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Call to Order
At 11:37 a.m. Senate President John Drummond called the meeting to order in the O’Hare Special Collections, Walsh Library, Rose Hill. Welcoming University President Tania Tetlow, along with the Provost and Vice Provost, returning senators and new senators, he invited everyone present to introduce themselves in turn.

Invocation
University President Tania Tetlow delivered the invocation.

President’s Report and Q&A
President Tania Tetlow introduced her remarks by saying she was delighted to be at the Senate meeting, to get to know the Senators, and to answer questions. She explained that she has spent the first few months learning about the campus, the culture, and the history of Fordham. She has spent time with the Deans from each of the Schools and has started to go to faculty meetings and hopes to go to more meetings to learn about what excites the faculty and what makes this place special.

Addressing the question of why she is here at Fordham, she explained that she is in love with the Jesuit tradition of academic excellence. She emphasized the historical example of the Jesuits’ commitment to research and teaching (for example to experiential learning before that became all the rage); and she emphasized their commitment to an education not just for the elite but for others, too. The Ignatian focus on free education, with its investment in a broader group of people, matters now as we seek to bring research and teaching to a student body that is broader and more inclusive, including students of color. She invoked the example of a dear friend, the late Moon Landrieu, referring to his recent New York Times obituary. A champion of integration, he offers a model for what we want our students to become.

President Tetlow described her personal attachment to Jesuit education and Fordham specifically. Her parents met at Fordham; her godparents taught at Fordham. They instilled in her a love of academic learning; so much so that, although she tried to rebel and not be an academic, she got sucked back into the academic world. As a
practising lawyer she was drawn to teaching, and then to administration at Tulane University, which lead to her being asked by neighboring Loyola University to be President there. At Tulane, similar in complexity to Fordham, she learned about running a research-intensive university, skills that will matter for Fordham. At Loyola, she learned about the strengths of being able to speak of faith in an out loud voice; and came to appreciate a space that could welcome Catholics, excluded from other places; a space that would welcome all those (from all faiths and none) who found themselves excluded; a space where we all might find our full selves without shame.

Research is the heart and soul of a Jesuit institution, President Tetlow said, and that is why she is here. She said her job is to support the work of faculty by raising transformative gifts from our alumni. Noting how many of our students are first generation students, she noted the time it takes to build toward that end. She sees her job as helping bring the best and the brightest students to Fordham; and the best and brightest include those who have faced the highest obstacles in reaching higher education. To help support those kind of students requires special attention – and she was glad to see Fordham turning to look at issues of retention. Concluding with a few remarks on the challenges posed by the pandemic, as a reminder of the privilege of in-person attention to students, she closed with an invitation to senators to ask questions.

In the Q&A, the President engaged senators in a lively, open, and wide-ranging discussion about the challenges currently facing higher education generally and Fordham specifically.

One senator asked the President what she considered to be the two biggest challenges facing Fordham. In response, President Tetlow foregrounded the problem of how to bridge the gap between the excellence our students deserve and what they and their families can afford. Noting the contrast between the privilege and wealth of a Harvard, where success begets success, and the economic constraints facing the vast majority of tuition-dependent institutions, the President said that Fordham is on the cusp between those two models. We need to figure out ways both to control costs and to grow. This entails finding sources of revenues beyond tuition, but ensuring our response to market constraints still fits our mission (we don’t want to be in the fast-food business). How do we get creative? Although the market constraints of higher education have always entailed a brutal process, it is a more brutally immediate process than 10 years ago. Another challenge is to raise the profile of Fordham by highlighting the incredible choices Fordham offers to students. In part this is a matter of bragging better, urging everyone to be a little less humble about our faculty’s achievements.

Asked whether she would be a good ally for prestigious fellowships, President Tetlow affirmed that she certainly would, based on her life-changing experience as a Truman fellow. Such fellowships totally transform the lives of students.

