Meeting: 12:45 p.m. in Fordham Law School, 4th Floor, Room #430 B & C
Lincoln Center Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer
Mr. Jeffrey L. Gray, Vice President for Student Affairs
Ms. Michelle Burris, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Mr. Keith Eldredge, Dean of Students at Lincoln Center, and
Mr. Christopher Rodgers, Dean of Students at Rose Hill

Excused: Senators Martin Chase, S.J., Michael M. Martin, Mark Massa, S.J., and Berish Rubin

Dr. Joel R. Reidenberg, the President of the Faculty Senate called the meeting to order at 12:55pm. Father Joseph McShane, S.J., University President, delivered the invocation.

1. Matters Presented by the President of the University.

Father McShane introduced Dr Stephen Freedman, the new Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer.

After explaining the recent decision of the Union of British Academics to endorse a Palestinian trade union’s call for a boycott of Israeli academic institutions, Father McShane noted his respectful disagreement with this action. He informed the Senate that this summer he had signed two documents, one a petition circulated by Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, another by the American Jewish Committee, so as to make clear that Fordham University stands in solidarity with Israeli academics and those who affirm the principles of academic discourse. He explained that he had not been contacted for his signature prior to the statement in The New York Times expressing opposition to the boycott, but that he signed on to that statement after its appearance.
Admissions. The University received a record number of applications (21,955) for its 2007 freshman class, an increase of 21% over last year’s record number (18,111). Fr. McShane commended the diligent work of the Admission Office. The University accepted only 42% of those who applied. The average SAT for the Class of 2011 has jumped 30 points to 1230 (45 points to 1245 if the scores of HEOP students are not included). The number (but not the percentage, 26.5%) of under-represented minorities increased this year (9% Asian, 5% African-American, and 12% Hispanic). The new class is 48% male, 52% female, overall. In FCLC the ratio of men and women is more balanced than in recent years (38% male, 62% female). In FCRH the ratio is 46% male, 54% female. In CBA the ratio is 65% male, 35% female. CBA’s average SAT score rose 50 points this year to 1227. The geographical distribution of the new class includes 24% from New York City, 46% from New York State (including the City), 13% from New Jersey, 14% from New England, and 6% from Pennsylvania. The largest feeder school is Chaminade (38 students, 10% of their 2007 graduating class). The largest Jesuit contingent comes from St. Joseph’s Prep in Philadelphia (22 students), and there are 15 from Boston College High School. Although FCLC has been leading the pace of growth in recent years, it did not experience the same sort of increase this year. The total number of new freshman is 1774 (955 in FCRH, 396 in CBA, and 423 in FCLC). There are 64 National Merit Scholars in the entering class.

Development. The University narrowly missed its $50 million target for the year – we did raise $49.4 million. The participation-rate rose to 22% (the goal was 22.5%), with contributions from almost 20,000 individual donors. The University will continue its efforts to improve on these numbers in the coming year. The Schools of Business received a $5 million gift for an endowed professorship from Gerry Corrigan, and the estate of the late Prof. Ann Anastasi has endowed a chair in the graduate psychology program as well as scholarships for that program. The University has also recently signed agreements for a chair in theology and is working on others. Fordham University Law School received a chair in international human rights.

Finances. On June 30, the University’s endowment stood at $513 million (a growth of $111 million over the last year). The 19.3% rate of return on the endowment put Fordham in the top quartile. By comparison, Harvard’s return, for instance, was 23%.

The University remains in the silent phase of the Capital Campaign and has thus far received $137 million of our $500 million goal, with over $200 million anticipated by the end of this academic year. Achieving this goal would allow the University to begin the public phase of the campaign during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Announcements. On Dec 6, 2007 the University will celebrate the opening of the Fordham Museum of Classical Antiquities, a gift of the Walsh family. It is being located in what had been the Periodicals Room of the Walsh Family Library.
In the spring 2008 semester the University will open a Hall of Fame for major academic contributions to scholarship and society.

This year is the 125th anniversary of football at Fordham, and there will be many activities to celebrate the football program.

On Monday, Sept. 10, 2007, the University will have a hearing with the New York City Planning Department to consider the environmental impact of the master plan for the Lincoln Center campus. The University has been working hard with local politicians to gain their support for the plan. There is still much opposition to any further development in the area from the neighbors, but the University is working closely with all parties in the hope of moving this plan forward. Once we erect the new building for the Law School we will be able to begin providing more room for other units of the University based at Lincoln Center. The architect that the University has engaged for the Law School (Pei Cobb Freed & Partners) has designed a “stunning” building that will be the University’s face on Lincoln Center.

Father McShane concluded his report by reminding the Senate of the academic convocation that will take place in the Pope Auditorium of Lowenstein on Monday, Sept. 10.

In the discussion that followed, Father McShane responded to various questions about Marymount. He first reviewed the context for the recent decision to put the Tarrytown campus up for sale and to seek a different location in Westchester. He noted that Fordham had not sought the merger; the trustees of Marymount had come to Fordham, under the burden of tremendous operating deficits and a crushing debt of approximately $10 million that Fordham agreed to assume. In return Fordham received the property, the facilities, and a modest endowment of $5-6 million. After signing the memorandum of understanding about the eventual amalgamation, Fordham took over Marymount’s business operations and introduced various cost-cutting measures in a serious effort to make the school work. In the agreement Fordham promised to run the school as long as it was academically and financially feasible. In order to give Marymount College its best chance for survival, the University did not assess Marymount for its operating costs. Further, the University significantly increased its financial aid budget for Marymount students and made $6 million in plant improvements. Academically, the University was able to increase the number of new freshman students at Marymount considerably, but we were never able to bring the retention rate from freshman to sophomore year above 55%. Qualitatively, the average SAT score at Marymount was approximately two hundred points below that of the other Fordham schools. Marymount College thus proved unsustainable, causing the need to close the College. The University’s Tarrytown graduate programs had not been housed at Marymount College with its 500,000 square feet of facilities, but rather at North Hall, which has just 45,000 square feet of space. The Marymount campus is thus much larger than the graduate program space needs, and there seems no good reason to reconcile ourselves to annual multi-million-dollar operating deficits.
for running this campus, a burden that the other schools of the University would have to bear.

The University plans to move its graduate and professional operations from Tarrytown to a more centrally located site in Westchester. The selected site for the facility that we wish to lease is near the intersection of I-87 and I-684, just two miles from downtown White Plains, at 400 Westchester Ave; it is served directly by local bus service. The site is thus easily accessible and has ample parking. Its 65,000 square feet gives our programs room to grow without being excessively large. The University has engaged a real estate agent to sell the property at Tarrytown in the hope of getting something more than the appraised value (a little under $25 million). While some alumni have suggested that the 25-acre site is worth $100 million, the appraisal is much less, due largely to the topography and the classification as “improved land” in a tough zoning situation. Improved land tends to be worth less than unimproved land, for one would have to demolish existing buildings in order to erect new buildings, rather than to grade the land to one’s own liking without obstructions. No specific buyer has been identified as yet, but there have been inquiries. Unfortunately, the current mortgage market is not very favorable. There is hope in the fact that other recent down-turns in the mortgage market (1999 and 2001) saw market-strength return within six months. If the market remains depressed, there may be need to mothball the campus until it proves possible at least to make up for the losses that have been incurred with the Marymount amalgamation. In any case, the University hopes to have the Westchester location ready in about six months.

2. Matters Presented by the President of the Faculty Senate.

President Reidenberg noted that the agenda for the meeting includes a number of new items that are required according the By-Laws. Before turning to these matters, he asked the Senate to remember four members of the Fordham faculty who passed away this year:

- Prof. Abraham Abramovsky who taught at the law school since 1979. A memorial service has tentatively been scheduled for October 29.
- Prof. Ann Moynihan who taught at the law school since 1993. There will be a memorial service at 6pm on October 2, 2007 in McNally Amphitheatre.
- Prof. Walter O’Connor who taught accounting and tax law in the Schools of Business at Fordham since 1987. A memorial service for him is being planned for a date in late September. He had twice been a member of the Faculty Senate.
- Prof. Leon Shelton who taught finance in the Schools of Business at Fordham since 1987. There was a Memorial Mass for him in April 2007.

3. Consideration of the Minutes from the May 7, 2007 meeting of the Senate.

The Senate approved (19:0:2) the Minutes of May 7, 2007 (Vernon/Procidano).
4. Reading of Important Communications.

President Reidenberg reported on three items of correspondence. He dispensed with a formal reading of these materials and offered instead a description of their contents.

(1) *Correspondence about a change in the University’s Pension Plan.* In July the administration announced a unilateral change in the pension plan, so as to give credit for years of service at other institutions to those hired laterally to Fordham beginning July 1, 2007. The effect of this change is to reduce the 5-year waiting period for the university’s higher contribution level to TIAA/CREF. President Reidenberg noted that this change was made without the statutorily required consultation and approval of the Salary & Benefits Committee and and the Senate. With the approval of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, he communicated to the President of the University in writing a strong objection that this change had been made without Senate’s approval as required by the University Statutes. The President referred the matter to Mr. John Lordan, the Senior Vice President for Finance, and President Reidenberg and Mr. Lordan exchanged several communications. The administration has apologized and has promised not to make any such changes in the future without the Senate’s approval. President Reidenberg has asked the Salary & Benefits Committee to investigate the possible impact on any faculty hired within the last five years and not covered by the terms of this change. Senator Berg noted that Mr. Lordan has been asked to construct a financial impact statement, but that statement has not yet been received. President Reidenberg further explained that his letter focused not on the substance of the change but on the failure of the administration to follow the shared governance procedures that are outlined in the Statutes. He noted that he personally thinks that the change is a good change for lateral hiring, but that this benefit does not alter the fact the Senate needs to approve any such change. Because this particular change has already been approved by the Board of Trustees, it went into effect on July 1, 2007. In discussion on this matter, one Senator wondered whether the Trustees are already aware of the violation of statutory procedure described in this portion of the Minutes.

(2) *Correspondence about the Budget Planning Committee.* President Reidenberg then reported on his correspondence with Mr. Lordan about the existence and functioning of the Budget Planning Committee, whose statutory charge is to examine budget priorities. President Reidenberg explained that he had written to the administration about the importance of respecting the statutory mission of this committee and about having the committee meet regularly so as to discharge this mission. President Reidenberg noted that on the basis of various conversations that he has had with the administration, he expects that this committee will be more active than in the recent past. Senator Vernon noted that last year the administration tried to merge this committee into the 33-member University Planning Council. Senator Berg noted that the Budget Planning Committee has been neglected long before Mr. Lordan’s tenure, that at best it had met two or three times a year, and that it had
never been adequately staffed for its mission. He urged that it needs to be re-envisioned so as to clarify how often it should meet and what its objectives should be. Senator Vernon noted that it is in the interest of the faculty to have this committee operating efficiently, and so there needs to be initiative from the Faculty Senate in this matter.

(3) Correspondence about Merit Procedures and about Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Standards and Procedures. President Reidenberg reported that he had recently written a letter to each of the deans, chairs, and heads of academic units at the University, to remind them of the November 1 deadline, for filing each unit’s statements regarding the standards and procedures to be used for merit increases and for handling requests for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. He noted that his letter urged them to consider including within their criteria for merit evidence of faculty initiatives to obtain grant support for their work. He observed that last year Fordham received only $13.7 million in external research grant support. By comparison, some of the institutions featured in the Toward 2016 report had significantly higher results, including Boston College ($33 million), Georgetown University ($45 million, not including the GU Medical School), and NYU ($144 million, not including the NYU Medical School). He noted that the value of grant support is not just in the money received but also in the recognition and prestige for the faculty and university.

5. Introduction of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Stephen Freedman.

President Reidenberg introduced Dr. Freedman with a warm welcome to Fordham and with special praise for his work as a stronger supporter of the faculty that is evident from his first month and a half here.

Dr. Freedman thanked the members of the Senate who had been on the search committee and offered some remarks about the importance of shared governance, the role of faculty in the University’s decision-making, and the centrality of academic concerns in the University’s decisions. He stressed that action is needed as soon as possible on such issues as compensation and budget planning. He praised Senate President Reidenberg’s strong leadership and promised his support and collaboration. He commented on the need for the deans to have a strong role in resource allocation and in decision-making, and he indicated that he will be working on a new structure for ensuring the presence of academic voices in the budget planning process. He stressed that the University’s decisions need to be driven by good academic policies and processes and need to be carried out in fiscally sound ways. He also noted the need for patience, for as changes of this type require time.
6. Matters Presented by Vice President for Student Affairs, Jeffrey L. Gray.

Mr. Jeffrey L. Gray, Vice President for Student Affairs, introduced three members of his staff: Ms. Michelle Burris (Associate Vice President for Student Affairs), Mr. Keith Eldredge (Dean of Students at Lincoln Center), and Mr. Chris Rodgers (Dean of Students at Rose Hill). Their presentation was in two parts: integrated learning communities and emergency procedures.

**Integrated Learning Communities (ILC).** The University’s Strategic Plan calls for developing a number of Integrated Learning Communities on campus. The Office of Student Affairs has investigated the initiatives in this area that are being taken by our peer and aspirant institutions and has conducted a review of Fordham’s current programs and residence halls. It is currently in the process of modifying some of the University’s residence halls (both buildings and programs) in an effort to develop various types of ILC relevant to Fordham’s mission.

