this summer and finish in fall 2014.

2. More parking: The administration is looking at additional parking where the tennis courts are now located, but are considering several areas. The proposed deck would add 600 new spots to the campus. The University may need to look at increasing fees.

3. Residential facilities: The small sophomore class allowed us to fit all freshmen who wanted on-campus housing on campus. The administration plans to refurbish Aquinas Hall this summer; the plan is now to add a fourth floor and a new wing.

4. Fitness center work is under way and it should open in October or November 2013. It was delayed due to the water table being higher than anticipated.

The President thanked faculty members for their work in bringing in the class and being supportive in difficult times. He hopes to start funding projects and plans to build in multi-year salary increases. He also stressed that, since the University relies upon largely tuition-driven revenue, the administration is trying to err on the side of caution.

\*Provost Robinson then addressed the Senate. He also expressed appreciation for the work of the faculty members. We should have three or four additional classrooms for spring 2013. By next fall there will be eight new classrooms repurposed from existing space. We could increase this number by about 1/3 in a short window, in terms of space capacity. We could then address the issues of fall. With the profile we are attracting, all our indicators suggest we are on track for another strong class. As we plan for the future, the additional classroom and living space means that if we keep our profile we’ll grow 10% in three to four years. Each year we can strengthen our position and work on sensitive issues like base salary. We’re in a position to plan on such contingencies moving forward. Some freshman denied for space are waiting and starting in the spring. Also, the population of transfers is also up.

\*Questions from the floor:

A question was raised about who is involved with background checks and what the policy is. Provost Robinson clarified that he was asked to review the policy and it was precipitated by the Penn State issue. He then advised an Academic Affairs subcommittee and then the full Board to develop a plan that all incoming faculty staff and administrators would be subject to background checks. Decisions were made with input from others. It is a process that is fair to candidates and to the institution. He said that this is not a Human Resources-driven process.

Faculty can access the revised policy here <http://www.shu.edu/offices/policies-procedures/background-check-policy.cfm>

The Provost also indicated that there will be larger classroom spaces that will accommodate 70 students.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/10-12-12-draft-minutes-posted.doc) of the October 12 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee report accepted without objection

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/APC-Report-12.7.12.Final_.doc) and [additional information](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Concentration-in-Mathematical-Finance-APC-EPC.doc) on the concentration in Mathematical Finance accepted without objection

I. Motion regarding SSOB's proposed undergraduate concentration in Mathematical Finance

Resolved: That the Stillman School’s proposed undergraduate concentration in Mathematical Finance is approved.

b. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Admissions_Committee_Report_to_Senate_December_2012.doc) accepted without objection

I. [Motion](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Admissions_Committee-MOTION-Dec-mtg.doc) to establish a policy to “super-score” ACT exam result

The CLEP issue might be getting more important, so faculty members might want to review it in each department. The chair asked to have this followed up.

c. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Comp-Comm-Report-12-12.doc)

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

f. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee report accepted without objection

I. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d

Article 5.5.d.of the Faculty Guide:

Motion: To add the following as # 1:  *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

II.  First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.1.e

Article 5.1.e of the Faculty Guide currently states: *Applications shall be submitted to the department by October 1 and to the dean by November 1.*

 Motion: The proposed change reads: *All applications will be submitted by October 1.*

III.  First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 6.1.b.4

Article 6.1.b.4 states that *Faculty associates and term faculty members with two academic years of service completed*are eligible to vote for sabbatical applications.

 Motion: The proposed change reads: *Recommendations based upon a majority vote of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty members in a department are submitted to the dean of the respective college no later than November 1*.

IV. Second reading of the motion to delete Faculty Guide Article 4.7.d

Article 4. 7. d: In the field of nursing, a total of 60 post baccalaureate credits which includes a master’s degree in nursing may be substituted for the doctoral requirement for the rank of assistant professor.

Motion: Delete Article 4. 7. D

V. Second reading of motion for 10.1.a

Article 10, 1, a. Election of Department Chairs.  This currently reads " 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"

Motion: To replace Article 10, 1, a with

*Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of faculty members (including full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates) who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year. Faculty members on a terminal contract are not eligible to vote.*

g. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/GradStudiesDecember_7_2012.docx) accepted without objection

I. Motion regarding annual graduate data reporting

Given the growing importance of graduate programs, the Faculty Senate would like to request the annual reporting to the Senate Admissions and Graduate Studies committees of the following indices by program: numbers enrolled; number of graduates; time to completion for those graduates; retention rates; acceptance rates.

h. Report from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board accepted without objection

j. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Library-Committee-Dec-7.docx) accepted without objection

k. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/09/Program-Review-Senate-Report20121010.docx) accepted without objection

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Faculty Development Committee

d. Grievance Committee

e. Intellectual Property Task Force

f. Instructional Technology Committee report

g. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

a. Academic Policy Committee

I. Motion regarding SSOB's proposed undergraduate concentration in Mathematical Finance

Resolved: That the Stillman School’s proposed undergraduate concentration in Mathematical Finance is approved.

\*The Chair requested unanimous consent for approval of the motion. It was approved without objection.

b. Admissions Committee

 I. [Motion](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2012/12/Admissions_Committee-MOTION-Dec-mtg.doc) to establish a policy to “super-score” ACT exam results

\*After discussion, the motion passed by voice vote with one opposed and one abstention.

c. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee

I. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d

Article 5.5.d.of the Faculty Guide:

Motion: To add the following as # 1:  *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

II. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.1.e

Article 5.1.e of the Faculty Guide currently states: *Applications shall be submitted to the department by October 1 and to the dean by November 1.*

  Motion: The proposed change reads: *All applications will be submitted by October 1.*

III. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 6.1.b.4

Article 6.1.b.4 states that *Faculty associates and term faculty members with two academic years of service completed*are eligible to vote for sabbatical applications.

Motion: The proposed change reads: *Recommendations based upon a majority vote of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty members in a department are submitted to the dean of the respective college no later than November 1*.

\*Discussion regarding whether or not faculty associates are eligible for sabbatical ensued.

IV. Second reading of the motion to delete Faculty Guide Article 4.7.d

Article 4. 7. d: In the field of nursing, a total of 60 post baccalaureate credits which includes a master’s degree in nursing may be substituted for the doctoral requirement for the rank of assistant professor.

Motion: Delete Article 4. 7. D

\*After discussion, this motion passed by unanimous consent*.*

V. Second reading of motion for 10.1.a

Article 10, 1, a. Election of Department Chairs.  This currently reads " 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"

Motion: To replace Article 10, 1, a with

*Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of faculty members (including full time tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty associates) who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year. Faculty members on a terminal contract are not eligible to vote.*

\*The motion passed by voice vote with one objection.

d. Graduate Studies Committee

I. Motion regarding annual graduate data reporting

Given the growing importance of graduate programs, the Faculty Senate would like to request the annual reporting to the Senate Admissions and Graduate Studies committees of the following indices by program: numbers enrolled; number of graduates; time to completion for those graduates; retention rates; acceptance rates.

Motion to amend by Richard Stern and seconded by King Mott.

Given the growing importance of graduate programs, the faculty Senate would like to request the annual Fall reporting to the Senate Admissions and Graduate Studies committees of the following indices by program for the previous academic year: numbers enrolled; number of graduates; time to completion for those graduates; retention rates; acceptance rates.

The amendment to the motion failed by voice vote.

Motion to amend made by Richard Stern and seconded by Elizabeth McCrea.

Given the growing importance of graduate programs, the Faculty Senate would like to request the ~~annual~~ ~~reporting~~ information as availableto the Senate Admissions and Graduate Studies committees of the following indices by program: numbers enrolled; number of graduates; time to completion for those graduates; retention rates; acceptance rates.

\*The amendment passed by unanimous voice vote.

\*The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

10. Old Business

\*No old business.

11. New Business

\*No new business.