In response to a request that she say more about the role of graduate professional programs in the changing environment of higher education, President Tetlow noted that there are limits to growth at the undergraduate level (physical limits of campus, on headcount, classroom size, pricing strategies over financial aid, etc). So part of the road to growth has to come from graduate programs. Gabelli and the Law School, among the crown jewels of Fordham, are crucially important, positioning Fordham at the center of the global economy, and offering the promise of an extensive Fordham network, a network born of first generation college graduates; a network that promises to attract students who know they don’t want Harvard but Fordham. Law and Business, of course, have natural cycles of their own (when the economy is hot, Business loses students; when the legal market craters, Law enrollment goes down). But we need to adjust to where the market is going (for example, there is no longer so large a Chinese student market).

One senator expressed concern about the changes that have taken place at Fordham over the past 30 years, noting especially the increasing reliance on adjuncts and the loss of full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty
even as the undergraduate enrollment has increased; and noting, too, the rising tuition discount rate. In response to this set of questions, President Tetlow noted that we need to work out how Fordham negotiates the financial issues facing higher education more today. She said that it’s simply not feasible to return to a model where all of our courses are taught by full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty. That would cost vastly more than the operating budget could sustain; and that financial issue is the trouble that needs to be addressed. She also noted that the discount rate question is a very complicated balancing question (easy to ratchet up discounts, hard to pull back). Discount rate is about pricing strategy, not just meeting our students’ needs. It is not at all clear we could reduce the discount rate without losing students and thus operating revenue. Part of what she has already asked the financial team to do is to work on our enrollment strategies to ensure that we prevent the very last minute changes in enrollment that have created such difficulties. She suggested it might be valuable to have the Enrollment group come to the Senate to discuss these issues.

A number of senators expressed concern that a logic of austerity was compromising our responsibilities toward our students and the mission of the university. Noting the ethical quandary faced when a department is repeatedly denied authorization to hire the faculty needed to teach the students it serves, one senator drew attention to the feeling of embattlement between faculty and administration and asked what strategies President Tetlow might suggest to address this problem.

President Tetlow emphasized the need to figure out a different model from either that of the well-endowed university with full-time research-intensive faculty or the market-driven tuition-dependent college. What she has tried to do is to be transparent about the constrained choices universities face. Transparency is vital to earn trust, so that everyone can work toward seeing what a fair allocation of workload, salary, and benefits looks like. But there is no getting around the difficult world we live in where you can’t ignore market trends. She indicated she had asked the financial people to dig into the budget and to make things clear so that we can together engage in a discussion of budgetary allocations. The need for honest and realistic discussion of budgetary allocations came up repeatedly. In response to the point that administrative positions had increased dramatically, President Tetlow noted several times how much the industry of higher education has become highly regulated (the most highly regulated industry in the country), and much more so than thirty years ago. Besides the increasing need to provide support and counseling for students, there is the unrelenting pressure to address multiple levels of legal regulation, such as with Title IX. She said she had not yet seen signs of bloat in the upper administration, but indicated that she would be looking at every level of administrative budgeting.

One topic discussion repeatedly returned to was the challenge of hiring and retaining faculty of color, and its central importance for individual departments and for the mission and strategic plan of the university. There was some discussion about the recent history of failed searches and the competitive landscape for hiring faculty of color; but it was pointed out that the issue concerned more than individual searches, encompassing the whole process beginning with authorization and including efforts to retain successful hires through the tenure-track and beyond.

One senator asked President Tetlow about Fordham’s commitment to hiring and retaining faculty of color to provide meaningful representation for our students. Speaking to the heavy burden placed on faculty of color in all areas of teaching, service, and research, this senator noted that there had been a lot of talk about addressing racial inequities, but now that seems to have been forgotten. In response, President Tetlow underscored her own commitment to this issue, noting that at Loyola the number of faculty of color had risen by 5 points. She said that Fordham should use everything at our disposal to recruit the top candidates; that we need to be careful in the way we seek to diversify committees, sparing faculty of color from an overload of service and making sure they are tapped only for the committees that matter. She also noted that her leadership team at Loyola was majority women and half people of color; and that she will make sure, in her review, that the Deans are all aware that this is high on the list of priorities. We have a strategic plan, a good one, and it’s a matter of meeting the goals of that
plan. She also reiterated the senator’s point that this issue is the elephant in the room and needs to be talked about and thought about.