The Strategic Plan identifies the need to create and maintain a campus culture that reflects and advances the Roman Catholic tradition of moral and intellectual development with high standards of academic, social, moral, and spiritual excellence. The Office of Student Affairs has accordingly tried to devise these ILCs in such a way as to increase expectations for student participation and to encourage good student advising and guidance within and outside of the classroom. In order to encouraging student responsibility, these ILCs are designed to give students a greater student role in the running of the community. These initiatives are expected to have various benefits for the community, including greater student safety, on the assumption that the more participatory the community, the safer that community will be.

Mr. Eldredge and Mr. Rodgers explained that the University already has residence halls in this spirit, such as Queens Court, but that the present effort is an attempt to devise new approaches for other buildings.(Student Affairs is responsible for the physical and program configuration of the ILCs, Academic Affairs takes the lead in devising the scholarly components.) The new initiative here has deliberately tried to blur some of the traditional boundaries between residential, commuter, and academic spaces, both by the design of the facilities and by the type of programs. Instead of a “silo” approach, in which academic and residence space are strictly separated, the renovations to Tierney Hall include the provision of rooms that will be available for the seminars of the Manresa Program and for other purposes when not in class use.

The learning outcomes anticipated for the ILCs include better academic performance and better retention rates. As is already done at Queens Court, the Manresa Program will feature on-site academic advising and the possibilities for interaction with faculty outside of the classroom. The Office of Student Affairs also envisions that ILCs will help to reduce some student misconduct and the need for counseling interventions. Increased expectations of student participation in their residence halls will help to inculcate a sense of responsibility for
others and also help to counter various pathologies, such as alcohol, drugs, depression, etc. The Office of Student Affairs also expects the ILCs to become a regular destination on campus tours and thus to have value for student recruitment.

Mr. Eldredge and Mr. Rodgers explained that it is still too early to analyze the results in Tierney Hall, but that there are good indications about the value of the Science ILC, begun last year in cooperation with Dr. Donna Heald of the FCRH Dean’s Office. The Science ILC arose out of the Strategic Planning process discussions about pre-med advising and started as a freshman program in Alumni Court South. A preliminary survey indicates that a strong majority of students felt that living in such an Science ILC had helped them, and in particular they reported enhanced cooperation among the residents with their studies in science. The high number of those who expressed an interest in continuing with the program has prompted the establishment of an Science ILC for upperclassmen on a wing of O’Hare. Dr. Heald’s study of the grades that these students achieved in General Chemistry and General Biology (compared to those of non-Science ILC freshmen) have has demonstrated a clear positive value of the Science ILC in terms of academic outcomes. During the summer of 2007 there were extensive renovations to Tierney Hall. It now has the most highly developed technology of any Fordham residence hall. The first Manresa Program seminars are being conducted this fall.

At Lincoln Center, there is an ILC in McMahon Hall that initially consisted of 50% resident students and 50% commuters. This ILC is seminar-based, and survey results from the pilot sections of the seminars have shown that the program did help to build a sense of community. The biggest impact seems to have been on commuter students, but it appears that still more needs to be done in promoting resident and commuter interaction. The ILC program at LC has been expanded to 200 resident students and 100 commuter students as of fall 2007 and uses the fourth and fifth floors of McMahon. In the spring term the same groups of students will be assigned another core course (Close Reading and Critical Writing) together, to promote their continued interaction, and their seminar professor will continue as their faculty advisor. Another innovation has been the redesign of the apartment doors for the Resident Assistants on these floors, to allow them to be kept open to the hallway so as to encourage socialization. These doors are now connected to the fire alarm system and would automatically close in the case of a fire. The fire codes for high rise buildings in Manhattan would otherwise forbid the propping open of apartment doors.

In the ensuing discussion, one Senator asked how the students are selected for these programs. At LC the goal is to have this program in place for the whole class. The 200 students presently participating constitute about half the entering class at LC. Incoming students had been asked to rank the seminar topics that were of interest to them, and assignments were made on the basis of course availability. At RH, the Manresa Program at Tierney Hall was advertised through the brochure on housing sent to students over the summer, as was the Science ILC program, and students were thus able to choose to participate in these programs. There are ten
seminars available for FCRH students in the Manresa Program, with an average class size of 16 students. (CBA is presently studying whether its students should participate in this program. CBA students do participate in the Queens’ Court Residential College Program.)

The professor for each seminar serves as the faculty advisor for the same group of students during the fall and spring semesters, but there is no special seminar in the spring semester. The Manresa seminars are designed and qualify as core courses, but they have specialized titles rather than the general title of the core courses.

One Senator asked if this change in the curriculum had been properly vetted through the statutorily required academic processes such as the Arts & Sciences Council, and it appears that this has not yet happened. Another Senator noted that the faculty participating in the Manresa Program receive a one-course reduction, and that this benefit is very demanding for departmental staffing, especially when one also takes into consideration such other factors as the implementation of the 3/2 teaching load. He explained that at present only 38% of undergraduate courses are now taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty, and this program makes it slightly more difficult yet for other students to have access to tenured/tenure-track faculty. Dr. Freedman noted that he has raised the question with Dean Brennan O’Donnell, for the clear benefits of this program need to be considered in relation to the implications that it has for departmental hiring.

Dean Gray explained that Residence Life has been in transition from having graduate students serve as Resident Directors (RD) to a position of having half the RDs as full-time employees of Student Life.

A number of Senators noted the importance of having more comprehensive comparative data for the thorough evaluation of these programs. Mr. Rodgers explained that the Office of Student Life is regularly collecting such data and has plans to continue data collection so as to ensure proper program assessment.

Emergency Response. Ms. Burris then explained the latest developments in the University’s emergency management plan. Such a plan has long been in place at Fordham, but it has recently been reconsidered and revised, especially in light of the tragic events at Virginia Tech. She noted that it is impossible to foresee every possible contingency, but that the University has tried to devise a highly adaptable program. The full Emergency Manage Plan is available on the web at www.fordham.edu/campus_resources/safety_security.

Ms. Burris highlighted some features of this plan. There is an Emergency Management Team for each campus, with designated staff that have regular meetings and exercises. On each campus there is an Emergency Operations Center (in the Security Office at RH, in McMahon Hall at LC, and in Facilities at Marymount). The plan uses a system of five Emergency Levels to handle: (1) unusual events, e.g., an accident, a bias incident; (2) a more serious incident, e.g., demonstrations, small fires, an elevator accident; (3) incidents that involve individual
harm, e.g., violent felonies, missing persons, hostages, deaths, suicides, rapes; (4) situations that have a serious impact on a sizable portion of the community, e.g., an extended power outage, a riot, severe weather, confirmed bomb; and (5) catastrophic events that affect the campus and the surrounding community, e.g., earthquake, terrorism, structural collapse, etc. On each campus there are always at least two senior staff members available: the Residence Director on duty and the Security Supervisor; they are prepared to manage an emergency even if other officials are unable to reach campus quickly.

There is a comprehensive and coordinated Emergency Response Communication plan, so as to ensure a single voice for all communication during an emergency. The methods of communication include email, the University website, text messages, the Fordham TV channel, flyers, satellite inter-campus communication, radios, etc. Additional vehicles will be considered and added as they become needed and available.

In terms of on-campus safety, a recent survey (Educational Benchmark Inventory) indicates that our students do feel relatively safe on our campuses. Mr. John Carroll and the Office of Security does a wonderful job in supervising access to our campuses, and further innovations are being considered.

Student Affairs also reported on the search and seizure procedures that are in place at the university. Security officers and members of the Residential Life staff make regular rounds. There are scheduled room inspections, and there can be unannounced “for cause” individual room inspections. In the latter case, there is a special process that must be followed. It includes the need for the search to be authorized by Mr. Carroll and by Dr. Jeff Gray or Ms. Burris.

For mental health safety, there is a special committee charged with coordinating the efforts of all pertinent staff members, so as to break through the “silo mentality” that might more easily permit a troubled student to slip through without obtaining needed help. Fordham encourages appropriate levels of communication with parents, and the University understands itself to have a more accurate sense of the law in this area than that of some other institutions that are more reserved in this regard. Fordham tries to distinguish between the types of problems that should involve parental contact and those that are better handled without such contact. There is special training for staff and faculty on suicide and mental health. (See item #7 below for further discussion of a brochure for faculty involvement in reporting mental health concerns.)

In the ensuing discussion a number of Senators raised questions about the need for further outreach to graduate and professional students on mental health issues, and the need for special consideration in the case of international students, where parents often live at great distances from the University. President Reidenberg briefly described the program in place at the Law School as an example of outreach at the graduate level. There was also discussion about what faculty should know and should do in the event of an emergency or disaster.
text messaging system may be of help, but since cell phones will presumably be off during many classes, the Emergency Plan also depends on the work of security personnel on campus for spreading the proper information (e.g., about a lockdown or an evacuation, depending on the circumstances).

The Senate then thanked Dr. Gray and his staff for their presentations with a round of applause.


Prof. Elizabeth Stone, Chair of the Faculty Senate’s Student Life Committee, briefly described the work of this committee and its recent work on mental health issues. The Committee has been preparing a brochure in cooperation with Student Affairs that sets out guidelines for proper faculty response to mental health concerns. In particular, the Committee was concerned about the possible reluctance of faculty to be too pro-active, especially out of fear of litigation. After consultation with the Office of Legal Counsel, the Committee designed a brochure with the assistance of Mr. Chris Rodgers entitled “Cura Personalis: Responding to Mental Health Emergencies: A Guide for Faculty.” On behalf of the Committee, Prof. Stone then distributed the brochure to the Senate.

In the discussion that followed, a number of Senators praised the design of this brochure, especially for its treatment of suicide emergencies. There was general sentiment about the need either to prepare other guides for other types of mental health emergencies or to expand the present brochure. Prof. Stone explained the emergency training that individuals who work in the offices mentioned in the brochure have received. A question was raised about whether individuals who work in the offices of the graduate and professional schools have received similar training for emergency response.

The Senate then approved (20:0:0) the following resolution (Koterski/Schwalbenberg): When the brochure is ready, the Senate President should facilitate the distribution of the brochure to the faculty.

8. Old and New Business and Announcements.

Faculty Senate Committees. President Reidenberg presented to the Senate an updated list of Faculty Senate Committees for 2007-2008 due to personnel changes during the summer. He noted one addition to the printed list: Prof. Leonard Nissim continues to be a member of the Budget Planning Committee. The Senate gave its consent to the committee appointments by consensus.
Domestic Partners. Senator Nissim asked about the status of the petition letter circulated last year. The Senate Office will determine the final number of signatures on this petition. The petition itself has not yet been sent to Governor Spitzer. President Reidenberg is preparing a cover letter.

Academic Freedom. Senator Piotrkowski asked about the status of the resolution the Senate passed two years ago on academic freedom and artistic presentations. President Reidenberg agreed to follow up on this topic.

Elections for the Enlarged Salary and Benefits Committee. President Reidenberg reported that he will be soliciting nominations for the ten new members needed to complete the expanded Salary & Benefits Committee. He expects to receive nominations and conduct the election during the fall 2007 semester. He has asked Senator Bruce Berg, the chair of this committee, to have the present Salary & Benefits Committee devise an appropriate set of By-Laws, so that the enlarged committee will be able to do its work effectively.

Law School Vacancy. Senator Mike Martin of the Law School has temporarily taken on an administrative position. It is not yet clear how long he will serve in that capacity, and so there may be need to have an election at the Law School if he needs to resign from the Senate.

Announcements by the Senate President.

(1) There will be a Faculty Convocation at noon on Monday, September 10, 2007 in Pope Auditorium of Lowenstein Hall on the Lincoln Center Campus.

(2) The website for the Senate is now operating at <http://www.fordham.edu/senate>. It contains the Minutes from all of last year’s Senate meetings as well as an updated set of the University Statutes and a directory of Senators with their contact information. In the near future the list of Faculty Senate Committees will be posted, as well as the materials received from Deans and Chairs about Standards and Procedures for Merit and for Re-Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Please direct any comments to President Reidenberg at <senate@fordham.edu>.

(3) President Reidenberg urged Senators to take advantage of the capability to have their own faculty webpage on the server <http://faculty.fordham.edu/> and to set up a link to the directory of Senators on the Senate’s webpage.

(4) Ombudsman Issues. Please inform President Reidenberg about any glitches connected with the opening of the new academic year, so that they can be appropriately resolved. There were some reports, for instance, about the lack of a classroom assignment for several courses.
on opening day. One Senator raised a question about the lack of offices for some faculty members.

(5) The Senate has a new corporate email account (senate@fordham.edu) that will hereafter be used for official communications from the Senate.

The Senate adjourned at 3:40pm on a motion proposed by Senator Mannion.

Minutes submitted by Joseph W. Koterski, S.J., Secretary of the Faculty Senate.
Meeting: 12:45 p.m. in Walsh Library, O’Hare Special Collections Room, Rose Hill Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer
John Carroll, Director of University Security Services
Fr. Paul McNelis, Robert Bendheim, Professor in Economics and Financial Policy, Schools of Business

Excused: Senators Bruce Berg, Joseph Koterski, S.J., Anne Mannion, Michael M. Martin, Berish Rubin, and Henry Schwalbenberg

Dr. Joel Reidenberg, the President of the Faculty Senate, called the Senate to order at 12:55 p.m. Senator Mark Massa, S.J., delivered the invocation.