12. Communications

a. At-risk Program information

Seton Hall is one of the earliest adopters of Kognito’s At-Risk Program for University Faculty.  A demo of the technology can be viewed at <http://www.kognito.com/atrisk>. and when you are ready:

Go to:  [http://www.kognitocampus.com/faculty](https://mail.shu.edu/owa/UrlBlockedError.aspx)

School enrollment key:  shu48

For more information call Community Development at 973-275-2137

 13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of January 25, 2013**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

David Beneteau (chair), Mary Balkun, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Thomas Rondinella, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, King Mott, Jon Radwan, John Saccoman, Mehmet (Alper) Sahiner, Arline Lowe, Mitra Shojania-Feizabadi, A.D. Amar, Michael Valdez, John Shannon, Dan Katz, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Margaret Farrelly, Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Judith Lothian, Brenda Petersen, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Eric Johnston, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski

2. Call to order

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

3. Communications from the Provost

\*The Provost reported that, as of January 24, 2013, Seton Hall received 10,335 applications; at this time last year, it received 9,958 and 6,628 in 2011. He noted that these are exceptionally strong students. The SAT scores of last year’s applicants were 20 points above those of the year before and they are even higher this year. The administration’s calculations suggest Seton Hall is on track to have a class that is very strong academically. The Provost expressed that, if the administration errs in its calculations, he would rather have a few too many students than not enough students, so admissions goals can be met. The administration would like to admit a medium number and would like to avoid having another huge class like that of this past year, but it wants to be certain that we meet our budgetary goals. Thanks to Senior Associate Provost Guetti and Dr. Snow, there will be three new classrooms in Mooney Hall starting this semester. There will be five additional classrooms available by the fall; in total, there will be eight new classrooms to address challenges from this past year. The Provost addressed Stafford Hall construction, saying it will be a complete tear-down and rebuild project; this will add around 10 additional classrooms (by fall 2014). He stressed that this is sorely needed and that it will increase our space capabilities by close to 25% by fall 2013 and there will be 10 additional classrooms by fall 2014. The Provost said that if we maintain a class of 1,250 to 1,275 students and meet our budgetary goals, within three to four years, Seton Hall will have grown 10%. The University Center construction has been postponed in order to focus on academic facilities. Each year, the administration will assess the numbers and strive to sustain them while strengthening the academic profile, which is part of the Strategic Plan.

\*The Provost also stressed that it is important to invest in the faculty; this is also part of the Strategic Plan. He said that we are on track to support gradual and systematic growth and that the administration is trying to plan for growth. In a half decade, the administration will revisit ratios regarding financial aid.

\*In the spring semester we had 30 new freshman, which compares to about 8 freshman last year. There is a substantial wait-list already. Students were wait-listed in the fall because the school stopped taking applications. There are students who waited to come here, rather than going elsewhere, as they did in the past. The transfer population is up; there were 119 transfers for the spring, versus 92 last year. The Provost said he would share retention rates for the fall within the next couple of weeks.

\*The Provost told faculty members to expect announcements regarding Centers for Excellence.

\*The Provost stressed the creation of a culture that incorporates assessment and said we will be cited for this (by Middle States accreditors) if we do not improve. All indications are that Seton Hall is moving in the right direction for Middle States, but he stressed that everyone must be attentive to the assessment component in order to prepare for the Middle States visit.

\*Senior Associate Provost Guetti shared information about assessments on behalf of Dr. Burton. She spoke of announcements that came out the previous week regarding assessment; these announcements ask faculty members to focus on a project that would make student learning outcomes more prominent. The announcement asked departments to consider the identification of one selected student outcome, to assess it and then to review it within the department. This may become part of the annual report. It is also possible that an assessment center will be created if departments need help working through assessments. She expressed the administration’s appreciation of anything faculty can do that will make assessment more evident to people coming from Middle States.

\*Dr. Snow encouraged anyone with questions about the background check policy to touch base with the Provost’s Office. He expressed that a great deal of time was spent trying to develop a policy. He then took questions from the floor and clarified that the background check policy has been published and implemented and is on the HR website.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/12-7-draft-minutes-posted/) of the December 7 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/4-ec-report-jan-25-2/) accepted without objection

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Admissions Committee report accepted without objection

b. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/comp-comm-report-1-13/) accepted without objection

1. The Compensation Committee moves that the following list of schools be approved for possible use in a forthcoming salary study ([see attached](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/peer-institutions/)).

c. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/fdc-report-jan-13/) accepted without objection

d Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/fgc-actionable-items-1-25-13/) accepted without objection

i. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d

Article 5.5.d.of the Faculty Guide:

Motion: To add the following as # 1:  *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

ii. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.1.e

Article 5.1.e of the Faculty Guide currently states: *Applications shall be submitted to the department by October 1 and to the dean by November 1.*

Motion: The proposed change reads: *All applications will be submitted by October 1.*

iii. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 6.1.b.4

Article 6.1.b.4 states that *Faculty associates and term faculty members with two academic years of service completed*are eligible to vote for sabbatical applications.

Motion: The proposed change reads: *Recommendations based upon a majority vote of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty members in a department are submitted to the dean of the respective college no later than November 1*.

iv. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.j

Article 12.6.j states: Twelve credit hours of release time per semester will be available for the Senate officers, apportioned by the Senate Executive Committee.

Motion: The proposed change reads: Fifteen credit hours of release time per semester will be available for Senate officers and At Large Executive committee members.

v. First reading of proposed changes to Article III of the Faculty Senate By-Laws

Motion to delete the first three paragraphs of Article III and to add in its place: Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. In 2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members; over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members. Each school shall by April 1, 2013  forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.

e. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/gradstudiesreportjanuary2013/) accepted without objection

f.  Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/programreviewsenatereport_20130125/) accepted without objection

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Academic Policy Committee

c. Calendar Committee

d. Core Curriculum Committee

e. Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

f. Grievance Committee

g. Instructional Technology Committee

h. Intellectual Property Task Force

i. Library Committee

j. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

a. Compensation Committee

i. The Compensation Committee moves that the following list of schools be approved for possible use in a forthcoming salary study ([see attached](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/peer-institutions/)).

\*The chair of the committee asked that suggestions be sent to the committee. She will ask individual schools and colleges to weigh in to make sure everyone is reasonably represented.

\*The list was approved by unanimous consent.

b. Faculty Guide and Bylaws Committee

i. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d

Article 5.5.d.of the Faculty Guide:

Motion: To add the following as # 1:  *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

\* The motion passed without objection.

ii. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.1.e

Article 5.1.e of the Faculty Guide currently states: *Applications shall be submitted to the department by October 1 and to the dean by November 1.*

Motion: The proposed change reads: *All applications will be submitted by October 1.*

\*The motion passed without objection.

iii. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 6.1.b.4

Article 6.1.b.4 states that *Faculty associates and term faculty members with two academic years of service completed*are eligible to vote for sabbatical applications.

Motion: The proposed change reads: *Recommendations based upon a majority vote of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty members in a department are submitted to the dean of the respective college no later than November 1*.

\*The motion passed without objection.

iv. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.j

Article 12.6.j states: Twelve credit hours of release time per semester will be available for the Senate officers, apportioned by the Senate Executive Committee.

Motion: The proposed change reads: Fifteen credit hours of release time per semester will be available for Senate officers and At Large Executive committee members.

v. First reading of proposed changes to Article III of the Faculty Senate By-Laws

Motion to delete the first three paragraphs of Article III and to add in its place: Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. In 2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members; over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members. Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.

\*Amendment proposed by Marianne Lloyd (indicated by the additions in red): “Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. In 2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 10); over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 15). Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.”

The amendment proposed by Marianne Lloyd was approved unanimously.

\* Amendment proposed by John Saccoman (indicated by the additions in red): “Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. In 2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 10); over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 15). According to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.f, there will be a minimum of two faculty members from each school. Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.”

The amendment proposed by John Saccoman was approved unanimously.

\*Amendment proposed by Ben Beitin: Replace “In” with “As of,” so the second sentence reads: “Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. As of 2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 10); over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 15). According to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.f, there will be a minimum of two faculty members from each school. Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.”