In response to a senator’s concern that the President had talked about the professional schools but not the humanities, President Tetlow agreed that this was the keystone for what we do; and noted that she herself was an American Studies major. She then discussed the importance of catching up in STEM areas, arguing that there are examples to show how one can integrate the humanities and sciences. She affirmed the pressing importance of the humanities by saying that, in a world of selfishness, the ability of students to learn from history, literature, and the arts, is the future of democracy.

At approximately 12:50 pm, Senate President John Drummond called for an end to questions and senators applauded President Tetlow.

**Provost’s Report and Q&A**

Provost Dennis Jacobs began by noting that it was good to be back in person (the last time he visited the Senate in person was March 2020). He said it had been a delight to begin working with President Tetlow. He then turned to address some of the themes already discussed, beginning with the question of hiring and the extent to which there was flexibility in making competitive offers. He reported that this past year authorizations were moved up to May in order to get tenure-line searches underway in the summer. He reported that Ben Crooker has now fully retired and his successor is Ji Seon Lee, Associate Provost for what is now called “Faculty Affairs.”

The Provost reiterated the importance of hiring faculty of color as a key priority. In 2019, the percentage of Fordham assistant professors of color was only 28%; however, if you look at the combined cohorts joining Fordham in Fall 2020 and Fall 2021, 50% of our newly hired tenure-stream colleagues were faculty of color. This tremendous progress resulted from the extraordinary efforts of scores of faculty search committees, but when there is only a 4-5% turnover in faculty, it will take several years to significantly change the overall composition of the faculty.

The Provost reported on undergraduate and graduate enrollment figures (as of the current moment). Our first-year undergraduate population is, as of today, 2566 with a current projection of 2555 at census, the second largest compared with last year’s figure of 2879. In 6 of the 7 different graduate schools, registered credit hours are down. In the JD program, Law enrollment is up a bit; but all the other schools are down, and as a whole, graduate credit hours are down about 10% compared to last fall. Business is down 15%; the MBA is probably down 30%. If you look across all undergraduate and graduate programs we are down 1.4% in registered credit hours compared to last year – mostly because the graduate programs are down, and the undergraduate enrollments, though up, are not offsetting the declines elsewhere. Our net revenue for the year is projected to be a few million dollars short relative to what was planned in the budget. This is the most accurate picture that can be reported at the moment. The Provost stated he would have a clearer picture next month.

The Provost reported on the University’s response to COVID, noting that senators will have seen the messages sent via email. There is a new booster, available now in virtually every pharmacy; and the CDC advises to get this new bivalent booster if it has been more than 2 months since your last vaccination. The University will administer the bivalent booster on campus as soon as we receive shipment. Vaccinations are our primary mitigation approach to keeping our community relatively safe through this stage of the pandemic. VitalCheck has changed from required daily reporting, but it is expected that symptomatic people will disclose promptly to VitalCheck. Masks are recommended but not required. Students are asked to comply with faculty choices on masking policy in the classroom. The University has modified its policy about visitors coming to campus, although the requirement is still that everyone be vaccinated.
The Provost reported on next week’s upcoming Presidential inauguration, including a faculty panel moderated by the Deputy Mayor of New York City, Anne Williams-Isom (FCLC’86), Dumpson Chair of Child Welfare Studies at GSS and a showcase of student artistic performances.

The Provost announced that over the summer a new academic advising center for Fordham College was set up and is now in place serving the cohort of first-year students. In parallel to this, a new “student success hub” was instituted providing a digital platform to connect students with an array of resources. This will be rolled out starting September 15 and by January will be available to all undergraduates and, later, to all the graduate schools. Each student will see a personalized screen, so that students can access services (digitally or otherwise). Dawn Lerman, Special advisor to the Provost on Strategy, who succeeded Patrick Hornbeck, is co-leading the implementation of the student success hub.