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the September 7, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate

The Senate approved (16:0:2) the Minutes of September 7, 2007 (Vernon/Jackson).

2. Matters presented by the President of the Faculty Senate

Senate President Reidenberg announced that the LDA (legally domiciled adult) petition had been sent with 243 signatures to the governor and the president of NY State Senate and Speaker of the NY State Assembly.

President Reidenberg reminded Senators that the departmental/unit/school filing date for current merit and personnel standards and procedures is November 1.

President Reidenberg reported on requests from Political Science and Business for short extensions in the filing deadline to complete the respective unit votes on merit and personnel standards.
Lastly, Senate President Reidenberg reported on requests from the UTRC and the Hearing Committee in connection with personnel records. He indicated that a resolution would address this request under New Business.

3. Matters Presented by Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer

Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, presented his observations on the issues facing Fordham, his agenda for the year, and his thoughts on a broader vision. He stressed that his primary responsibility is clear: to focus on the central role of Academic Affairs in university planning, a role which has slipped over the years and needs to be restored, in particular by strengthening the perceptions of that role among faculty and faculty administrators. Dr. Freedman plans to support the faculty and reinforce its central position by emphasizing the faculty’s voice and mission. A first concern in this agenda is budget planning, which he wants to alter. He reported that planning should begin with the deans, so that Academic Affairs has a stronger role in shaping priorities, and that planning should reinforce links between the Strategic Plan and the budget in order to address the most important issues. This will mean changing the preparation of the budget (B-Prep). In the past, the financial administrators would ask for budgets from all of the university’s offices, academic and otherwise, which would then be discussed and reconciled in April. The first change will be to ensure that academic concerns shape the setting of priorities, which has not always been the case because of gaps in decanal coordination and cooperation. The second change is to ensure that academic affairs has an equivalent or more-than-equivalent say in final decisions. New initiatives will, for instance, require judgments with respect to priorities and their relation to other areas in academic affairs, even if it leads to paring back of some budget items.

Strengthening the research and scholarship of the faculty is a priority. The University now has a Chief Research Officer, Dean Nancy Busch, and the entire area needs a renewed emphasis, including a greater emphasis on external research support. Dr. Freedman noted that the research infrastructure needs improvement, and needs to be a collective goal of the administration, although not at the expense of teaching.

On setting priorities, the Senior Vice President noted that there were two general approaches, one concentrating on a range of administrative management issues, the other addressing broader goals, and he would like feedback from faculty on the priorities for his time. Among the administrative management issues, he commented on the need to consider the organization of the Academic Affairs office to ensure that it was responsive and accurate on such things as contracts, and that the paper flow was well managed. It would be important to integrate Institutional Research into the process. He is aware of problems such as coordination between the office of the SVPAA and Human Resources. On the other hand, while involvement in such matters is important, the Vice President asked whether the faculty thought these matters should come before the larger policy issues. He noted, for instance, his interest in supporting curricular reform, and the special attention being given to implementing 3-2. He also noted that the
University’s presence in Westchester needs thought and a broader consideration, while mission, ministry and student affairs need coordination. At the same time, strategic planning, especially in Arts and Sciences, needs more consideration.

In the broadest sense, the Senior Vice President presented his goals as the enhancement of academic quality through planning, mission and support of the faculty in concrete ways. Some areas of support are already good, but others need enhancement. His long-term goals will include the professional schools, although the Arts and Sciences will be his primary focus. In that regard, it will be important to restore a sense of purpose to Arts and Sciences, with more recognition of the importance of its work and concrete measures to validate them. With regard to graduate education, he proposed to set resources more closely in tune with the goals, and to apply them more effectively. In general, across the board he would be supporting the university’s interdisciplinary approaches and its global connections, and would emphasize responsiveness to faculty, whether junior or senior.

The Senior Vice President stressed that he would view his success in terms of how well trust, goodwill and respect increase, all partly a matter of tone, regard for others and bringing out the best in people.

Afterwards, Senate President Reidenberg thanked the Senior Vice President for his refreshing vision of his role and the collaborative relationship that they have established. Senators commented on the importance of re-visiting the Strategic Plan on a regular basis. Others noted the faculty skepticism commonly held about the process by which the Strategic Plan was created and suggested considering downplaying the plan itself. Senators stressed the faculty’s interest in Dr. Freedman’s success and thought he had a daunting list of goals. Senators welcomed the Senior Vice President’s commitment to being responsive and welcomed the tone he is setting. The Senior Vice President commented that he is concerned that there are some obstacles to the implementation of his goals, but that he was grateful for the considerable support and openness he had already encountered during his transition to Fordham. A Senator commented that questions of trust arise often from a lack of clarity, and encouraged transparency, especially between deans and the faculty. The Senior Vice President responded that while he favored transparency, not every administrator will see early stages in planning as the appropriate point for airing differences, and deans’ personal styles need also to be respected so long as the faculty remains well served. Another Senator commented on the lack of contact between parallel initiatives and areas in various schools, and encouraged the Senior Vice President to develop means of sharing information internally. The question of research support was raised and the Senior Vice President remarked that research and teaching are mutually supportive, especially if the university were to concentrate on areas such as its mission to others, or matters of social justice, that align with teaching interests and research and funding research grant opportunities.
4. Matters presented by John Carroll, Director of University Security Services

Mr. Carroll updated the Senate on concerns raised at a previous meeting regarding emergency measures. He described in particular the system by which faculty, students and staff will be alerted in case of emergency. The system includes nine avenues of contact, depending on the emergency, from text and voice messages to all members of the community, public address announcements, interruptions in campus cable services, and email. It depends, however, on current contact information. All faculty are encouraged to keep their current contact information up-to-date with Human Resources. Emergency management will include ensuring prompt and accurate information from local or general sources. The team coordinating the management includes Dr. Ron Jacobson from Academic Affairs. Although responses will depend on the kind of emergency and must take account of Fordham’s fluid community and varying schedules, faculty need to be aware of their duties, including keeping a roster of students in class so that the faculty can identify who was in their class, and where they were during the event.

Senators asked Mr. Carroll to re-send the summary of procedures, originally sent in 2005, to faculty, and encouraged him to include the various flat-screen monitors on campus among the avenues for alerts. In addition, including an alert on the main Fordham webpage http://www.fordham.edu was recommended. Mr. Carroll replied that the present page did not permit a full alert announcement, but he would follow up on a news message that could be inserted on the webpage. One Senator asked whether the entire system would be tested in a drill. Mr. Carroll described the informative table-top drill that has been conducted, and the plans to move to a general drill.

5. Matters presented by Fr. Paul McNelis, Robert Bendheim Professor in Economics and Financial Policy, Schools of Business, on student evaluations

Senate President Reidenberg described an issue over the posting of student evaluations on a school’s Internet website that was accessible to the general public. Though the evaluations were removed from the school’s website, the matter raised broader questions for the faculty related to the use and dissemination of student evaluations. President Reidenberg then introduced Fr. McNelis, the Robert Bendheim Professor in Economics and Financial Policy, Schools of Business, who has extensively analyzed student evaluations. Fr. McNelis told the Senate that he became interested in examining student evaluation data because he was concerned that little account seemed to be taken of “fixed effects” and their impact on the data. He emphasized the need to place student evaluations in the proper context. Fr. McNelis then described his study of Georgetown student evaluations conducted with Dr. Martin Evans. The funded research project compared Georgetown course evaluations with other teaching data, including grade distributions from the previous semesters. Their study was particularly interested in assessing the impact of grade inflation on evaluations. Their results showed that class size, average grades, evaluation response rates, and course difficulty level were significant predictors of the evaluation scores, and that these factors can explain the evaluation scores just as readily as the teaching or instructor.
In the discussion that followed, Senators pointed out that the numbers were rarely themselves
determinative in personnel decisions. Senators also addressed the case of the Business school
that uses evaluation instruments designed by students and subsequently used by the faculty. One
Senator noted that these were only the starting point for a narrative on an individual’s teaching.
Moreover, it was not clear from the summary of Fr. McNelis’s study whether grade inflation was
a result of administering evaluations, or whether good teaching (= high evaluations) could lead to
effective learning (= higher grades); the data could support either hypothesis. In general, as one
Senator noted, most would accept that extreme evaluations, even in Fr. McNelis’s study, could
indicate situations where attention was needed, but for most faculty in the mid range, the
evaluations were not particularly significant.

In the Arts & Sciences, Senators noted that SEEQ was the evaluation mandated for Arts and
Science faculty, and was confidential, although redacted versions were on file in the library for
student use. The comments on the evaluations could often be useful in assessing them. A
Senator noted that there was some debate on the relation of evaluations to grade inflation; at
Fordham, a study under Dean Jeff Von Arx had found a strong correlation between grades and
evaluations. Although Senators asked whether Fr. McNelis’s study should be used to guide the
use of evaluations, others noted that there is a very substantial literature in the field, and
considerable debate.

On the central issue of how the results of student evaluations should be disseminated, there was
some debate about who owned the results. In the Business school, for instance, they were
originally a student-designed and administered form that the Business school had adopted tacitly
as its own. In the specific case that prompted the presentation, the problem was that the results
were made available to the general public via the web. Although it was noted that the Business
school should develop its own evaluations if they intended to use them for personnel decisions,
the discussion ended noting that a resolution would be presented on the issue under New
Business (below).

6. Salary & Benefits Committee Report

Senate President Reidenberg reported that the consultants preparing the long-awaited
compensation study had been unsuccessful in obtaining compensation data from comparable
institutions. When the Finance office asked if data from another set of institutions would be
useful, Salary and Benefits indicated that data from non-comparable institutions would not be
meaningful for Fordham and asked that the consultants at least analyze the more readily
available data on benefits programs at the comparable universities. The next meeting with the
consultants would occur in approximately ten days in order to see if the study can be re-framed
usefully.

Senators were disappointed and noted that some data on benefits was indeed available, and
should be gathered by Salary and Benefits if the consultants were unable to proceed.
Senator Nissim then presented a report and motion from Salary and Benefits on a placeholder for budget planning in connection with next year’s compensation negotiations, i.e., the percentage increase in faculty compensation that will be used in the preliminary university budget for next year (see Appendix I). Senator Nissim explained that once the increase is set in the preliminary budget, it is difficult to achieve a higher settlement amount in the final budget, so accurate predictions are important. He reported that last year, for instance, Salary and Benefits, using Senator Schwalbenberg’s estimates, asked for a 4.5% placeholder simply to keep up with predicted inflation and continue merit increases. The Senior VP Finance, however, assigned a placeholder of 3%, which turned out to be about 1% low. This year, Salary and Benefits recommends a placeholder of 4.5% to accommodate both an inflation increment and merit within the AAUP 80th Percentile agreement.

In the discussion of the motion that followed, the accuracy of the Salary and Benefit’s projections in the past, the need to consider extraordinary measures to restore losses due to inflation, and the 2.75% half-year inflation already experienced in the region were all noted in support of the resolution. Senators asked whether the figure should be higher in order to catch up with inflation over the last few years, which had outpaced the 80-percentile benchmark usually used in these calculations. Others noted that last year’s reduced sum for merit ($800 instead of the expected $1200) was a result of the administration’s resistance to a realistic placeholder and showed a mismatch between the university’s goal of preeminence and its support of the goal.

The Senate approved (12:2:3) the following motion (Nissim/Vernon):

In order to assure that the University budget can meet the compensation commitment to the faculty, the Senate strongly recommends that the budget for the 2008/09 academic year include at least a 4.5% increase in faculty compensation (salary and benefits) so that the compensation pool can allow the possibility of giving an across-the-board increase equal to inflation without the need to reduce the merit award.

7. Old Business: Mental Health Emergency Brochure

Senate President Reidenberg updated the Senate on the Mental Health Brochure. He informed the Senate that the Committee on Student Life met following the September Senate discussion of the brochure. In response to the Senate’s comments, the Committee working with Student Affairs plans to prepare three additional brochures on the following topics: (a) safety crises; (b) emotional crises; (c) drug and alcohol crises. The consensus of the Senate was that these topics would be sufficient. Senate President Reidenberg also indicated that versions would be tailored for the graduate and professional schools. With respect to the existing Mental Health Brochure on suicide, Senate President Reidenberg said that he would facilitate its distribution in the present form to the FCRH, FCLC and CBA faculty. Senators noted that for students in graduate schools, some of the information about contacts may not be relevant, and the support network for them needs to be clarified. Once this is done, this brochure will be sent to the remaining
schools. President Reidenberg indicated that work on the three additional brochures will be done by the end of this semester.

8. New Business

Senator Chase noted that faculty had complained about the loss of the periodical room in the Walsh Library. Senate President Reidenberg informed the Senate that the Library Committee raised this issue at its first meeting this year.

Student Evaluations In light of the earlier discussion of student evaluations, a motion was presented to keep them confidential as is the case for any other material used in personnel decisions. It was noted that faculty in Arts and Science had already approved through the Arts and Science Council the publication of redacted forms in the library, and had done so in response to student action at Lincoln Center. At the time, students threatened to boycott the SEEQ evaluations and use their own if the results of the former were not made available. After clarification that only deliberations and some evidence presented to personnel committees were confidential (not, for instance, publications), senators proposed that any dissemination require faculty approval.