The amendment proposed by Ben Beitin was approved unanimously.

10. Old Business

\*No old business.

11. New Business

a. Intellectual Property [Policy](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/2013/01/13/meeting-of-january-25-2013/ippolicyv2-new-business/) submitted by the Senate Intellectual Property Task Force

\*This will be brought up for approval at the February 15 Senate meeting.

\*John Shannon discussed the background of the policy and answered questions from the body. Further questions and suggestions should be referred to the chair of the task force, Marta Deyrup.

12. Communications

\*No communications.

13. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of February 15, 2013**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

David Beneteau (chair), Mary Balkun, C. Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Thomas Rondinella, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Matthew Escobar, Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, King Mott, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, John Saccoman, Cathy Zizik, Nathan Kahl, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, A.D. Amar, Michael Valdez, Pledger Fedora, Ben Beitin, Lauren McFadden, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Judith Lothian, Eileen Toughill, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Tim Fortin, Eric Johnston, Philip Moremen, Ann Marie Murphy, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers

2. Call to order

\*The meeting was called to order at 1:06 pm.

3. Communications from Provost Robinson

\*The Provost discussed the announcement regarding the Centers of Excellence. He expressed that, in alignment with the Strategic Plan, three proposals concerning the Centers of Excellence have been recognized: the Accounting program and the Finance program in the StillmanSchoolofBusiness and the Graduateprograms in the Whitehead School of Diplomacy. He looks forward to other submissions in the future.

\*The Provost shared enrollment updates with the Senate. The University is in receipt of 11,298 applications; this compares with 10,866 last year and 7,086 in 2011. There are 8,400 completed applications; last year, there were 8,000. The Provost reported over 6,600 admits, compared to 6,800 last year, which indicates that the University is tightening the admissions already. There is a substantial waiting list. Deposits are up 57%, but it is still quite early. The average SAT score is 1130; this compares with an average score of 1105 last year. The quality of the class profile is on track. The target number is 1,250 students, but the Provost indicated that the yield is the qualifier; the administration wants to make sure there are 1,250 students.

\*The Provost shared that there was a preliminary discussion about the budget today. There was feedback from the Executive Committee. The Provost expressed an awareness of financial challenges since 2006 which link to faculty salaries and adjunct stipends. In the late 1990s, there was a shift from 24 credit hours to 18 credit hours; this was informal and not codified, so the financial impact was not addressed. When this transition was made, there should have been the accompanying budget to help support it. The Provost expressed that there will hopefully be some dedicated salary increases for adjuncts as well. The Budget Committee has started looking at ways to impact that area because it has been a legitimate concern for some time. The committee is aware of this issue and the Provost asserted that it needs to be addressed.

Questions:

\*A senator asked about the possibility of a raise for faculty next year and the Provost said this is a priority; with the projections the administration has now, he believes that if the University is able to get 1,250 students and increase the tuition slightly, a raise will be within reach.

\*The Provost addressed a question about the target for the discount rate and said it will probably go up a little bit because the University is graduating a smaller class and admitting a larger one. He hopes that, within the next three years, we can start reducing those ratios and netting more.

\*A Senator inquired about the sustainability of outcomes assessments as they relate to a department’s culture rather than the Middle States review. The Provost said that regional assessments look for a culture of assessment. There is ample evidence of many areas on campus that have development assessments. There are some areas that have not been as attentive to assessment. In preparation for the Middle States visitation next year, we need to prepare to be evaluated on how we are assessing student outcomes. This is a major criterion that accrediting bodies evaluate. The Provost expressed that he hopes that the assessments departments develop are sustainable and said that we need to be able to sustain whatever we come up with.

\*The 2011-2012 Fact Book is being worked on and will be posted.

\*The Provost addressed concerns about the possible divisiveness of the Centers of Excellence initiative. He stated that many committees were involved in working on the Strategic Plan and that these committees looked at ways in which to focus on the centrality of academics. The Centers of Excellence initiative is meant to create incentives and additional opportunities and to enhance and supplement strong departments. The Strategic Plan evolved this way and the Provost expressed that he is trying to implement it. The three programs that were recognized as Centers of Excellence met the criteria. The initiative is meant to invest interest in academic programs; the Provost said he is looking for other ways to accomplish this as well. He is open to revisiting some aspects of this initiative. His main concern is to focus on the centrality of academics.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/Jan-25-13-minutes-posted.doc) of the January 25 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/5-EC-Report-Feb-15.doc) was received without objection

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/APC-Report-2.15.13.doc) was received without objection

b. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/Admissions_Committee_2013_February_Reporttosenate.doc) was received without objection

c. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/CC-Senate-Report-2-13-.doc) was received without objection

d. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/FDC-report-February-1.doc) was received without objection

e. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-feb-15-2013.doc) was received without objection

i. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.j

Support for Faculty Senate. To enable the Faculty Senate and its major officers to carry out their responsibilities, the provost will each year provide the Senate with an operating budget sufficient for its needs, substantial secretarial assistance for the Executive Committee and for other standing committees as specified by the Executive Committee, and suitable office space with appropriate furnishings and equipment. Twelve credit hours of release time per semester will be available for the Senate officers, apportioned by the Senate Executive Committee. For librarian faculty, the released time shall be equivalent to six or three credits of release time provided to other faculty.

Proposed Change: Fifteen credit hours of release time per semester will be available for Senate officers and At Large Executive committee members.

Rationale: This has been the credit allotment for the past several years. This makes the necessary change to the Faculty Guide.

ii. Second reading of proposed changes to to Article III of the Faculty Senate By-Laws

Motion to delete the first three paragraphs of Article III and to add in its place: Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. As of  2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 10); over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 15).  According to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.f, there will be a minimum of two faculty members from each school.  Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.

 Rationale: This apportionment formula achieves two purposes. The Senate will become somewhat smaller and the apportionment allows all schools to fully participate and be fairly represented.  Based on approximate faculty numbers, using this proposed formula, this is what the apportionment would be.

f. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/GradStudiesReport_February2013.docx) was received without objection

g. [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/PGABReport_February2013.docx) from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board was received without objection

h. Instructional Technology Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/IT-report-2013-01-24.doc) was received without objection

i. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/library_committee_report_2_6_13.docx) was received without objection

j. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/ProgramReviewSenateReport_20130212.pdf) was received without objection

i. Latin American and Latino/Latina Studies Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/LatinoLatinaStudiesProgramFinalReport20121213.pdf)

ii. Department of Religion Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/ReligiousStudiesFINAL_Senate20130210.pdf)

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Core Curriculum Committee

d. Grievance Committee

e. Intellectual Property Task Force

f. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

a. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

i. Second reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.j

Support for Faculty Senate. To enable the Faculty Senate and its major officers to carry out their responsibilities, the provost will each year provide the Senate with an operating budget sufficient for its needs, substantial secretarial assistance for the Executive Committee and for other standing committees as specified by the Executive Committee, and suitable office space with appropriate furnishings and equipment. Twelve credit hours of release time per semester will be available for the Senate officers, apportioned by the Senate Executive Committee. For librarian faculty, the released time shall be equivalent to six or three credits of release time provided to other faculty.

Proposed Change: Fifteen credit hours of release time per semester will be available for Senate officers and At Large Executive committee members.

Rationale: This has been the credit allotment for the past several years. This makes the necessary change to the Faculty Guide.

\*After discussion, the motion passed with 37 senators in favor, 4 opposed and 0 abstentions.

ii. Second reading of proposed changes to to Article III of the Faculty Senate By-Laws

Motion to delete the first three paragraphs of Article III and to add in its place: Each three years the Senate shall review and as necessary, based on the current faculty data, reapportion the membership. As of  2013 the Senate will be apportioned based on the following formula: for the first 100 full time faculty members in a school there will be 1 Senator for every 10 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 10); over 100 there will be 1 Senator for every 15 full time faculty members (rounded to the nearest 15).  According to Faculty Guide Article 12.6.f, there will be a minimum of two faculty members from each school.  Each school shall by April 1, 2013 forward a list of full time faculty (as defined in the Faculty Guide) to the Nominations and Elections committee so that the number of Senators for each school can be determined.