The Provost described another project, the Center for Educational Innovation with a presence on both campuses. The vision is to create communities of practice to reflect on and advance teaching and learning, at times leveraging technology and at other times working on how to promote deep learning in the classroom (for example, managing class discussions around difficult topics). Up to now such services have been provided in an ad hoc way. The new Center will offer comprehensive programming and individualized support.

The Provost also reported on the Laudato Si’ initiative (consisting of a committee of faculty and staff) which has produced a Fordham University Action Plan to address climate crisis, focusing on everything from campus operations to curriculum and individual actions. Also, Fordham has been invited to join a team led by Northeastern University to compete for the establishment of a Center for Sustainable Solutions on Governor’s Island. Focused on coastal cities, this project seeks a $150M grant from the city, and the State is likely to contribute more. A range of other institutions are involved from across the globe: including Woods Hole, Northeastern, Johns Hopkins; and universities in London, Tokyo, Puerto Rico, Ghana, Chile, Colombia and Israel. In the competition to see which team will be selected, it has been narrowed to 3. We will learn whether Fordham’s team is successful early in 2023.

In the Q&A following the Provost’s remarks, there was some discussion about the Covid protocols, ranging from suggestions on how Facilities might improve its classroom filtration systems to broader ruminations on the wisdom of the CDC guidelines around boosters.

A number of senators asked the Provost to say more about the summer’s authorization of tenure-line searches, noting that at the time of the May authorizations there was discussion about a possible 2nd round. The Provost confirmed that this was so, but noted that the overall drop in enrollment, plus the prospect of a future drop in revenue for graduate programs in the out years meant that he could not afford to authorize further tenure-line searches (although the Provost’s Office will revisit all of the forecasts after census in mid-October). Some senators expressed frustration about the low number of authorizations and the lack of ability to plan ahead for hirings of all kinds. One senator asked if we might not develop a longer-term budget prediction-model (such as other businesses have). The Provost indicated that we were working with such a model in moving to May authorizations; but then why, the senator asked, would one driver (the dip in enrollment) make such a big difference? The Provost said the model wasn’t wrong, but the volatile environment meant that the assumptions in the model had to be adjusted.

Following further discussion about the difficulty in planning for hiring authorization and its effect on various areas of curricular and faculty development, one senator asked if the Provost could help the Senate build on President Tetlow’s lead in proposing a fuller discussion about shared governance and decision making across the university. The Provost said he would welcome that conversation.
The Provost’s report and Q&A ended at approximately 1:40 pm.

Approval of Senate Committee membership, Online and Hybrid Learning Committee (OHLC) Chair, and nominees for the University Research Council

Senate President John Drummond called on the Senate to consider the membership of Senate committees circulated in advance of the Senate meeting.

On a motion from Senator Schwalbenberg, seconded by Senator Idris, the Senate unanimously approved the membership of Senate Committees.

On a motion from Senator Schwalbenberg, seconded by Senator Mozes, the Senate unanimously voted Falguni Sen as chair of the Online and Hybrid Learning Committee.

On a motion from Senator Rubin, seconded by Senator Sen, the Senate voted to recommend Lisa Cataldo and Mary Beth Werdel as nominees for the University Research Council by a vote of 16 – 0 – 1.

Senate President’s Report: The State of the Faculty

At approximately 1:40 pm, Senate President John Drummond delivered a report on the state of the faculty. In a series of slides (see Appendix), he presented data on the changing composition of full-time tenure, tenure-track, and visiting faculty by contrast to non-tenure-track, contingent instructional staff. The data (from AY 2013 to AY 2022) showed a striking drop in the composition of tenure/tenure-track faculty and a corresponding rise in contingent, non-tenure/tenure-track instructors. The slides also included data on teaching load, assessed according to total credits attempted (rather than sections taught); and the data showed an increase in overall teaching. He noted that these figures capture longer-term trends than what the Provost had earlier focused on when speaking of the drop this year in enrollment. In short, the data shows a decline in full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty and an increase in students.