The Senate approved (16:1:2) the following motion (Massa/Balestra):

In light of the increasing accessibility of student course and faculty evaluations, the Senate recommends to the colleges, schools and departments of the University that evaluations used for faculty personnel decisions should proceed from faculty approved instruments, and the results of such evaluations may not be used or released for non-personnel purposes without the consultation and consent of the faculty.

Record-Keeping for Personnel Matters In light of difficulties that the Senate and its Committees have encountered related to record-keeping for personnel matters, Senators indicated the need for some revisions to the process related to transmitting information to the Senate and the Committees. In particular, the UTRC recently received 3 day notice for the need to convene a meeting to address a personnel matter and the Hearing Committee has often had to request additional documentation from personnel files for its deliberations.

The Senate approved (19:0:0) the following motion (Bray/Massa):

The Senate recommends that the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Deans of each School of the University, provide to the Senate office each year by March 15th a list of all the foreseeable personnel processes that will require review by such Senate Committees as UTRC and TRAC. In addition, the SVPAA should communicate to the Senate a timely notice about any additional such personnel processes that arise after the date of the annual report. Further, the Senate
requests that the Office of the SVPAA develop a thorough checklist of materials that need to be included in every such personnel file, so that the Senate committees can be assured of having a complete dossier for their review.

Senator Flicker asked if there should be a motion to consider the publication of evaluations as a faculty development issue.

Senator Keller reported that faculty had asked whether smoking immediately in front of many building entrances could be controlled and prohibited. President Reidenberg noted that there may already be city ordinances prohibiting the practice, and he would follow up on their enforcement with the Vice President for Facilities.

9. Announcements

President Reidenberg announced that nomination ballots were being sent for the new positions on the Salary & Benefits Committee.

President Reidenberg also announced that the referendum to amend the Senate Constitution and By-Laws would begin in November. Since a referendum requires the affirmative vote of 50% of the eligible faculty, he asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to vote.

At the September meeting of the Senate, a question had been asked about the implementation of the Senate recommendation on academic freedom (April 2005). The recommendation called for a designee from the Committee on Student Life and designees from the Office of Student Affairs to review plans for campus productions when issues of academic freedom may arise. President Reidenberg informed the Senate that the Committee designated its chair, Senator Procidano, and Student Affairs designated Deans Christopher Rodgers and Keith Eldredge to serve in these roles.

Senator Vernon announced that the Senate’s Faculty Life Committee would be presenting its report at the November meeting.

At 3:44 the Meeting adjourned (motion by Flicker).
For the 2008 – 09 academic year I propose that the University increase faculty compensation by 4.5%.

Last year the increase in total compensation for faculty at the 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile among category I institutions increased significantly, probably in response to higher inflation rates among other factors. While there may be some moderation in the inflation rate this year, my expectation is that faculty compensation will increase at a similar level as last year to make up for earlier years when the increase in compensation fell behind inflation.

If inflation hits last year’s high of 3.8%, an increase in Fordham compensation of 4.5% will allow the possibility of giving an across the board increase equal to inflation without the need to reduce the merit award. If inflation moderates to a level of 3%, then a 4% increase would cover both a cost of living increase and a full merit award. If, however, the increase in Fordham compensation for next year is only 3.5% or less, then it is highly unlikely that we will be able to provide both a cost of living increase and a full merit award.

In early January 2008 we will be able to calculate the annual inflation rate for 2006-2007. And sometime during April to June of 2008 we should be able to calculate the percentage increase in total compensation for 2007-2008 for the 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile, category I institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL COMPENSATION INCREASE (80\textsuperscript{th} percentile, Category I Institutions)</th>
<th>INFLATION (All Urban Consumer, New York Metropolitan Statistical Area, average calendar year to calendar year percent change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.7% (half year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Call to Order.

Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order at 12:48pm.

2. Invocation.

Father Joseph Koterski, S.J., offered an opening prayer.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Previous Senate Meeting.

The Senate approved (14:0:4) a motion to approve the minutes from the October 19, 2007 meeting of the Senate, as corrected (Vernon/Gyug).

4. Matters presented by the President of the University, Father Joseph McShane, S.J.

The President of the University, Father Joseph McShane, S.J., presented three items to the Senate: (a) the capital campaign, (b) the admissions picture, and (c) the actions of the Board of Trustees at its most recent meeting.
(a) Capital Campaign. The University’s current capital campaign is still in its quiet phase. The University has already raised about $155 million in this campaign and hopes to pass the $200 million mark before end of June 2008. The University expects to enter the public phase of the campaign during the following year after raising at least half of the official campaign goal. The Development Office has made requests for a number of eight-figure gifts and thus far none of these requests has been turned down.

(b) Admissions. The early action cycle for the class that will enter in fall 2008 is presently running 15% ahead of last year. The pool of students who apply for early action tends to be made up of two types of individuals: (1) the high achiever who wants to make sure of a reserved place, and (2) the student who has been told by the guidance counselor that “it can’t hurt to apply early and often.” The number of individuals applying for early action at FCRH is up substantially; the number for CBA is also up but not as much as it was last year; the number for FCLC is up only 2%. The quality for all three schools is up in terms of SAT and ACT scores.

In regard to the regular applicant pool, the University is running ahead of last year’s numbers, but it is still too early to predict the final outcome. By the third week of January one can get a better sense of this, once guidance counselors have finished writing their letters of recommendation. The open houses held this year had large attendance on both campuses. Because there were so many high school seniors who have been coming to these events, the University held a second open house this year for juniors. In order to lessen the demands on the time of faculty for assistance at events of this type, the Admission Office did not ask as many faculty to participate at the event for juniors. Attendance at the events for juniors was good but not as large as at those for seniors. Understandably, neither the students themselves nor their parents seemed as urgent about making college decisions.

(c) Actions of the Board of Trustees. At its first meeting this fall, the Board of Trustees approved capital projects on both campuses:

(1) As part of the build-out at Lincoln Center, the Trustees approved a new building for the Law School, including 265,000 square feet of space for instructional use, and on the upper floors a residence hall with 120,000 square feet that will be used for about 400 FCLC students. The residence hall for law students will remain McMahon Hall, with its apartment style arrangement. The residence hall to be built above the Law School will feature double-loaded corridors, designed to promote better community-building among freshmen and sophomore students, for whom the apartment-style housing typical of McMahon is not as suitable. The University hopes to obtain approval from the city for this building project in January, at which time a seven-month timeline leading up to the start of the actual construction process will begin.

(2) For Rose Hill, the Trustees approved the construction of a 450-bed residence hall for juniors and seniors, to be located near the railroad tracks behind Martyrs Court. This location will allow the University to retain as much green space as possible on the campus.

Father McShane noted that these projects are very expensive. The building costs at Lincoln Center are presently estimated at $265 million and at $85 million for Rose Hill. The financing for the Rose Hill project will make use of a bond to be issued by the New York State Dormitory Authority, while the financing at Lincoln Center will involve a similar bond and the sale of property and other fund-raising. Constructions costs tend to go up at least 12% annually.
Father McShane observed that the construction of a new building for the Law School will provide a benefit not only for the Law School but for everyone, since other units of the University based at Lincoln Center will be able to move into the space that will be vacated by the Law School. In particular, the Law School’s present building will provide many faculty offices for FCLC faculty.

The dormitory construction at Rose Hill should be completed by 2010 and this will make additional office space available on that campus as well, for the new building will permit the return of Hughes Hall to academic purposes, presumably by 2011-2012. Because of the uncertainty associated with all construction projects in New York, the administration is allowing for 2010-2011 as a transitional year for the necessary reconfiguration of Hughes Hall.

Besides allowing for the vagaries of the construction process, there is also need to be mindful of local politics. At the moment the University is caught in the middle of a number of questions that have arisen about labor unions. Local 32BJ of the Service Employees International Union has raised concerns about the firm that the University uses for its security personnel, Summit Security Services. The guards who work at Fordham for Summit Security are represented by Allied International Union, but 32BJ wants to challenge that arrangement. A number of prominent local politicians have weighed in and while the dispute is between the two unions, the University has recently negotiated with Summit Security to obtain a hospitalization package for its workers. A number of the guards here at Fordham have already expressed their appreciation for this improvement, but the issue is not yet settled, for 32BJ is looking for an industry-wide settlement and not just for a local solution of the issue. The rules of the National Labor Relations Board require that these issues be resolved by collective bargaining through the leadership of these unions, and there is need for great care in any public comments on these issues. The University is continuing negotiations to resolve this issue.

Father McShane concluded his presentation by thanking the Senators who were involved in preparing a report from the Core Curriculum Revision Committee, including a timeline for bringing the committee’s proposal to a faculty vote during the present academic year. He noted that there are considerable funds available from the Mellon Grant that the University holds for help with curriculum development projects. He departed from the Senate meeting with wishes to all for a Happy Thanksgiving.

5. Reading of Important Communications.

Senate President Reidenberg informed the Senate about three matters of importance: (a) the budget placeholder for faculty salary increases, (b) the submission of standards and procedures for merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and (c) the University Statutes.

(a) Thanks to the efforts of Father McShane, Mr. John Lordan (Senior Vice President for Finance), and Dr. Stephen Freedman (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs), the administration has agreed to use 4.5% as the placeholder for compensation increases in the budget planning process. President Reidenberg noted that this decision marks a major change from recent practice and that it will have a significant impact in the way that negotiations will
take place in the spring. He also noted that there remains in place for 2008-2009 the long-standing agreement between the Senate and the Administration that the 80th AAUP percentile is to be regarded as the benchmark for faculty salaries at all levels.

(b) With regard to the requirement that all academic units at the University annually submit to the Senate office a statement of their standards and procedures with regard to Merit, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion by November 1, President Reidenberg announced that almost all units have now complied. Only two departments remain outstanding with regard to their statements on re-appointment, tenure, and promotion; three or four still need to submit their statements regarding merit criteria and procedures.

President Reidenberg reported that the filings would be reviewed to identify whether all the components that are supposed to be present in these statements are included. President Reidenberg noted that the Senate Committees such as TRAC, UTRC and the Hearing Committee had regularly expressed concern about missing information. There was discussion about whether it is the Senate’s place to review these documents and President Reidenberg agreed to check the Minutes of the Senate in which it was agreed to require the submission of these documents.

(c) There was a transcription error in the last printed version of the University Statutes within the amendments made to the section on clinical staff. The error was only discovered when an academic unit that hires clinicals raised a question. The changes in the Statutes that the Trustees approved at the recommendation of the Senate eliminated the reappointment for clinical staff, but the final two sections that were supposed to have been deleted (4-11.03 and 4-11.04) were left in the printed version by a clerical error. They have now been removed.

6. Matters presented by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Stephen Freedman

Dr. Freedman thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak at length during the previous meeting of the Senate and then began his remarks.

(a) Research at the University. In consultation with Dean Nancy Busch, who will be addressing the December meeting of the Senate, Dr. Freedman has been reviewing the University’s organization for supporting research, with restructuring in mind. In particular, he noted the following items: (1) there has already been some restructuring of the Institutional Review Board, so that it will be possible to provide greater efficiency and a more timely responses to faculty submissions; (2) there have been about 50 faculty fellowship requests each year; this year there is a somewhat higher number than usual which is a positive development. Dr. Freedman noted that there are not as many requests from the professional schools as from Arts & Sciences faculty; (3) there is need for further work in restructuring the Office of Sponsored Programs, so as better to support faculty in efforts to secure grants and to process the grants received. The University has hired a new grant officer in October and plans to make a second hire during November 2007. Dr. Freedman stressed the need to work as vigorously as possible in enhancing the research culture at Fordham and to consider how we can best improve our internal operations.
in order to provide more effective support of faculty. He briefly discussed some ideas for providing incentives to our grant officers that would build into our system a way to reward them for successful work with faculty in obtaining grants.

In the ensuing discussion, a number of Senators commented on the importance of increasing the research expense grants for faculty and to clarify the options available to faculty for support for the purchase of computer software. There was also some discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of centralizing the offices and the processes responsible for research support, as well as the merits of the decentralized approach favored by some of the professional schools. Dr. Freedman also noted that there had been a hope to move the Office of Research back onto campus, but that further planning is required for this move.

At the conclusion of Dr. Freedman’s report, President Reidenberg welcomed him to stay for the remainder of the meeting, and Dr. Freedman agreed to do so while deferring to President Reidenberg should there be any need to excuse himself.

7. Committee Reports.

A. Budget Planning Committee. President Reidenberg noted that the Committee met in early November and will meet again this semester. The first meeting examined the FY07 financial statement and identified policy issues to be addressed in future meetings. The next meeting will focus on the processes and formulas used for budget allocations.

B. Salary & Benefits. Senator Bruce Berg reported that a group of faculty and administrators had met with the compensation consultants that the University had hired to try and salvage some benefit from this consultation given their inability to obtain the desired data from our aspirant universities. The current plan is for the firm to seek data from a number of prominent public universities in major metropolitan areas, in the hope that it will prove easier to get data that could be used as a benchmark for our purposes. The firm also plans to use the data from CUPA, a group that already collects disaggregated salary data. Senator Berg noted that there is a problem with this approach, for the data would come largely from institutions that are not in our aspirant group. The firm also plans to seek data from institutions such as Georgetown, Boston College, New York University, and so on, by searching public documents such as institutional webpages for information on non-salary benefits. In discussion, various Senators urged that the committee try to concentrate on prominently ranked schools, such as Michigan, Virginia, Minnesota, Berkeley, SUNY Stony Brook, Suny Buffalo, and so on.