Rationale: This apportionment formula achieves two purposes. The Senate will become somewhat smaller and the apportionment allows all schools to fully participate and be fairly represented.  Based on approximate faculty numbers, using this proposed formula, this is what the apportionment would be.

\*After discussion the Senate voted by secret ballot: 27 senators voted in favor, 13 were against the motion and there was 1 abstention. The motion passed.

\*By April 1 each school and college must submit a list of all full-time faculty members to the Nominations and Elections Committee.

b. Program Review Committee

i. Latin American and Latino/Latina Studies Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/LatinoLatinaStudiesProgramFinalReport20121213.pdf)

\*The review was accepted by voice vote.

ii. Department of Religion Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/ReligiousStudiesFINAL_Senate20130210.pdf)

\*Anthony Sciglitano proposed a motion to table this review until the next Senate meeting. The motion was approved by voice vote.

10. Old Business

a. Revised Intellectual Property [Policy](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/02/revised-intellectual-policy-report.docx) submitted by the Senate Intellectual Property Task Force

\*The revised policy was approved by voice vote.

11. New Business

\*No new business

12. Communications

\*No communications

13. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of March 22, 2013**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

David Beneteau (chair), Mary Balkun, C. Lynn Carr, Colleen Conway, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Peter Savastano, Anthony Sciglitano, Matthew Escobar, Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, King Mott, John Saccoman, Mehmet (Alper) Sahiner, Nathan Kahl, Arundhati Sanyal, A.D. Amar, Michael Valdez, John Shannon, Elizabeth McCrea, Dan Ladik, Pledger Fedora, Eunyoung Kim, Lauren McFadden, Martha Loesch, Alan Delozier, Judith Lothian, Eileen Toughill, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Tim Fortin, Eric Johnston, Philip Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Irene DeMasi, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski

2. Call to order

\*The meeting was called to order at 1:06 pm.

\*The chair announced that this would be his last meeting as chair of the Faculty Senate.

3. Communications from Provost Robinson

\*The Provost commended the chair for his service to the University and for his effective and persistent advocacy for faculty issues. He expressed that the chair served the faculty and the academic culture of this institution well. The Provost said he gives the chair credit for representing what is best about Seton Hall and its faculty and thanked him for his leadership. The Provost announced that the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board recognized the chair as well.

\*The Provost announced that he attended meetings with the Board of Regents for the past two days. The budget was tentatively approved, subject to the University meeting enrollment goals. This tentative approval applies to a 2% across-the-board raise to the base. The Provost reiterated that we have stabilized our enrollment and have momentum. He indicated that we have a waiting list and that the profile and quality of our students are quite good.

\*As of two days ago, our fall applications were up to 12, 057; applications were up to 11,502 last year and 7,500 the year before. Our goal is 1,250 students, which is why we have the waiting list. We have 299 deposits, compared with 283 deposits last year. The average SAT score is 1116; last year it was 1092, so we are up 20 points. We want to have a class of 1,250 or 1,260 and retain these students in greater numbers. The University will grow 10% if we retain them. By fall 2013 there will be eight new class rooms; by fall 2014 there will be 11 more. This will help accommodate the growth.

\*The Provost reported that transfer applications look good, though it is early. Graduate numbers are still running comparable to last year. The Provost is asking deans and departments to look at our programs and examine and assess them. There may be the opportunity to invest more or reexamine the profile of some of these classes. The law school admits are at 413 this year, which compares with 690 last year. The Provost expressed that there are real challenges and stresses there. The law school budget will be constricted by about 25%. Enrollments have fallen dramatically, so the administration is looking at ways to move forward. There will be a period of transition over the next five years; part of that will involve a smaller law school. There will be classes of 750 rather than 1,100 or 1,200. The Provost mentioned that from 2006 to 2010 we had to do our own corrections on the South Orange campus. He reiterated that our enrollment on the South Orange campus is on track to meet our targets and the budget was tentatively passed based on that.

\*The Provost announced that there are 17 applicants for the position of Dean of the School of Diplomacy.

\*The Provost indicated that the President has provided effective leadership in addressing the Big East situation. Seton Hall will benefit from this arrangement.

\*The Provost addressed recent talk regarding the founding of a medical school at Seton Hall. He expressed that any determination about Seton Hall starting a medical school is premature, but that there has been some discussion about it. In 2010 there was a request as a result of the University’s relationships with certain hospitals. A feasibility study was done; there is a need and the demand is there. The Provost expressed that a standalone medical school sounds inviting, however there is a major qualification when it comes to financial considerations. Regrettably, there is not enough money to carry out such a plan. The administration has considered it because the University has people that support it and want us to consider this. However, there is no plan to go forward. The Provost said he has looked at every aspect of it, but it’s not financially practical at this time.

\*The Provost addressed the issue of outside employment. The issue has arisen that some faculty members have full-time employment at Seton Hall and elsewhere. The Provost indicated the need to look at a provision that is more explicit about stating that a faculty member’s full-time job at Seton Hall is his or her primary job; there cannot be something that interferes with it. The Provost will ask for volunteers for a task force regarding outside employment eventually.

Questions:

\*A senator asked about planning for the future in terms of expanding enrollment and admissions. The Provost expressed that he agrees about expanding, but believes that last year’s success must be repeater for a few years to make sure the University is in a good place to do so. This is only the first year that the administration has been able to build a raise into the budget, so the Provost expressed the need to operate conservatively to ensure stability before expanding. He said that modeling when it comes to enrollment management is not an exact science. The Provost said there are two competing cultures on any campus: the collegial culture and the managerial culture. The managerial culture deals with a corporate view of the world; this includes accountability, efficiency, productivity, bottom-line considerations and a customer-oriented mentality. The collegial culture is focused focus on liberal arts, research, peer review, academic freedom, shared governance etc. Once the University has restored its financial strength, it can ultimately expand and be bold. The Provost expressed that that magnitude of expansion is high-risk for us until a pattern is set. He said that in two to four years, the University will hopefully be in position to do this. The University will grow through retention and then continue to hold the line before expanding.

\*A senator inquired about a feasibility study regarding growth and satellite campuses or alternate locations. The Provost said that within three to four years the University will grow 10%. If the University does this and continues to admit 1,250, numbers can easily be over 6,062. He indicated that the administration has looked at how large we need to be. He has talked with the Board about an audit of our existing space. The Provost said that the administration has not looked into branch campuses, but it is continually analyzing opportunities for growth. He indicated that there is a great deal of pressure from Board regarding online education; the Provost believes this has to be guided carefully.

\*A senator expressed concern over the preparedness of transfer students and inquired about the rationale for continuing to increase the rate. The Provost said tuition is not discounted for this population. He expressed that transfers were needed to offset challenges, but they will monitor this and look at the transfer population. The Provost said that during the recession, the administration was aware that some students could not come here due to financial reasons. He wishes to grow the transfer population carefully and deliberately. Many transfers come from two-year schools, which are not as strong academically. He wants to make sure that those who come here can be successful. He said he would continue to attend to this.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/2-15-draft-minutes.doc) of the February 15 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/6-EC-Report-Mar-22.doc) was received without objection

i. [Response](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Response-from-Provost.pdf) from the Provost regarding the interpretation of Faculty Guide Article 4.5.d

ii. [Responses](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Provost-Responses-on-ACT-Superscore-Voting-for-Sabbatical-and-Chair-Math-Finance-Concentration-deletion-of-4.7.d-and-voting-for-Full-Professor.pdf) from the Provost regarding ACT super-scoring, voting for sabbatical and chair, Concentration in Mathematical Finance, deletion of FG 4.7.d, and voting for full professor

7. Reports of standing and special committees

1. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/APC-Report-3.22.13-with-attachments.doc) was accepted without objection

1. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Admissions_Committee_Report_to_Senate_March_2013.doc) was received without objection

1. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/CC-Senate-Report-3-13-UPDATED.doc) (updated on 3/28)

\*The chair of the committee provided an updated report (above) on 3/28.

i. Motion to create an Adjunct Task Force

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost create an Adjunct Task Force, consisting of faculty and administrators, to address the following concerns:

* Compensation
* Increments for longevity
* Quality of life
* Adjunct Faculty Guide
* TIAA-CREF possibility
* Assessment of performance
* More equity across schools
* Participation/voice in department life
* An adjunct study/survey

We would like to see the work of this task force begin Sept. 1, 2013.

1. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/CCC-Senate-Report-3-13.doc) was received without objection
2. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/FDC-report-March.doc) was received without objection

f. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-March-22-2013-FINAL.doc) was received without objection

i. First reading of proposed changes to Article 3.1 of the Faculty Guide

Article 3.1, a reads:

**Full-time term appointments and reappointments shall not exceed a total of five years.**

Motion: To add the following sentence to Article 3, 1, a:

Term faculty teaching in the Core and term faculty teaching core English courses who are completing their fifth year in 2012-2013 are eligible to have their contracts extended for one additional year (2013-2014). This is a one -time waiver of the 5 year term limit.

Rationale:

Term faculty who teach the University Core and the core English courses play an essential role in supporting the mission of the University.  Recognizing the expertise and experience required of the specialized term faculty who teach these courses,  extending the contracts of Core faculty and faculty teaching core English courses who are completing their fifth year in 2012-13 for one additional year, through 2013-14, would retain these faculty until  a lecturer line without term limits is developed and approved.

g. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/GradStudiesReport_March2013.docx) was received without objection

h. [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/PGABReport_March2013.docx) from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board was received without objection

i. Instructional Technology Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/IT-report-2013-03-14.doc) was received without objection

j. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/ProgramReviewSenateReport_20130322.pdf) was received without objection

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Grievance Committee

d. Intellectual Property Task Force

e. Library Committee

f. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

a. Compensation & Welfare Committee

i. Motion to create an Adjunct Task Force

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost create an Adjunct Task Force, consisting of faculty and administrators, to address the following concerns:

* Compensation
* Increments for longevity
* Quality of life
* Adjunct Faculty Guide
* TIAA-CREF possibility
* Assessment of performance
* More equity across schools
* Participation/voice in department life
* An adjunct study/survey

We would like to see the work of this task force begin Sept. 1, 2013.

\*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

b. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

i. First reading of proposed changes to Article 3.1 of the Faculty Guide

Article 3.1, a reads:

**Full-time term appointments and reappointments shall not exceed a total of five years.**

Motion: To add the following sentence to Article 3, 1, a:

Term faculty teaching in the Core and term faculty teaching core English courses who are completing their fifth year in 2012-2013 are eligible to have their contracts extended for one additional year (2013-2014). This is a one -time waiver of the 5 year term limit.

Rationale:

Term faculty who teach the University Core and the core English courses play an essential role in supporting the mission of the University.  Recognizing the expertise and experience required of the specialized term faculty who teach these courses,  extending the contracts of Core faculty and faculty teaching core English courses who are completing their fifth year in 2012-13 for one additional year, through 2013-14, would retain these faculty until  a lecturer line without term limits is developed and approved.

\*The Senate had a lively discussion about the motion.

\*Mehmet Sahiner proposed the following amendment: “Term faculty ~~teaching in the Core and term faculty teaching core English courses~~ who are completing their fifth year in 2012-2013 are eligible to have their contracts extended for one additional year (2013-2014). This is a one -time waiver of the 5 year term limit.”

 The proposed amendment was seconded by John Saccoman.

 The amendment passed by voice vote with three nays.

\*Peter Savastano proposed an amendment to strike references to specific years from the motion.

The amendment failed by voice vote.

10. Old Business

\*No old business.

11. New Business

1. Vote on ratification of the interpretation of Faculty Guide Article 4.5.d

\*A “yes” vote is a vote to ratify the interpretation by the EC of the FGC, which is that there are 4 years between promotions (not that one waits four years to apply and then gets in the fifth year).

 The vote took place by secret ballot.

 With 32 yeas, 3 nays and 1 abstention, the motion carried.

12. Communications

\*No communications.

13. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of April 12, 2013**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

Mary Balkun, Colleen Conway, Nancy Enright, Anthony Haynor, Amy Silvestri Hunter, Cherubim Quizon, Thomas Rondinella, Anthony Sciglitano, Bert Wachsmuth, Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, Peter Reader, John Saccoman, Mehmet (Alper) Sahiner, Cathy Zizik, Jeffrey Levy, Arline Lowe, Karen Boroff, Penina Orenstein, A.D. Amar, Elizabeth McCrea, Pledger Fedora, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Christopher Tienken, Martha Loesch, Richard Stern, Judith Lothian, Brenda Petersen, Marcia Gardner, Tim Fortin, Eric Johnston, Philip Moremen, Assefaw Bariagaber, Ellen Mandel, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski

2. Call to order

\*The meeting was called to order at 1:06 pm.

3. Communications from Provost Robinson

\* The Provost congratulated the faculty on two successful events this past weekend regarding enrollment; some of the strongest students scholarship-wise were on campus for these events. The Provost said the numbers relate to the faculty efforts and commented on the tremendous representation from all segments of the University at these events. He emphasized the importance of faculty members visiting with students and their parents and said the initial response was quite favorable. Applications are 5.8% above what they were last year. Completed applications are up 1.6% above what they were last year. Admits are down by design because the administration is trying to hold the incoming class to 1,250. The Provost expressed that one of the challenges we have is our yield rate. Numbers are trending the way the administration had hoped they would, but the class is not here yet. The yield rate should be around 1,250, but if they are off by even 1%, that is an 80-student difference and it has budget implications. The Provost expressed that the freshman class makes up only about 15% of the budget; retention rate and graduate students make up the rest. The Provost said that the numbers are trending in such a way that unless something unforeseen happens, we will make our numbers. The Provost reported that, though it is early for transfer numbers, they are holding up quite well. He reiterated that there will be eight new classrooms by fall.

\*The Provost announced that they recently received approval to begin construction for Stafford Hall (which would add 11 new classrooms) and for improvements to Aquinas Hall. He expressed that the administration’s analysis and feedback is that a lot of the students the University is attracting want to live on campus, so residential space needs to be address this. He also spoke about expanding parking options; he wants to address this and get approval to start a project for this next year.

\*Regarding graduate programs, the Provost that the numbers for some programs look good and some do not. The Provost will go to the deans for additional analysis on why numbers are down and what can be done to change that.

\*The Provost reiterated that the budget is tentatively approved based on numbers the administration currently has; this includes a 2% increase across-the-board in salaries.

Questions:

A senator inquired about the announcement on discounting particular summer courses and asked if the administration will consider discounting summer courses in other academic areas or providing need-based discounts. The Provost said he is open to these options and expressed that the transition to flat tuition adversely affected summer enrollments and that the last 3 or four years, the University has experienced the consequence of running a deficit between $1 million and $1.3 million dollars for summer school. He expressed interest in creating opportunities to revitalize summer school and provide additional instructional opportunities while remaining revenue neutral. The Provost generated $479,000 three years ago because of a pilot program and put this toward the deficit; he generated close to $600,000 two years ago and generated over $700,000 last year to offset the deficit of flat tuition. The idea with this discount announcement is to target particular areas to revitalize and to create incentives to take these courses that are struggling with enrollment. If this experiment turns out well, then the Provost will be open to broadening the scope of it next year.
A senator noted that this new plan might detract from enrollment in summer courses in other areas (non-discounted areas) and that it would be important to track whether students were planning to take summer classes already or if they are new to it and did it specifically because of the discount. The Provost expressed that he is trying to address the deficit and will be sensitive to these concerns as the new plan plays out over the summer.