President Drummond argued that we need to have a serious conversation about the composition of faculty. It is untenable to continue such a decrease in the numbers of full-time faculty and still call ourself a research university.

There was extensive discussion during and following the presentation of these slides. Key themes to emerge from the discussion include:

*the need to emphasize that the best measure for considering instructional burden is credits attempted rather than course sections
*the need to find a way to measure the faculty’s administrative labor concealed by “service” (including the increasing labor of managing and evaluating the non-tenure/tenure-track teaching)
*the need to compare different sources for this data, e.g. comparing the IPEDS source for the Senate President’s presentation and AAUP data.
*consideration of housing and cost of living expenses in discussions of competitive hiring
*the need for a better breakdown of the data on declining faculty across departments and schools
a recognition that the conflict between our identity as a research institution and our identity as an undergraduate institution is an old debate, but one that has become more aggravated and cannot be resolved without extensive discussion

a recognition that this year is crucial for addressing these issues and the need to take up President Tetlow’s call for open and collaborative discussion

President Drummond also noted that this coming year we face negotiations over salary and benefits. He presented a series of slides revealing the change in purchasing power for faculty, showing hypothetical scenarios for a faculty member who received no merit, for someone who received merit half the time, and for someone who received merit all the time.

President Drummond also presented slides showing overall budget expenses as a percentage of the Net revenue. This led to discussion of what “Instruction & Research” covered; and how we might get fuller, more detailed data to explain possibly hidden expenses (such as individual stipends for extremely well-paid faculty or administrators).

It was noted that this was precisely the kind of data that should be (but has as yet not been) shared with and discussed by the Presidential Budget and Planning Committee. President Drummond referred senators to the motions passed last year enjoining the Chief Financial officer to abide by the charge of this committee. He also noted President Tetlow’s commitment to having open communication and discussion of just such issues. It was generally agreed that the Budget and Planning Committee ought to be a key site for these deliberations.

**New Business**

Following this report and Q&A, the Senate President noted that the Executive Committee has recommended that the first and last meeting of this year’s Senate should be in person; but that, although it is not quite an emergency situation, the rest of the meetings might take place on Zoom, if that was the will of the body.

There was extensive discussion on the merits of holding in-person Senate meetings. It was noted that this year, in particular, it would be beneficial to continue the kind of in-person discussion that had just occurred in the Q&A with President Tetlow. Several senators emphasized the importance of having an option for those who are unable to attend in person to Zoom in to the in-person meeting. It was generally agreed that in-person attendance should be strongly encouraged, but that, if absolutely needed, there should be a Zoom option for senators, though not for guests.

**Senator Rubin offered a motion, seconded by Senator Dietrich, that all Senate meetings should be held in person, with the option for Zoom. Following discussion, the motion was passed unanimously.**

The Senate then turned to consider a motion from Senator Dietrich, seconded by Senator Albin, that the Senate authorize the Executive Committee to consult with the Provost’s Office regarding a return to the statutory norms for holding personnel meetings in person. The Senate voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The Senate approved three sets of minutes for April 29, 2022 (#492); May 2, 2022 (#493); and May 2, 2022 (#494), with a vote of 10 – 0 – 6.

A motion to adjourn (from Senator Falguni seconded by all) was unanimously approved.
The Senate adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Christopher GoGwilt, Secretary
“State of the Faculty”
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[Bar chart showing the comparison of FTE enrollment for 2012F and 2021F.]
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Expenses as % of Net Revenue FY2021

- Instruction & Research: 45.03%
- Academic Support: 26.65%
- Auxiliary Enterprises: 14.17%
- Institutional Support: 12.98%
- Net Operating Revenue (before transfers): -0.46%