C. Faculty Life Committee. Senator Anne Mannion briefly reported on the four-year history of this committee and noted that the general problem of faculty retention was recapitulated in the changing make-up of the committee, for a number of the members of the committee left Fordham for employment elsewhere during these four years. She then presented a twenty-page executive summary of the findings from the questionnaire distributed to the faculty last spring. Senator Mannion offered a set of resolutions to the Senate (see attached Appendix I). The statistical analysis of this material will be made available at a later date.
Senator Mannion explained that the committee has communicated its findings to other Senate committees, as appropriate and is now working on other items. She will invite Prof. Jim Wilson, who prepared the executive summary, to attend the Senate’s January meeting. President Reidenberg expressed the gratitude of the Senate for all of the committee’s work thus far.

In the ensuing discussion, several Senators commented on the portion of the executive summary that includes material on unprofessional behavior (e.g., bias, favoritism, prejudice, intolerance and/or harassment). Senator Mannion noted that the committee has been trying to explore further the nature of this problem and the adequacy of resources for addressing it. The Senate then approved (22:0:0) the following motion (Vernon/Procidano):

**The Faculty Senate accepts the first Faculty Life Committee Report and its recommendations of November 13, 2007. Furthermore, the Senate directs the Executive Committee to communicate the recommendations to the appropriate administrator(s) and Senate Committees for development of an action plan (including implementation) to be sent to the Senate by April 2008.**

[cop[y of the Report and Recommendations attached as Appendix I]

Senator Mannion then noted that the Faculty Life Committee plans to survey the faculty in the future on a three-year cycle.

8. **Old Business.**

President Reidenberg received the consent of the Senate that the recommendation to the President of a slate for the nominating committee for appointments to the rank of Distinguished Professor will consist of those who currently hold that rank.

9. **Election for Salary & Benefits Committee.**

President Reidenberg presented the slate of nominees for election to the Salary and Benefits Committee and explained the procedure used to obtain the list. After the discussion of the list, the Senate voted. The results are as follows:

**FORDHAM COLLEGE AT ROSE HILL - TENURED FACULTY**

- Mark Caldwell
- Christine Hinze
- Charles Lewis

The Senate approved (21:0:0) the following resolution to enhance the compensation benchmark (80th percentile of AAUP by rank) and to propose recommendations for improvement (Vali/Gyug):

Over the long term the 80th percentile benchmark has served the Fordham faculty well, but in recent years it has lagged inflation by a significant amount, particularly given the cost of living in the New York metropolitan area. Moreover, as Fordham implements its Strategic Plan and works to achieve its goal of becoming the preeminent Catholic institution on the continent by 2016, it is expected that faculty compensation will need to be enhanced, and made comparable to that of its aspirant institutions in major urban areas. Therefore, the Senate directs the Salary & Benefits Committee to explore and analyze alternatives to the 80th percentile benchmark in order
to improve faculty compensation with respect to inflation and compensation at aspirant institutions.

President Reidenberg then invited Senators to suggest other items that should be considered by the Salary & Benefits Committee. The suggestions included the following: gender parity questions; the drafting of a bylaw for the Salary & Benefits Committee, so that it can set up a separate task force for specific issues; the question of disparity in salary structures between liberal arts colleges (LC & RH); compression; phased retirement issues; the possibility of finding an arrangement to complement the present arrangement with Fordham Prep (such as Loyola in Manhattan) to help with tuition remission for the female children of faculty members.

11. Announcements.

President Reidenberg announced that the ballots for the referendum on the Senate’s proposed constitutional change will be in the mail shortly. President Reidenberg explained the two ballot issues: (1) that vacancies on elected committees of the Senate are filled through the end of the original person’s term and (2) that the procedure for Senate elections be more flexible. The ballots will make clear what the changes are by presenting the old language in strikeout and the proposed new language in bold. For the changes to be approved, at least 50% of those eligible to vote must vote in the affirmative. To enhance the voter turnout, the mailing will include a list of ballot box locations.

President Reidenberg mentioned a communication that he had received, asking for help in publicizing the “Focus the Nation Effort” (an environmental activity).

Fordham University is a founding member of the Environmental Consortium of Hudson River Valley Colleges and Universities that includes over 60 institutions. This year’s annual conference on “Climate Change, Science, Culture and the Regional Response” will be hosted by Fordham on January 24-25, 2008. The Conference is being planned in conjunction with the Focus the Nation project, a nationwide interdisciplinary collaborative discussion of global warming, that will have presentations, panels and workshops on campus January 30 & 31, 2008.

The Senate adjourned at 3:08pm on a motion proposed by Senator Mannion.

Minutes submitted by Joseph W. Koterski, S.J., Secretary of the Senate.
Appendix I

Report to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Life Committee

The Faculty Life Committee of the Faculty Senate was created in the spring 2005 semester. By forming this committee, the Senate was eager to respond to the felt need to assume a pro-active role in the process of faculty development. Consisting of ten members (including all the professional schools as well as the Liberal Arts Faculty and equally balanced between tenured and non-tenured faculty), the Committee continues to work toward recommendations on the subject of faculty development.

In the efforts to promote faculty development, we feel that there must be a focus on strategies to recruit and retain faculty as well as on providing assistance in development. This agenda resonates with the University’s recently adopted Strategic Plan and is now incorporated within the budget of the University’s Endowment Campaign. The Faculty Life Committee has been mindful that there are a number of other committees that are engaged in related questions, and so the Committee has tried to maintain regular contact with these committees, including Salary and Benefits, Research Council and Technology.

Some items already recommended to the Senate for inclusion in the University Statutes:

The promotion of faculty development was an important component of the resolution of the Faculty Senate mandating greater transparency in faculty personnel procedures. A statute recommended to the Senate by this Committee was formally approved at the December 2005 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

A second component of the concern with faculty development is reflected in the resolution concerning statements of the standards and procedures of each academic unit for personnel decisions on renewal, tenure and promotion. The Committee proposed and the Senate accepted at its February 2006 meeting appropriate provisions for inclusion in Appendix C.

The main work of the Committee during the 2005-2006 year was the preparation of a faculty satisfaction survey which was distributed during the Spring 2007 semester to all full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty. Special acknowledgement is extended to Dr. Jim Wilson and Dr. Lisa Colarossi for their expertise in designing this survey. In an effort to shed light on issues relevant for faculty retention and development, the survey covered issues on job satisfaction, work environment, professional development, work and family responsibilities, housing assistance, medical and retirement, and so on. The initial report of the Faculty Life Committee to the Senate on the findings from the Quality of Life Survey was presented to the Senate at the Nov. 19, 2007 meeting.
On behalf of the Committee, Father Joseph Koterski prepared a university-wide survey of academic departments and units in Spring 2005 semester to ascertain the pattern of success (or lack thereof) in hiring efforts over the preceding three years. The analysis of this data produced significant information concerning efforts to recruit new faculty. **The Committee seeks updated materials from the VPAA’s office to continue this analysis.**

Some Recommendations:

1. **The University continue the implementation of an across-the-board University-wide reduction in faculty teaching load.** This is an important aspect of faculty development for many reasons, including the advantages that it would confer for better teaching and for greater availability of faculty to students, for additional opportunities for research and scholarly publication, and thus for enhancing the academic quality and prestige of the University. It is already beginning to be evident that the University’s commitment to reduction of faculty teaching load has had a positive influence in allowing departments to hire those whom they identified as first-choices. We also expect that the implementation of this plan would assist with faculty retention.

2. **The University should dedicate a suitable informal/community space on each campus.** The faculty survey underscores a substantial dissatisfaction by all categories of respondents with the lack of such facilities. Mindful of the severe limitations at LC we support the build-out of a larger space for the faculty dining room, combined with its availability for faculty use when not in service as a dining area. At RH, we recommend that provision be made for the use of Duane Commons as a faculty lounge, able to be reserved for other functions, but managed to accommodate the faculty.

3. **The Committee Recommends that the University increase its efforts to provide suitable work space for its faculty.** Lack of suitable office and research space dominated the concerns of the untenured faculty as well as tenured women. A significant number of full-time tenured faculty shared office space with colleagues and adjunct faculty. Shared office space can clearly have a detrimental impact upon those faculty who carry substantial advisement and/or mentoring responsibilities as well as those who use this space for research and writing.

4. We recommend that the Office of the VPAA continue its efforts to maintain a complete and up-to-date list of all Fordham faculty on the University Website, with contact information.

5. **The University must address the question of housing assistance, especially for the newly hired.** While the prospect of a professional career in N.Y.C. is a strong positive in faculty recruitment, the cost of living (and particularly the cost of housing) is an equally strong negative. The FQOL survey presented several possible approaches (housing subsidies, low-interest loans, etc.) – all of which were valued as important initiatives by at least 80% of all faculty.
6. The Committee refers a wide range of fringe benefits issues (see figures 3, 4, 5 in summary report) to the Salary and Benefits Committee for further action.

7. The Committee asks the VPAA’s Office to review the existing overall institutional support for research. The committee was particularly concerned that a significant proportion of the faculty – especially the untenured - indicated that the lack of research support was key to a potential decision to leave Fordham. 10% of the tenured faculty concurred. Financial and technical support, structural and staffing considerations and overall institutional recognition that these are priorities are fundamental. The Committee views support for research as an investment in Fordham’s future and consistent with the direction to which both Fordham and its faculty aspire.

8. The University needs to undertake a comprehensive look at the percentage of classes taught by staff other than full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. Questions concerning the use of clinical instructors, adjuncts, post-doctoral teaching fellows, visiting faculty, etc. seem to be emerging with greater frequency. Part of the issue here seems to involve the deferral of increasing the number of full-time faculty lines to match the growth in student population in recent years. This issue is further compounded by the need to have adequate faculty to compensate for the reduction in faculty teaching loads.

Work in Progress:

The Committee is currently probing the multi-faceted issue of workloads. The Committee views this as the overarching theme of expectation management. Teaching load is but one aspect. Committee work on every level (usually restricted to full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty), mentoring of theses (from undergraduate to Ph.D. level), student advisement (particularly on the undergraduate level) and administrative and quasi-administrative responsibilities coupled with increased research expectations have created in a substantial number of faculty the perception of increased work loads.
Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes # 335

December 14, 2007

Faculty Senate

Meeting: 12:45 p.m. in Walsh Library, O’Hare Special Collections Room, Rose Hill Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer
Dr. David Stuhr, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Nancy Busch, Chief Research Officer

Excused: Senators Michael M. Martin, Mark Massa, S.J., and Mary Procidano

1. Call to Order.

Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order at 12:54pm.

2. Invocation.

Senator Dominic Balestra offered an opening prayer.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Previous Senate Meeting.

The Senate approved (18:0:1) a motion to approve the minutes from the November 16, 2006 meeting of the Senate, as corrected (Koterski/Bray). A question about the Senate’s resolution (see section 7 of Minutes #334) concerning the report of the Faculty Life Committee was deferred to “New Business.”

4. Matters Presented by the President of the University.

Father Joseph McShane reported on the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees, development efforts and admissions.
(a) **Board of Trustees.** The University’s Board of Trustees met on December 6, 2007. Immediately following the Board Meeting, they participated in the dedication of Fordham’s new Museum of Greek, Roman, and Etruscan art in the Walsh Family Library and a dinner to honor the donors, Mr. Bill Walsh and his family. The Board approved a tuition increase of 7.55% for University’s undergraduate schools. The discussion prior to this decision entertained but rejected the notion of differential increases (e.g., a 10% increase to begin with the incoming freshman class). The increase is not expected to have an adverse impact on our entering class, but adjustments can still be made if there should be a significant economic downturn.

(b) **Development.** The University has received a gift of $10 million from Bob & Joan Campbell. The new residence hall for 450 students on the Rose Hill Campus will be named in their honor, with construction anticipated to begin by June 2008 and with residence expected by the fall 2010 semester. Hughes Hall will remain in use as a residence hall until the opening of the new building but will then be converted for academic use.

The University hopes to raise over $65 million this year which would be substantially ahead of last year’s figure by about $25 million. Father McShane stated that despite current worries about the stock market, our requests for gifts to the University are going well. Father McShane indicated that he expects to be on the road for considerable portions of January, February, and Marchi, including trips to California, Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Boston, Florida, London, and Paris.

(c) **Admissions.** The acceptance letters for early action candidates were mailed on December 15, 2007. This year’s early applicant pool topped 7000 applications, and we accepted a high percentage of them. The average SAT for those accepted was 1293. In any given year, the early action pool tends to consist of very talented applicants, but the yield tends to be low, for many schools are in competition for these students. In the regular admissions cycle, we have thus far experienced an increase of 12.5% in the number of applicants over last year. If we continue at this pace, we can expect about 25,000 applications this academic year. The quality and the geographical diversity remain high, with good growth in our targeted states (e.g., California, Texas, and the Carolinas) and with the rates of local applicants steady. Recent aggressive activity by CUNY gives us some worry about our numbers for FCLC from New York City, and especially from Brooklyn. The Admission Office monitors these trends carefully and we are ready to adjust our financial aid strategies as needed.