\*A senator inquired about the possibility of tuition discounts for graduates, since the University provides tuition discounts for undergraduates. The Provost expressed that there are a number of discounts in targeted areas and that review of discounting is something the administration continually looks at and examines. He said that in the next three to four years there should be a concerted effort to start pulling back on the discount rate. The Provost said that attentiveness to the demand and need from programs is continually analyzed. He said the price structure will be revisited and that the administration will make the best assessment that it can.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/3-22-draft-minutes-POSTED1.doc) of the March 22 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/EC-Report-April-12th.doc) was received without objection

i. [Response](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/EC-Release-Time.pdf) from the Provost regarding EC release time

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/APC-Report-4.12.13-Draft.doc) was received without objection

i. [Recommendation](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/APC-Evaluation-Questions-Final-4.9.13.doc) on student evaluation questions

\*The Senate discussed the issue of student evaluation completion rate. Some senators find that administering the online survey during class time yields a high completion rate. Instructional Technology statistics indicate that there is a 2/3 completion rate and it is increasing.

\*The Senate also discussed the evaluation deadline. Some senators noted that the evaluation is due during the busiest time of the semester for students and suggested that evaluations should be available for completion through final examination time. The evaluation deadline must, however, occur before grades are released.

ii. [Recommendation](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/APC-Honor-Code-Policy-Final-4.9.13.doc) on honor code policy

\*A senator noted that there is an academic grievance policy that handles issues of grades and contestations relating to academic honesty. The chair of the committee expressed that the honor code policy should dovetail with existing University policies to avoid duplication. This would fall under the purview of the task force, if it is created.

b. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Admissions-Committee-Report.doc) was received without objection

c. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Comp-Comm-Report-4-13.doc) was received without objection

d. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/CCC-Senate-Report-4-13-revised.doc) was received without objection

e. Faculty Development Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/FDC-report-April-2013.doc) was received without objection

f. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-April-12-2013.doc) was received without objection

i. Second reading of proposed changes to Article 3.1.a of the Faculty Guide

Article 3.1.a reads:

**Full-time term appointments and reappointments shall not exceed a total of five years.**

Motion: To add the following sentence to Article 3.1.a:

Term faculty who are completing their fifth year in 2012-2013 are eligible to have their contracts extended for one additional year (2013-2014). This is a one-time waiver of the 5 year term limit.

Rationale:

Term faculty who teach the University Core and the core English courses play an essential role in supporting the mission of the University.  Recognizing the expertise and experience required of the specialized term faculty who teach these courses,  extending the contracts of Core faculty and faculty teaching core English courses who are completing their fifth year in 2012-13 for one additional year, through 2013-14, would retain these faculty until  a lecturer line without term limits is developed and approved.

ii. First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d:

The following motion was approved by the Senate in December 2012:

Motion: (to add) *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

The Provost recommended adding the following:

*The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit, with the approval of their dean, two external review s reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.*

Rationale: This additional language was proposed by the Provost to the motion submitted in Feb. 2013.

g. Graduate Studies Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/GradStudiesStudiesReportApril_2013.docx) was received without objection

h. [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/PGABReport_April2013.docx) from the Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board was received without objection

i. Instructional Technology Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/IT-report-2013-04-10.doc) was received without objection

j. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/Library-Committee-Report1.doc) was received without objection

k. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/ProgramReviewSenateReport20130412.pdf) was received without objection

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Calendar Committee

c. Grievance Committee

d. Intellectual Property Task Force

e. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

i. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

Second reading of proposed changes to Article 3.1.a of the Faculty Guide

Article 3.1.a reads:

**Full-time term appointments and reappointments shall not exceed a total of five years.**

Motion: To add the following sentence to Article 3.1.a:

Term faculty who are completing their fifth year in 2012-2013 are eligible to have their contracts extended for one additional year (2013-2014). This is a one -time waiver of the 5 year term limit.

Rationale:

Term faculty members play an essential role in the University. The expertise and experience of many term faculty members and the difficulty of replacing these faculty members demonstrates the need for a lecturer line that has rolling contracts. The Faculty Guide committee is developing a proposal for a lecturer line to be sent to the Senate in Fall 2013. Extending term faculty member contracts who are completing their fifth year in 2012-13 for one additional year, through 2013-14, will retain these faculty until a lecturer line without term limits is developed and approved.

\*The Senate discussed the proposed term appointment extension.

\*The Senate voted by secret ballot. The motion carried, with 28 yeas, 6 nays, and 0 abstentions.

ii. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

First reading of proposed changes to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d:

The following motion was approved by the Senate in December 2012:

Motion: (to add) *Such guidelines shall include guidelines for voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department.*

The Provost recommended adding the following:

*The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who*

*seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit, with the approval of their dean, two external reviews reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.*

Rationale: This additional language was proposed by the Provost to the motion submitted in Feb. 2013.

\*After discussion, Amy Hunter proposed the following amendment: *The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit~~, with the approval of their dean,~~ two external reviews reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The two external reviewers must be approved by the dean. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.*

The above amendment was meant to address clarify the referent of the “with the approval of their dean” clause. There was discussion regarding the motion.

The amendment to the motion failed by voice vote.

\*Colleen Conway made a motion to remand this to the Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee so it can discuss this more and clarify the language with the Provost. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

10. Old Business

\*No old business

11. New Business

\*No new business

12. Communications

i. [Letter](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/EC-Promotion-Interpretation-4-2-13-Final-Letter-for-GE.doc) to the President regarding the interpretation of Faculty Guide Article 4.5.d

13. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of May 3, 2013**

1:00 p.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

Kelly Goedert, Manfred Minimair, Marianne Lloyd, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, Cathy Zizik, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Rick Dool, Patrick Fisher, Anthony Haynor, Amy Hunter, Mitra Shojania Feizabadi, Joel Sperber, A.D. Amar, John Shannon, Hongfei Tang, Anca Cotet, Ben Beitin, Eunyoung Kim, Lauren McFadden, Beth Bloom, Alan Delozier, Sharon Favaro, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Judith Lothian, Eric Johnston, Phil Moremen, Ann Marie Murphy, Richard Boergers, Patricia Remshifski, Irene De Masi, Mara Podvey

2. Call to order

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

3. Welcome and communication from the Chair: procedures for participating in the Faculty Senate

\* The chair appointed Dr. Phil Moremen as parliamentarian for the meeting and welcomed all newly elected senators.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/4-12-draft-minutes-posted.doc) of the April 12 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/7-EC-Report-May-4-2013.doc) was received without objection

7. New Executive Committee election

Nominations:

Chair:

Dr. Judith Lothian. She accepted the nomination.

Dr. Lothian’s nomination was uncontested; she was elected as Chair unanimously.

Vice-chair:

Dr. Mary Balkun. She accepted the nomination.

Dr. Balkun’s nomination was uncontested; she was elected as Vice-chair unanimously.

Executive Secretary and Treasurer:

Dr. Marianne Lloyd. She accepted.

Dr. Lloyd’s nomination was uncontested; she was re-elected as Executive Secretary and Treasurer unanimously.

Two Members-at-Large:

Dr. Ben Beitin. He accepted the nomination.

Dr. Phil Moremen. He accepted the nomination.

Dr. Ben Beitin and Dr. Phil Moremen were unanimously elected as the members-at-large.

\***The 2013-2014 Faculty Senate commences, with a new Executive Board\***

8. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Admissions Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Admissions-Committee-Report-for-5.3.doc) was received without objection

b. Compensation & Welfare Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/CC-Senate-Report-5-13.doc) was received without objection

c. Core Curriculum Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/UPDATED-CCC-Senate-Report-5-13-1.doc) was received without objection

<http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/03/CCC-Senate-Report-4-13.doc>

\*There was a request to clarify the reporting process; the CCC reports directly to the Senate and has a representative on the Core Advisory Board. The CCC supervises the administration of the core.

 i. Proposed [CCC By-Laws](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/CCC-By-Laws.doc)

d. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Faculty-Guide-committee-report-May-3%2C-2013.doc) was received without objection

i. [First Reading](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/FGC-5.5.d-motion.doc) of proposed changes to FG Article 5.5.d (concerning voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department)

e. Graduate Studies Committee [report and faculty graduate workload survey summary](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/May_GradStudiesSenateReport-and-survey-summary.docx) was received without objection

i. [Motion](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Graduate-Studies-Committee-Motion.doc) to create a task force to investigate the issue of discounting graduate tuition.

f. Library Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Report-of-the-Senate-Library-Committee-4-29-13.docx) was received without objection

g. Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/ProgramReviewSenateReport20130503.pdf) was received without objection

\*3 programs were granted extensions:

1. BA/BS Biology
2. Women's Studies
3. Modern Language/Africana Studies

\*It was clarified that, generally, EPC representatives are appointed to Program Review Committee.

\*The PRC is in need of a chair; the Provost will be asked for a release time of 1 course per semester. It was stressed that that this is a crucial committee, especially with Middle States going on. Ideally, the chair would be a Senator.

i. Department of Religion Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/ReligiousStudiesFINAL_Senate20130210-1.pdf)

ii. [Communication](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Comm-from-the-Provosts-Office.pdf) from the Provost's Office

9. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

b. Academic Policy Committee

c. Calendar Committee

d. Faculty Development Committee

\*It was reported orally that the FDC is having a workshop this June to help professors who are submitting information to Rank and Tenure to show them how to upload files to Blackboard. The chair said the committee will broadcast it as soon as they have a set date.

\*The chair also announced that there are 25 Fulbright scholars who have succeed in their scholarship at Seton Hall. The committee feels the University should support those people who are not fully-funded (on Fulbrights) so they not struggling with New Jersey taxes; it feels the University should help compensate for the shortfall of the Fulbright. This issue will go to the Faculty Guide Committee.

e. Grievance Committee

f. Intellectual Property Task Force

g. Instructional Technology Committee

h. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

i. Senate Representative of the Graduate Policy Advisory Board

10. Committee motions

a. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

i. [First Reading](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/FGC-5.5.d-motion.doc) of proposed changes to FG Article 5.5.d (concerning voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department)

\* It was clarified that the Library (like the School of Diplomacy) is treated as a department rather than as a school, with regard to FG Article 5.5.d.

\*The following sentence was added to Provost’s language: “The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate.”

\***Motion: *The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit two external review s reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.***

\*Amendment proposed by Dr. Carr: Delete “The Dean will approve…” sentence and replace with: “The candidate may submit names of external reviewers to the Dean for approval.” With the amendment, the proposal would read as follows:

***The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit two external review s reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. ~~The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate.~~*** The candidate may submit names of external reviewers to the Dean for approval.***The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.***

The amendment failed.

b. Graduate Studies Committee

i. [Motion](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/Graduate-Studies-Committee-Motion.doc) to create a task force to investigate the issue of discounting graduate tuition.

**Motion**:

Whereas graduate education has an important role in this institution;

Whereas the high cost of graduate tuition and lack of sufficient financial aid in the form of graduate and teaching assistantships limit the ability of graduate programs on campus to recruit the top students and therefore their academic profiles;

Whereas tuition discounting has been effective at improving the quantity and academic profile of the recent undergraduate student body;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the formation of a Graduate Tuition and Financial Aid Taskforce to: 1. examine the benefits and challenges of offering tuition discounts and other forms of aid at the graduate level, particularly among programs not currently benefiting from competitive tuition pricing; 2. make recommendations about program-specific tuition and financial aid policy at the graduate level; 3. articulate a policy through which programs can propose financial packages for their graduate students.  The Senate supports a membership consisting of a designated senate representative, two (2) representatives from each college offering graduate programs and determined by the faculty of the respective colleges, the Dean of Research and Graduate Services, and representatives from the offices of the Provost, Financial Aid, Admissions, and Enrollment Services.

\*The motion passed unanimously.

11. Old Business

i. Department of Religion Program Review Committee [Report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/ReligiousStudiesFINAL_Senate20130210-1.pdf)

\*The report was accepted unanimously by voice vote.

12. New Business

i. First reading of College of Nursing [Clinical Line](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/04/POSTED-clinical-line-w.-CoN-approved-changes.doc) with proposed changes to Faculty Guide Articles 3 and 4

\*This motion does not come from the FGC; it was brought by Dr. Lothian and seconded by Dr. Marianne Lloyd.

\*Dr. Lothian outlined the background of the Clinical Line proposal. In January 2012, the Senate approved a Nursing Clinical Line and sent it to the Provost. Part of the FG changes related to Clinical Line was a statement that the Faculty Associate line would not be used in Nursing. The Provost rejected this statement. The EC worked closely with Provost to sort out differences last summer. By the end of the summer, the EC felt comfortable with not including the part regarding Faculty Associates as long as all Faculty Associates were given the opportunity to apply to the Clinical Line. This is one change that’s been made since the last time the Clinical Line proposal has been in the Senate.

\*The second big change is that the Dean of Nursing was concerned with the idea of an initial 2-year contract followed by a 5-year contract. Now it is an initial 1-year contract followed by renewable 3-year contracts. This went back to the Nursing faculty, who approved it. This is the new proposal of the Clinical Line.

\*Dr. Amar proposed an amendment to correct the proposal’s grammar: “If the department~~,~~ and the dean agree, the faculty member may be appointed for a three-year~~-~~ contract. If a three-year appointment is not offered, the faculty member’s term will expire ~~and~~ at the end of the contract year. In the fall semester of the third year of a three-year contract, the faculty member will be required to undergo a rigorous review and be recommended for another ~~multi-year~~ three year appointment as in the above section ~~for an additional three-year contract~~. This review process shall be continued for each subsequent three-year contract. Three-year contracts can be renewed after each ~~3~~-three-year contract expires and future ~~3~~-three-year contracts can be granted without limit.”

\*Beth Bloom proposed an amendment to delete “multi-year.” (Appears above.)

\*Kelly Goedert proposed an amendment to add: “the third year of.” (Appears above.)

\*A.D. Amar proposed a motion to remand this proposal to the committee. It was noted that this would make it impossible to hire Clinical Line faculty in the fall..

 \*Vote: One “yes” vote; all remaining votes were “nays.” The motion failed.

\*Marcia Gardner proposed an amendment to delete “for an additional three-year contract. (Appears above.)

13. Communications

\*No communications.

14. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

**SETON HALL UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

**Meeting of June 10, 2013**

9:30 a.m.

Beck Rooms

Walsh Library

Agenda

1. Sign in for quorum

Kelly Goedert, Marianne Lloyd, Jon Radwan, Peter Reader, Mary Balkun, C Lynn Carr, Gita Das Bender, Patrick Fisher, Anthony Haynor, Nathaniel Knight, Diana Alvarez-Amell, Joel Sperber, Nathan Kahl, A.D. Amar, Theresa Henry, Hongfei Tang, Mark Holtzman, Daniel Ladik, Ben Beitin, Lauren McFadden, Margaret Farrelly, Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj, Beth Bloom, Pamela Galehouse, Marcia Gardner, Donna Ho-Shing, Judith Lothian, Mary Patricia Wall, Judith Lucas, Eric Johnston, Gregory Glazov, Phil Moremen, Ann Marie Murphy, Patricia Remshifski, Irene De Masi, Cathy Maher

2. Call to order

\*The meeting was called to order at 9:40 am.

3. Communications from Senior Associate Provost Guetti

The Senior Associate Provost reported that the University has over 1,455 deposits and expects that there will be a melt. She said we are starting to experience a 4% melt, which is normal; deposits are down to 1,400. The Senior Associate Provost expects that there will be additional melt over the summer. She said the goal of the Provost’s Office is to keep this to about 1,250 or a few more in case people drop out at the last minute. She also reported additional selectivity; the University’s acceptance rate was almost 85% last year. Right now, the acceptance rate is 79%. This selectivity has caused a rise in our SAT scores; the average score is 1,110. The Senior Associate Provost extended appreciation to faculty members for their help with orientations.