(d) **New York State.** Father McShane reported on a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of CICU (the Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities) in Albany with the New York State Budget Director and other aides to Governor Spitzer. The CICU delegation stressed the following items: (1) the indispensability of TAP (Tuition Assistance Program) for every institution of higher education in the state; (2) the importance of continued funding for HEOP (Higher Education Opportunity Program), (3) the value of continuing the Bundy program, (4) the urgency of the Capital Match program, and (5) the advantages of a new initiative to begin a state-sponsored low-interest student-loan program.

The idea of the Capital Match Program, promised several years ago, was that the State of New York would match the funds raised for certain capital projects at a 4:1 ratio. Many schools
have found that some of the capital projects that they have undertaken have now become stalled,
for they were counting on money from the state that has not been forthcoming.

With regard to (5), New York State is the only large state in the Northeast not to have a
low-interest loan program for students that is state-administered and state-sponsored. While
CUNY and SUNY were not recommending this initiative, the private institutions did urge its
creation, as the more that we can get our students into such state and federal programs, the less
likely it is that they will be subject to predatory loan practices in the private sector.

Since the New York State Budget Director is expecting there to be a shortfall of up to $4
billion in this year’s budget, he recommended that CICU prioritize its recommendations. The
CICU delegation urged that if cuts are needed, they occur in institutional aid rather than in aid to
students. In particular, the Long Island representatives in the New York State Senate and
Assembly have expressed their concern about the way in which middle class families are being
squeezed in state programs for the assistance of college students. The Long Island
representatives plan to seek a raise in the income-ceiling for TAP assistance.

The CICU delegation was told to expect the imminent publication of the report of the
Governor’s Commission on Higher Education. The report will emphasis the desire for New York
State to have a flagship state university by trying to raise one of the SUNY campuses to the level
of state universities such as the University of Michigan. Most members of this commission seem
committed to strengthening SUNY and CUNY and to be less sympathetic to private education.
On the other hand, the presidents of the other SUNY campuses can be expected to have strong
views about any suggestion for the establishment of a flagship within the SUNY system. Every
legislator has a stake in maintaining support for the local branch of SUNY, and so it is unlikely
that this initiative will advance unless a new revenue stream is identified. The CICU delegate had
greater concern about the proposal of a new innovation fund that SUNY and CUNY might like to
have all to themselves (especially for the research universities within those systems), without
access for private institutions. It is expected that this fund would allow SUNY and CUNY to hire
about 2000 new full-time faculty over the next five years, on the ground that these institutions
have some of the worst faculty-to-student ratios in the country. The private institutions have
argued that there should be a “non-compete” clause embedded in this proposal, so that the public
institutions would not be able to raid the faculties of the private institutions for these new faculty
lines.

In the ensuing discussion, Senators asked about the development campaign recently
announced by Boston College. Father McShane noted some of the structural similarities of the
BC plan to Fordham’s own plan, and acknowledged that BC’s is more financially ambitious. He
pointed out that the remarkable growth of the BC endowment has depended especially on the
management of their investments and on surplus-budgeting, a practice in which BC has tended to
enroll about two hundred more students each year than had been budgeted for, thereby
generating a considerable amount of annual surplus revenue. The cabinet will be considering this
matter in its January meeting, and Father McShane welcomed a discussion with the Senate on
this topic in the spring semester.

In response to a question about what appears to be an increased number of students from
eastern Europe in classes in recent years, Father McShane explained that we do not have any
formal admissions outreach to central or eastern Europe at this time, but that many families have
come to the U.S. from those regions. In addition, the University’s initiative with the Orthodox Church seems to have enhanced the attractiveness of Fordham for this community. The Admission Office does conduct a program for prospective applicants in western Europe.

With regard to the newly approved increased in tuition to $35,200, Father McShane explained that similar increases by our peer and aspirant schools means that our relative rank will not change. A number of Senators asked about the cost centers that are driving tuition increases. Father McShane commented on the unevenness of tuition income across the university and on the current enrollment challenges being experienced by GSSS and GED. He explained that the University is trying to manage the budget prudently, including an effort to examine the formulas by which overhead expenses are assessed to the various Schools of the University. Father McShane has directed the newly revamped Budget Planning Committee to consider the advisability of making some adjustments in these policies over the course of time, and to be mindful that Fordham is “a university, not a multi-versity,” with a need for each unit to contribute to the common good. He has reminded the Committee that each school has had its own hard times and has benefitted from the support of other units.

Father McShane also commented on the potential for the U.S. Congress to intervene on the question of tuition increases at institutions of higher learning. He noted that both major political parties are now considering the idea of creating a watch list of schools that increase their tuition at a higher rate than the increases in the cost of living. This practice would be disadvantageous for us because it could easily keep us locked into a tuition rate that would make us annually lose ground against our competitors. It would also be disadvantageous for us during the time of our change-over to a 3-2 faculty course load and the implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan.

5. Matters Presented by Dr. Stephen Freedman, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer.

Dr. Freedman reported to the Senate on the composition of the University’s instructional staff by rank and type. After recounting the work that Dr. Judy Mills had done in cooperation with the Senate on the re-definition of “clinical” for the University Statutes, Dr. Freedman noted that the administration is interested in providing the Senate with reliable data on topics like these, so that there can be good academically-based decisions made about converting non-tenured-track lines to tenure-track lines, given the particular needs of each department and school and in relation to the University’s resources and the Strategic Plan.

Dr. David Stuhr, Associate Academic Vice President, then made a presentation on the trends in regard to visiting professors and to clinical staff during the period from 1999 through 2007. The handouts that he distributed provided data on the number of full-time lines (tenured and tenure-track) authorized in each department and school, the number of those positions that are filled and unfilled, the numbers of visiting professors, clinical instructors, lecturers, artists-in-residence, fellows, and various corresponding percentages [see attached Appendix I]. Dr. Stuhr noted that there has been a significant increase in the number of visiting appointments this year, mostly as the result of failed searches (due particularly to factors such as housing costs and teaching load) or of faculty members who left the University too late to be replaced by a permanent appointment conducted through the standard search process. Dr. Freedman noted that
the administration is monitoring the progress of faculty searches and is eager to drive down the number of failed searches. Dr. Stuhr called attention to the fact that there was a dramatic decline in the number of clinical instructors within the Arts & Sciences faculty after the statutory redefinition of the term “clinical” and the establishment the post of “lecturer”. In the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, for instance, all the clinical positions were converted to lecturer positions, except for one. Dr. Stuhr noted that the total number of clinicals plus lecturers is about same as last year. The only sizable increase occurs at the Law School for visiting professors, mostly as a way to replace individuals on leave. The number of “post-doctoral fellows” has been increasing. This type of appointment has been popular with some departments as a way to supplement the available faculty and at the same time to support some of their own recent Ph.D. graduates while they are still seeking permanent positions elsewhere.

In the discussion that followed, a question arose about the possible implications of the shift in numbers from the clinical rank to the lecturer rank with regard to the University’s reporting of salary and benefits to the AAUP. In particular, a Senator asked whether removing clinical positions from the figures reported to the AAUP would make it easier for the administration to report salaries that meet the requirement of the 80th AAUP percentile without actually raising salaries appropriately. Academic Affairs offered to provide data in response to this question for a future meeting of the Senate. In the discussion there was emphasis on making sure (1) that the University is fully transparent in its reporting and (2) that this change does not harm the effort to keep faculty salaries competitive. There was also discussion about the fact that the new statutory provisions on clinical appointments did not address the possibility of successive appointments of the same individual to a “lecturer” position. There is no provision in the Statutes for re-appointment, but Academic Affairs is currently presuming that it is possible to make a “new appointment” for the same person. The issues involved are three: concern for the individuals involved, concern about the AAUP policies on de facto tenure, and the appropriate tenure/non-tenure mix. It is not yet clear whether the policy of using successive applications of “new appointment” escapes the problem of de facto tenure rules. Dr. Freedman noted that many universities have worked with the AAUP to make sure that appropriately defined clinical positions (especially in the professional schools) can be used to have the same individual remain in place without de facto tenure by due care in following the AAUP guidelines.

Senate President Reidenberg promised to take up these questions again at the Senate’s January meeting and asked for suggestions to be sent to him in advance, so that he can provide a draft resolution with the agenda for that meeting. Note was taken that it will be helpful to have available for that meeting a report with comparative data for the previous five years on (1) the number of authorized clinical lines and (2) the number of adjuncts (in terms of full-time equivalents) and the number of students taught by adjuncts, so as to be better able to assess questions about the quality of instruction being given.

Dr. Freedman stressed the need for cooperation between his office and the Senate, so that we can find a suitable strategy to get to where we want to be in terms of instructional staffing, with due recognition of the fact that we may not be able to get there in just one semester. He urged that for the determination of the optimal numbers of staff in the various instructional ranks, it will be necessary for each dean to work with the faculty of the school to determine the appropriate mix of tenure/tenure-track faculty and non-tenured instructional staff, and to ascertain which decisions should be made locally and which should be made university-wide.
6. Matters Presented by the Chief Research Officer, Dr Nancy Busch.

Dr. Busch reported to the Senate on the evolution and status of faculty fellowships, the expansion of faculty research grants and the increased and restructured staff in her area to an Office of Research and an Office of Sponsored Programs. She also presented a list of external research grant awards made to faculty during the last six months [see attached Appendix II]

(a) Faculty Fellowships. Dr. Nancy Busch described the processes by which faculty members may apply for a faculty fellowship and by which they are reviewed. She noted that decision letters for this year’s applicants have recently been sent out and she provided a table [included in Appendix II] with the data available on faculty fellowship applications and awards from 2003 through 2007. After explaining some problems that have been encountered with data transfer from the old research office for the year 2004, she noted the steady increase in the number of applications from tenured and tenure-track faculty during this period. She also observed that the steadily improving quality of the applications has made it easier for the applicants to be competitive for external funding. For the discussion of these matters at future Senate meetings, it will be important to have accurate data about the process, such as the percentage of successful applicants per school, while at the same time protecting confidentiality where necessary.

(b) Faculty Research Grants. Dr. Busch then reviewed the number of awards and the funds made available for University-sponsored Faculty Research Grants as well as a list of recent awards (2007-2008) to full-time faculty. She explained that the funding available from the University Research Council has increased threefold over the last five years to $202,347 in 2007-2008 that the eligibility criteria have been expanded to cover software, and that the number of grants has doubled, with the largest increase occurring during the past two years. She also noted that the budget in 2006 was not adequate to cover the proposals and that awards that year had to be cut proportionally for all recipients. During the 2007 competition, the Office of Sponsored Research encouraged applicants to connect their grant applications with the pursuit of external funding and increased the maximum amount available for each grant to $6500 so as to help the petitioners prepare their external funding applications. An increase in the budget this past year meant that all suitable applications were funded. When some individuals asked for additional funds outside the timing for applications, money was generally found, especially for equipment and software data sets. For the spring 2008 competition the Office of Sponsored Research has been stressing that “external funding” need not be limited to research grants but can include fellowships such as those found in the humanities and other fields. Dr. Busch also noted that during the fall 2007 semester her office also issued a separate call for equipment-funding, so that these requests can be put into budget planning through the University’s BPREP program.

(c) Office of Research and the Office of Sponsored Programs. Dr. Busch then discussed the reconfiguration of the old Office of Sponsored Programs and thanked the faculty members who have served on the University Research Council, including Prof. Bill Thornhill of the Department of Biological Sciences, who was present for this part of the Senate meeting, and Senator Martin Chase, S.J. Dr. Busch has divided the old Office of Research and Sponsored
Problems into two offices: the Office of Research (“OR”) and the Office of Sponsored Programs (“OSP”). As the Chief Research Officer, Dr. Busch has chosen to place the focus for the OSP on external funding and to organize it in a way designed to be helpful to faculty pursuing external funding while the OR will concentrate on research support from internal sources including faculty fellowships and faculty research grants.

The new OSP now has four and a half funded positions and has requested an additional position for AY 2008-2009. At the new OSP, Laura Ebert will continue to serve as the budget administrator for grants and contracts. She is now authorized to sign off on grants and to deal with contracts and subcontracts. Vicky Siefring remains as the OSP’s auditor. Angela Belsole has moved over to GSSS to serve as a grant officer and administrative support for major external funded projects. This semester Dr. Busch recruited two new staff members who were present for this part of the Senate meeting and who will support faculty in the sciences and social sciences. Dr. Busch introduced Kristen Wolff. She joined Fordham in October from Arizona State University after serving in a similar role at Columbia. Dr. Busch then introduced Celinette Rodriguez who came to Fordham from the Bronx Botanical Gardens just after Thanksgiving. The search for an additional position to support humanities and law faculty remains open at this time. The position descriptions for these new research grant officers were designed to enhance the support to be provided to faculty pre- and post-award. Dr. Busch reported that the new staffing will allow individual faculty members to be assigned to specific grant officers so that the grant officers will know better the faculty members whom they are supporting. The new arrangement should allow grant officers to seek additional support, as necessary, and allow faculty members to concentrate on their research and scholarship without having to worry as much about how to build a budget or find external support. New faculty members will be introduced to grant officer, who will explain internal funding possibilities and who will be able to help them in the preparation of faculty fellowship applications, faculty research grant applications, and applications for external funding.