The Senior Associate Provost spoke about renovations and notified the Senate that the Stafford Hall renovation is proceeding. This will help with classroom space and scheduling. She thanked Mary Balkun for attending the Board of Regents meeting. The Senior Associate Provost said that the Board of Regents is very interested in online/hybrid courses. She extended congratulations to the new Senate on behalf of the Provost.

Questions:

\*A senator expressed concerns about the impact of sudden announcements of carpeting and painting on faculty members in several departments and asked why notice was not brought through the Senate Facilities Committee. The Senior Associate Provost acknowledged these concerns and felt communication should have been more effective and said she would find out the answer.

\*A senator asked about a reevaluation of the University evacuation plan following the recent bomb scare. The senator expressed that there seemed to be no coordination with the police or fire department initially and that it took a significant amount of time for campus security to start directing traffic. Additionally, not all gates were open and there were no efficient traffic patterns, especially leaving the parking garage. The Senior Associate Provost said the person responsible for all this was caught; it was a disgruntled student from several years ago. Dr. Gottlieb is looking for feedback. The Senior Associate Provost asked that faculty members notify her of problem situations related to the evacuation to bring to Dr. Gottlieb.

4. Approval of agenda without objection

5. Approval of the [draft minutes](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/5-3-draft-minutes-posted.doc) of the May 3 meeting without objection

6. Executive Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/EC-Report-june-10-2013-final-revised-1.doc) was received without objection

\*Mary Balkun reported on the Board of Regents meeting she attended; she expressed that the Board is interested in online learning and related revenue possibilities. She said that the question of mission came up again, specifically how the mission is being fostered and to what extent it’s being fostered. They are interested in having a question about whether faculty members are teaching to the University’s mission on the student evaluation forms. Dr. Balkun suggested a question regarding bias instead.

\* A senator expressed that faculty should have a larger role at the Board of Regents meetings; currently, no faculty member is appointed to attend. The chair of the Senate is invited to these meetings. There are several committees and this is the only one on which a faculty member sits.

i. [Response](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/PRC-LALS.pdf) from the Provost regarding the Latin American and Latino/Latina Studies Program Review Committee report

ii. [Response and suggested language](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/voting-for-chair-provost-response-and-language.doc) from the Provost regarding the eligibility of voting for chairpersons (Faculty Guide Article 10.1.a)

7. Reports of standing and special committees

a. Academic Policy Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/APC-Report-6.10.13-Rev.doc) was received without objection

 i. Resolution regarding the Master of Arts in Public Relations

 Resolved: The proposed Master of Arts in Public Relations is approved.

ii. Resolution regarding proposed Minors in Music History and Music Technology

Resolved: The proposed Minors in Music History and Music Technology are approved.

b. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/FGC-report.doc) was received without objection

i. Second reading of proposed changes to FG Article 5.5.d (concerning voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department)

**Motion: To add to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d**

***The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit two external reviews reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.***

c. Grievance Committee

\*A.D. Amar, the newly-elected chair of the committee, notified the Senate that a grievance issue came up and the committee unanimously approved its by-laws. They have been filed with the Provost’s Office and the Senate and will be forwarded to the by-laws committee.

d. Program Review Committee report was received without objection

i. Police Graduate Studies Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/PRC-Police-Grad-Studies.pdf)

8. Committees with no reports

a. Academic Facilities Committee

\*Richard Stern was elected chair.

b. Admissions Committee

c. Compensation & Welfare Committee

\*Dr. Balkun was re-elected chair of the committee. She reported that the committee will continue working on the salary study, which is now moving forward. There is an indication that it will take $1.6 million to make the salary adjustment. They are using two models to determine the salary adjustment; one is the national average plus 30% for the cost of living and the other is using top 67th percentile of doctoral institution salaries. They are running the figures with the 2% increase and will work with the CFO to get this work done for the 2014-2015 budget. The salary adjustment will be worked into the next budget and the budget committee is working out a plan for how to move forward regarding a regular review of salaries. The sub-committee will continue to work over the summer.

d. Calendar Committee

e. Core Curriculum Committee

\*Dr. Balkun reported that the committee does not have a chair yet because not enough people have signed up to serve on the committee. She asked that senators consider serving on the committee. There should be at least one member from each school on the committee.

f. Faculty Development Committee

\*Peter Reader, who was re-elected chair of the committee, notified the Senate of a workshop on Wednesday for Rank and Tenure files in TLTC from 9:30-11:30.

g. Graduate Studies Committee

\*Kelly Goedert was re-elected as chair

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

i. Instructional Technology Committee

j. Library Committee

k. Nominations, Elections, & Appointments Committee

9. Committee motions

a. Academic Policy Committee

i. Resolution regarding the Master of Arts in Public Relations

 Resolved: The proposed Master of Arts in Public Relations is approved.

\*Dr. Moremen reported that there could be a lot of demand for this. A faculty member who can service this degree was just hired in 2011 and there is another approved hire for 2013 who could also service this degree.

ii. Resolution regarding proposed Minors in Music History and Music Technology

Resolved: The proposed Minors in Music History and Music Technology are approved.

\*Vote: both resolutions were approved unanimously.

b. Faculty Guide & Bylaws Committee

i. Second reading of proposed changes to FG Article 5.5.d (concerning voting procedures for promotion to full professor when there are no faculty of that rank in the department)

**Motion: To add to Faculty Guide Article 5.5.d**

***The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit two external reviews reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.***

\*Ben Beitin proposed a motion to amend the proposed changes by adding “(or professional effectiveness),” as indicated below:

***The departmental guidelines should clearly include teaching*** (or professional effectiveness)***, research and service expectations for those who seek to demonstrate a portfolio appropriate for advancement to the rank of professor. As for a process of evaluation of this portfolio, candidates may submit two external reviews reflecting on the level and impact of their scholarly accomplishments. The Dean will approve the external reviewers proposed by the candidate. The department has the prerogative to submit a position on the promotion, but with no vote.***

Vote on Dr. Beitin’s amendment by secret ballot: 14 yeas, 20 nays, 1 abstention. The motion fails.

\*After more discussion, Dr. Balkun called the question.

\*Vote: 1 abstention; all remaining votes were yeas. The motion passed.

c. Program Review Committee

i.Police Graduate Studies Program Review Committee [report](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/PRC-Police-Grad-Studies.pdf)

\*A senator made a suggestion for the recommendation regarding the program’s request for additional faculty members; the committee should recommend that instead of giving more faculty, they should ask for one more full-time faculty member with a guarantee from the program that it would reduce the number of adjuncts.

\*Dr. Balkun proposed a motion to remand the report back to the committee.

 Vote: the motion to remand was approved unanimously.

10. Old Business

i. [Second reading](http://blogs.shu.edu/senate/files/2013/05/REVclinical-line-w.-CoN-approved-changes-2.doc) of College of Nursing Clinical Line with proposed changes to Faculty Guide Articles 3 and 4

\*Faculty Associates have been offered the opportunity to transition to the Clinical Line. Three out of four have done so. Many schools have a Clinical Line already.

\*Vote: the Clinical Line proposal passed unanimously.

ii. First reading of the Provost's suggested changes to Article 10.1.a

"Department chairpersons are elected by majority vote of faculty members (including full-time tenured faculty members, probationary faculty, and faculty associates) who will be continuing employment at the university in the subsequent year.  Since eligibility is based on continuance in the following year, eligibility may need to be clarified with the dean.  Faculty members on a terminal contract are not eligible to vote."

11. New Business

\*Motion to amend the agenda: 1 nay; the remaining votes were yeas.

\*Dr. Balkun made a motion that the Academic Facilities Committee investigate the painting and carpeting issue.

Senators expressed an interest in establishing a precise timeline of the decision-making process.

 Vote: the motion passed unanimously.

12. Communications

\*Dr. Lothian introduced Michael Awad, the new Faculty Senate Graduate Assistant.

13. Adjournment

\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:09 am.