The discussion that followed included questions about the ways in which the OR and OSP will assist in various quarters of the University, e.g., in arts & sciences, in business, and in the professional schools. There were also questions about what type of grants should be brought to the University’s Development Office and what type are better handled directly through the OSP. Dr. Busch explained that the procedures to follow for these different types of grant applications are being revised to become more transparent.

Dr. Busch then noted a number of other aspects pertinent to the restructuring of the University’s research support. In the near future, all the staff members will be moved back onto campus and will be housed on the second floor of the Administration building. Appropriate space is still being sought on the Lincoln Center campus. She also explained plans to work with the Office of Public Affairs to produce a modular piece on the successes of Fordham faculty members in obtaining research grants, so as to provide better publicity for research efforts at the University.

In the ensuing discussion, a number of Senators reported on their experience of frustration with the University’s infrastructure and with a lack of appropriate support. Dr. Busch explained that it is her hope that the new grant officers will be helpful in the work of coordinating many practical details. A number of Senators commented on the importance of having the Senate agenda for coming meetings attend to various infrastructure issues.
7. Reading of Important Communications.

Senate President Joel Reidenberg informed the Senate that sufficient ballots have been received on the referendum and that the Election Committee would be convened shortly to complete the counting. Until the Election Committee meets to count the ballots, any outstanding ballots will still be accepted.

President Reidenberg also informed the Senate that additional vacancies on various Senate committees can be expected. There has been a need to replace approximately 15% of the faculty on these committees since the Senate’s May meeting for various reasons, including leaves of absence and resignations from committees due to time commitments. The Senate Office has also encountered numerous difficulties in scheduling meetings and there seems to be a need to streamline the ways in which committees meet. He asked for suggestions to minimize these two problems.

8. Committee Reports.

(a) Salary & Benefits. Senator Bruce Berg reported that the Salary & Benefits Committee recently met to adopt a set of by-laws that will be useful as the committee expands and divides into sub-committees for the various projects the Senate has asked the Committee to address. He noted that topics the committee wants to pursue as a priority in the spring of 2008 include: (1) faculty housing and (2) on-site child care. Suggestions should be sent directly to Senator Berg.

In the ensuing discussion, some Senators suggested that the committee investigate expanding the program by which the sons of faculty members can attend Fordham Prep at half-tuition, to some institution for the daughters of faculty members. There were various suggestions in this regard, such as trying to make some sort of arrangement with other private schools. Some Senators took note, however, that the present arrangement with Fordham Prep does not actually involve the expenditure of any University funds. It is a cooperative arrangement that also benefits the faculty at Fordham Prep, and that any arrangement for the daughters of Fordham University faculty might well have to be a cooperative arrangement of a similar nature.

Finally, Senator Berg reported the committee’s recommendation for two changes in regard to faculty benefits:

(1) that a Roth 403(b) option be included in the University’s TIAA/CREF retirement plan now that TIAA/CREF has added a Roth 403(b) option to the possible investment choices for pension plans.

(2) that the University report the premium for long-term disability insurance as current taxable income for faculty.

While the University pays and will continue to pay the cost of long-term disability insurance for faculty, at present, the insurance premium paid by the University is not treated as income. In the event that a faculty member is disabled, the benefit payment is set at 60% of...
income, and the benefit payments are taxed as income. The administration has indicated that if the insurance premium paid by the University is treated as imputed income (like the life-insurance premium) and the amount of the premium is taxed currently, then future disability benefits would not be subject to income tax. Faculty receiving disability payments will thus be able to receive them tax-free. This second recommendation is being made in consultation with the administration, and the University is willing to add the cost of the premium to each faculty member’s salary in order to fund the premium (approximately $200 per year). Faculty will then pay tax on the additional $200, in order to avoid paying tax on the disability benefit.

The Senate then approved (21:0:0) a motion (Berg/Vernon) recommending the inclusion of the Roth 403(b) in the University’s retirement plan.

The Senate also noted that there should be a communication from the Office of Human Resources, to acquaint the faculty with the nature of this program and to advise them about who might find it beneficial to participate.

The Senate then approved (15:3:2) the motion (Berg/Vernon) to recommend that faculty fund their long-term disability insurance premiums post-tax, according to the plan described above.

(b) Budget Planning Committee. Senate President Reidenberg informed the Senate that the Budget Planning Committee recently met to discuss cost-allocation formulas. The committee will meet again in January to continue the discussion about appropriate ways to divide the burden of overhead costs among the schools of the University. The committee also plans to look at research support and infrastructure.

(c) Technology Committee. Senator Marcia Flicker reported that the committee recently discussed a statement on guidelines and requirements for the use of Blackboard.com in connection with faculty committees [see attached Appendix III]. A resolution for the Senate to adopt these guidelines and requirements will come before the Senate in January. She also reported that on December 11, 2007 the committee discussed videoconferencing and adopted the following resolution: “The Faculty Committee on Technology endorses the use of videoconferencing for university committees between Rose Hill, Lincoln Center, and Westchester campuses. This proposal shall not apply to personnel and appointment decisions where a secret ballot is required by the Statutes, unless procedures for ensuring anonymous voting can be obtained. Conditions and procedures under which this resolution may be invoked will be determined later by the Faculty Senate.” This resolution was presented at the present meeting for the Senate’s information along with the following resolution for Senate consideration:

Resolution on Videoconference Meetings for UTRC, TRAC and Hearing Committee

In light of the need for the University Tenure Review Committee (“UTRC”), the Tenure and Reappointments Appeals Committee (“TRAC”) and the
Hearing Committee to meet expeditiously for the consideration of cases and in order to obtain the 80% quorum required for personnel matters, the Senate recognizes that these three committees comprised of members from disciplines and schools across the University may need to meet by videoconference and acknowledges that such meetings may be held consistently with the statutory requirements for such Senate committee meetings. The Senate further notes that any video conference meetings must conform to all other statutory requirements including secret balloting. This acknowledgement does not authorize videoconference meetings for personnel committees other than UTRC, TRAC and the Hearing Committee.

The Senate then undertook a discussion about the advisability of using videoconferencing for a number of Senate Committees, viz., UTRC, TRAC, and the Hearing Committee. The Senate was informed that each of these committees has resorted to use of videoconferencing on several occasions during the fall 2007 semester because of the need to deal with a number of important decisions on relatively short-notice when it would have been very difficult, and in certain instances otherwise impossible, to obtain a quorum. Senate President Reidenberg explained that nothing in the University Statutes prohibits holding meetings by videoconference; he also noted that judicial bodies such as the New York State Courts and the War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague accept videoconferencing. He granted permission to UTRC, TRAC, and the Hearing Committee to do so, but faculty uneasiness with videoconference meetings warranted discussion by the Senate. After noting the difficulties involved in travel-time between campuses the concern that a large number of faculty are precluded from serving on these important committees because of that additional time commitment, and the lack of a demonstrably adverse impact on the outcome of cases, he introduced a letter on the topic from Prof. Richard S. Carnell (Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee) and opened the topic for general discussion.

A motion was made as follows (Koterski/Balestra):

**The Faculty Senate confirms the fact that UTRC, TRAC and Hearing Committees are personnel committees. As such, these committees must continue to operate under policies and procedures not inconsistent with the Statutes, e.g. meet together as a group in the same room, secret ballot, quorum requirements.**

At 3:45 p.m. Senator Mannion moved to extend the Senate meeting beyond the time scheduled for its adjournment.

After vigorous discussion about whether these committees should or should not use such technology, especially because they are personnel committees, about various substantive reasons for and against adopting a policy that would allow such a practice, and about how to interpret the University Statutes on these topics, the Senate approved (14:7:0) a motion (Vali/Schwalbenberg) to table the discussion until the January meeting.
9. **Old Business.**

Senate President Reidenberg asked the Senate to consider its traditional annual renewal of an invitation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs to attend Senate meetings. He explained that, beginning in September, he had invited Dr. Freedman, who had by this time already left the Senate meeting, to attend the meetings of the Senate so as to learn more about the University’s faculty, and that Dr. Freedman had graciously agreed to stay or to leave, as requested by the Senate, so as better to support the faculty.

After a brief discussion, the Senate approved (20:0:1) a motion (Berg/Mannion) inviting the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs to be present at the meetings of the Senate, unless there is need for the Senate to go into Executive Session.

10. **Election for University Tenure Review Committee (UTRC).**

The Senate elected the following individuals to the UTRC:

1. A&S at RH, GSREE – Dominic Balestra, Philosophy
2. Schools of Business – Paul McNelis, S.J., GBA (Finance)

There was a tie vote among the candidates for FCLC, and so a run-off election will need to take place at the Senate’s meeting in January.

11. **New Business.**

(a) **Periodicals Reading Room.** The Senate approved (20:0:0) the motion (Sen/Piotrkowski) the following resolution pertaining to the Periodicals Reading Room in the Walsh Family Library:

The Faculty Senate requests the Walsh Library Administration and the Administration of the University to restore the essential resource of a periodicals reading room on the Rose Hill campus.

(b) The Senate agreed to defer the proposed discussion about giving additional specific directions to the Faculty Life Committee and the proposed discussion about smoking, until the January meeting.

At 4:10pm Senator Mannion moved to adjourn.

Minutes submitted by Senator Joseph W. Koterski, S.J., Secretary of the Faculty Senate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>VISITING</th>
<th>CLINICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African &amp; African American Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Languages &amp; Civilization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Information Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Visual Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; Religious Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF RECEIVE BENEFITS PACKAGE AND SALARY INCREASES.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>AWARDED APPLICATIONS:</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Eric</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>pes</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das, Cesare</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>NYS Department of the Aging</td>
<td>$44,023</td>
<td>$5,977</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels, Faith</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>lko</td>
<td>NIH - R21</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$37,940</td>
<td>$165,940</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Jane</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>The Elliott Foundation</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$18,400</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson, Howard</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>Council of Ivy Group Presidents</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
<td>$14,300</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Carla</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>NYU/NIH</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$45,500</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Carla</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>NIH / NIDA - R21</td>
<td>$367,408</td>
<td>$123,255</td>
<td>$490,663</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forney, Mary Ann</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>$54,297</td>
<td>$33,727</td>
<td>$88,024</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garg, Kathleen</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>The McGraw-Hill Companies</td>
<td>$42,950</td>
<td>$5,732</td>
<td>$48,682</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, D. Hau, P.</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>The Whig-Clint Student Research Foundation</td>
<td>$34,651</td>
<td>$5,185</td>
<td>$39,836</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mize, Sophie</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>eco</td>
<td>National Institutes of Health - NINDS / NIMH</td>
<td>$8,985</td>
<td>$3,031</td>
<td>$12,016</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papadimitriou, Aristotle</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>thr</td>
<td>E. Rhodes and Leona C. Carpenter Foundation</td>
<td>$26,740</td>
<td>$38,740</td>
<td>$65,480</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike-Traylor, Janine</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>pes</td>
<td>Hunts Point Alliance for Children</td>
<td>$12,267</td>
<td>$12,267</td>
<td>$24,534</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Russell</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>Intersection of Business Ethics and Legal Ethics</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, Mercer, Marissa</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>ffc</td>
<td>Hispanic Capacity Project (HCP)</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, Mercer, Marissa</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>eco</td>
<td>Community United in Development Youth Project (CUEY)</td>
<td>$22,523</td>
<td>$22,523</td>
<td>$45,046</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Catherine</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>eco</td>
<td>Human Rights &amp; Constitution: Whose are we Post 9/11</td>
<td>$66,662</td>
<td>$59,362</td>
<td>$126,024</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiner, Mindi</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>NIH / NIMH - R21</td>
<td>$186,424</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$200,924</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera, Gisela</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>lko</td>
<td>The Ludlum Littauer Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi, Xian</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>thr</td>
<td>UMassPHEE</td>
<td>$4,190.00</td>
<td>$4,190.00</td>
<td>$8,380.00</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtz, Frederick</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>The College Board</td>
<td>$69,765</td>
<td>$69,765</td>
<td>$139,530</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $1,363,618 $344,803 $1,698,421 $3,018,925
Office of Research

Appendix II

Faculty Fellowships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F07</th>
<th>F06</th>
<th>F05</th>
<th>F04</th>
<th>F03</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awards by school/discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>F07</th>
<th>F06</th>
<th>F05</th>
<th>F04</th>
<th>F03</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; Religious Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Records incomplete - denied applications not found
Note that numbers for F03-F05 may be revised after further review

Faculty Research Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of awards</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds</td>
<td>$ 202,347</td>
<td>$ 226,243</td>
<td>$ 136,026</td>
<td>$ 91,685</td>
<td>$ 68,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III

Guidelines And Requirements For Use Of Blackboard.com
in Connection with Faculty Committees

At the December 11, 2007 meeting, the Faculty Committee on Technology unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The Faculty Committee on Technology recommends to the Senate:

(1) the adoption of the Blackboard Guidelines for University and faculty personnel committees and appointments;

(2) that each faculty member be required to sign an acknowledgment each year for access to Blackboard personnel materials;

(3) that each committee chair be required to confirm with Fordham IT that Blackboard security features have been configured properly for the committee's work;

(4) that no confidential matters be communicated by email.
Meeting: 12:45 p.m. in McMahon Residence Hall Lounge, #109
Lincoln Center Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Senior Vice President and Chief Academic Officer
Dr. David Stuhr, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. James Wilson, member of the Faculty Life committee

Excused: Senators Dominic Balestra, Marcia Flicker, Margo Jackson, Rev. Joseph Koterski, S.J., Chaya Piotrkowski, Mary Procidano, Berish Rubin, and Shapoor Vali

1. Call to Order

Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order at 12:53pm.

2. Invocation

Senator Fran Blumberg delivered the invocation.

Senate President Reidenberg asked the Senate to pause and remember Fr. Donald Magnetti BA ’63, JD ’79, Associate Professor of Law and a member of the faculty for 25 years who passed away last month.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Previous Senate Meeting

The Senate approved a motion to accept the minutes of February 1, 2008 (Massa / Acevedo, 9-0-4).

4. Matters presented by the President of the University, Father Joseph McShane, S.J.

Senate President Reidenberg reported that Fr. McShane, S.J., was in Europe on university business and could not attend the meeting.

5. Reading of Important Communications and Announcements
Senate President Joel Reidenberg read or announced the following items:

(a) The Vice President for Administration, Dr. Brian Byrne, is following up on the Senate resolution (January 11, 2008) and is exploring the extension of no-smoking zones around building entrances.

(b) With the recent instances of violence on several campuses across the country, Senate President Reidenberg asked the Chief of Security, Mr. John Carroll, to indicate again to the faculty how to find emergency procedures, what to do in case of an emergency, and how to sign up for the University’s emergency notification service. Mr. Carroll has provided guidelines (attached as Appendix I)). In addition, Senate President Reidenberg reported that the first brochure on responding to mental health crises has been distributed to faculty, and the second on identifying and responding to safety and security emergencies is being drafted by the Faculty Senate Committee on Student Life.

6. Matters presented by the Senior Vice President and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Stephen Freedman

Senior Vice President and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Stephen Freedman, then addressed the Senate on two matters, a set of transitional administrative appointments in Arts and Sciences that he has been considering, and a proposal regarding the appointment of Magis Fellows.

(a) Transitional administrative appointments in Arts and Sciences. Dr. Freedman briefed the Senate on an upcoming administrative change for Arts and Sciences. There is an immediate concern that the Dean of Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Robert Himmelberg, would be completing the term of his interim appointment this summer. Dr. Freedman has been considering how best to assure the leadership of Arts and Sciences and how best to proceed at this time. Dr. Freedman stressed that he was approaching the Senate seeking advice and comment on his anticipated steps. After initial conversations with the Arts and Sciences deans about leadership of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Freedman indicated that he intends to keep an open mind on the long term needs and arrangements. As a first stage in a longer term discussion of administrative organization, Dr. Freedman has discussed the question of administrative appointments with the Arts and Sciences deans, consulted with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and with various Fordham constituencies. A number of options have been considered, such as the appointment of a search committee to find a permanent replacement for the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or to make an interim appointment. Some options might have had deans stepping aside with immediate organizational implications and ramifications that would have been too extensive.

In considering all this input, Dr. Freedman presented a transitional plan involving the three main Arts and Sciences deans (the deans of Rose Hill, Lincoln Center and the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; concerning the fourth dean, Dr. Freedman would be reporting at future meetings on the role and structure of Liberal Studies and on the organization of Academic Affairs itself. His proposed plan would appoint the Dean of Fordham College Rose Hill, Dr. Brennan O’Donnell, as a transitional Arts and Sciences dean of faculty for two years, and the Dean of Fordham College at Lincoln Center, Fr. Robert Grimes, S.J., as an Associate Vice President for Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Education. Both of these deans would continue with their duties in their respective colleges. During the two-year transitional period, a Task Force would be appointed to review the administrative structure of the Arts and Sciences colleges and develop recommendations for a more permanent structure. This plan has the support of the deans, and would enhance the positions for them enabling them to become more successful; for instance, Dean Grimes would be able to move forward on implementing core revisions, and would also have a role in strategic planning and budgetary matters, esp. important as the university entered a new phase in its planning for 2016, one which required considerable thought on resources. On the two-year terms, Dr. Freedman was looking to have sufficient time to gather information and recommendations on longer term issues.

In discussions as the plan was developed, the deans had considered the pros and cons, with varying views, but had now reached a consensus on the proposal. The existing structure has presented them with challenges, especially in the overlapping decision-making between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the college deans. Chairs had spoken to Dr. Freedman about these issues, and were active in seeking some type of streamlining. Under the proposed plan, Dean O’Donnell, as Dean of Faculty and Dean of FCRH, would have more decision-making authority on faculty matters and resources, although he would still require consensus with the other deans. As Dean of Faculty, he would need to be present regularly at Lincoln Center to absorb the differences between the colleges and to be able to represent the entire Arts and Sciences faculty. Dean O’Donnell was committed to this role and would reflect and respect the different views of the two campuses, which may be the biggest issue faced by a single dean. Both deans recognized, however, the burden of operating in a transitional structure under continual evaluation.

In the discussion that followed, Senators expressed appreciation for being consulted on this significant plan and commented candidly with a number of criticisms, although elements of the plan met with approval. In general, Senators appreciated the intended review of the administrative structure of the Arts and Sciences, and the difficulties with any transitional plan. One commented that the dean of FCRH would be a good dean of faculty, but asked whether placing the dean of faculty duties on the dean of an undergraduate college would be perceived as a lack of commitment to research. Dr. Freedman noted that the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Nancy Busch, had raised the issue of research and its relation to the university’s reputation early in the process. For now, Dr. Freedman has decided that the dean of the graduate school was already responsible for several areas, and the transitional positions should concentrate on signaling reforms in the undergraduate colleges. Next year, he would be
turning his attention to restructuring Academic Affairs, which would include promotion of research.

Senators representing FCLC Arts and Sciences faculty questioned whether the transitional re-organization would represent the differences in the colleges well. They pointed to the history of the establishment of the position of Dean of the Faculty. When administrative structures were being developed in the 1994 consolidations, the first plan had been to have a single undergraduate dean, which would have meant in practice the dean of Rose Hill; in order to reflect collegial differences, Lincoln Center kept a dean, and the Rose Hill dean acted as dean of faculty. To address concerns that soon arose among the untenured faculty at Lincoln Center, the plan was amended further and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, whose position was not seen to be attached primarily to any one college, became the acting dean of faculty. The proposed transitional re-organization could create similar anxiety, and a combined dean of faculty/dean of Rose Hill would need to demonstrate in dramatic fashion openness to the concerns of the Lincoln Center faculty. In any case, such combined duties would always be difficult for a single individual to handle given the inevitable conflicts between the goals of the separate offices. Senators noted that the recent survey of the faculty in connection with the report on faculty life showed that FCLC faculty would have insecurities and doubt about making a Rose Hill dean responsible for Lincoln Center faculty. Dr. Freedman recognized such concerns and stressed the importance of a joint dean of faculty/dean of Rose Hill being physically present and active at Lincoln Center. Conflicts could indeed result, and allegiances could be confused, but Dr. Freedman was confident in the personal abilities of the dean to resolve such difficulties and would be advising the dean to speak to the Senate as a first step in allaying anxieties. At the same time, in order to reduce the risk of conflict the new office of Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education would allow for closer coordination, and a strong voice for Lincoln Center. One of the duties of the Task Force would be to seek ideal solutions beyond the transitional arrangements.

Several Senators with current or past experience as departmental chairs commented on how important a stand-alone dean of faculty, one not doing double-duty as a college dean equal to other college deans or acting for a council of deans, was for regular administration. Hiring and personnel decisions were highlighted as areas in which the old council of deans without a stand-alone dean of faculty had been difficult and ineffective. From their perspective, the current system was a great success, especially in allowing for speedy and timely administrative responses. Critical of what they saw as a step back, Senators spoke of the recent history of the position of stand-alone dean of faculty that because of great dissatisfaction with the former administrative arrangements, the Senate and chairs had campaigned actively to fill the position of dean of faculty, and the search for a dean had resulted four years ago in the appointment of Dr. Dominic Balestra as a stand-alone dean of faculty. Senators noted that the Middle States report commented that the position was statutory, but newly filled, and it would take time to see how it worked. Although the Middle States report noted that the deans were skeptical then, and, from Dr.
Freedman’s remarks, appeared to remain so, Senators objected and found that the current arrangements were from a faculty and departmental perspective much more transparent, open and effective. Dr. Freedman responded that some new chairs he had consulted were not happy with the current structure and recognized a need to put into place a more streamlined process for personnel decisions. Although there had been, from the deans’ perspectives, positive effects from the consensus building in the former council of deans, the current arrangement created inefficiencies. Dr. Freedman recognized problems with the transitional model of joint appointments but was hoping that the Task Force would propose ways to change the organization to eliminate inefficiencies.

Senators also questioned the process of developing the transitional arrangements. One noted that the Statutes called for a search when there is a vacancy in the dean of faculty position, not transitional appointments. Dr. Freedman recognized the statutory norm, but responded that it applied only for permanent appointments, and interim or transitional appointments could be made by the President, and were provided for within the statutes. At this point in the institution’s history, it was not the time to make a permanent appointment without a full, reflective review of the structure. As Dr. Freedman had reviewed the possibilities—e.g., appointing an interim dean of faculty, perhaps one of the standing deans or another internal candidate—he had consulted and been particularly influenced by the experience of the deans themselves. He was convinced that any interim dean should have a dean’s experience in order to minimize difficulties in learning the duties of the position. The solution was the transitional structure being proposed, which was permitted by the statutes and would allow for a thorough review of the structure.

A Senator noted, however, that such interim appointments could give the appearance of permanence, esp. if understood as a step back, and could be perceived as contrary to the much-appreciated spirit of collaboration and faculty involvement Dr. Freedman has been developing so effectively. Dr. Freedman admitted that the steps could be misperceived and were not ideally in sync, but this was the reason for the emphasis on “transitional” in the titles “transitional Dean of Faculty” and “transitional Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education.” He wished to signal as clearly as possible that the goal was to have a review and a suitable time to develop solutions, that the roles being assigned to the current deans were indeed not permanent. In his considered view, direct input at this time on a longer-term, permanent structure would not have led to permanent appointments with suitable resources and support in place. He had met already with a group of faculty in December and had similar conversations with them. He was not ready to make a permanent decision, and intended to allow the Senate to participate fully. Such transitional structures are similar to those applied elsewhere and could allow for full discussion and informed decisions, not impede them. If, however, the perception was otherwise, it was a genuine concern he would wish to address.

One senator commented positively that the plan allowed for streamlined, compartmentalized decision-making, with the Dean of Faculty responsible primarily for appointments and resource management, the proposed Associate Vice President for
Undergraduate Education responsible for the core and planning, and the dean of the graduate school responsible for research. The Senator asked how the relationship among the deans would be defined and their work coordinated. Dr. Freedman explained that coordination was an issue and after discussion with the deans he intended the Committee on Undergraduate Strategic Planning (CUSP), which would include CBA, to provide a forum for implementing broad policies. If this group is to be influential, a single dean, the new Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education, would be best assigned primary administrative responsibility because such administration could prove cumbersome for a group of deans. The same applied to strategic planning and initiatives, which are difficult to implement and involve coordinating several faculty groups. Although the deans see this as part of their role, Dr. Freedman thinks it is better to have one dean responsible for such coordination. Among the deans, there was division on how duties should be assigned. The Dean of Faculty had favored a stand-alone role for the office, which would provide general coordination for Arts and Sciences departments. The new office of Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education would cover such coordination. A Senator noted that separating personnel decisions and undergraduate coordination would create tensions. Dr. Freedman responded that such tensions existed currently. For instance, the Dean of Faculty meeting with a department might reach a decision, but other deans did not approve of this role for the Dean of Faculty. The challenge would be to improve the way such administrative decisions were made. Other Senators asked whether the planned consolidation and distribution of duties added too much to the already considerable burdens of the deans.

One Senator suggested that Dr. Freedman meet with department chairs to solicit their views and the suggestion was supported by other Senators. Dr. Freedman concluded his remarks in noting that, as recommended by the Senate, he would seek to meet with the Arts and Sciences chairs to review the transitional proposal before finalizing any decisions. Senate President Reidenberg invited senators to communicate any additional comments to Dr. Freedman.

(b) Magis Fellows proposal. Dr. Freedman then turned to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. David Stuhr, to present and comment on a proposal for Magis Fellows. Senate President Reidenberg introduced the topic for Dr. Stuhr by reviewing the history of the proposal noting that in resolutions adopted in April 2006 and January 2007, the Senate had reviewed the procedures for the appointment of Distinguished and University Professors, and asked Academic Affairs to provide a rationale and procedures for the Magis Fellowships that had been proposed in the Strategic Plan. Dr. Stuhr then reported that the current proposal was not being returned to the Senate as quickly as had been hoped, but this was the last term for the Magis Fellows appointed in the fall 2005. In order to develop and continue the program without gaps, Academic Affairs was proposing the two-year plan to the Senate as a way to test the procedures prior to any statutory change. The plan provides for the appointment of 5-7 Magis Fellows each year from among the pool of recently-tenured associates. Magis Fellows would hold the fellowship for a period of three years during which time they would
receive course reductions and research support ($3000 annually). Based on this initial experience, the program and procedures for appointment would be reviewed for appropriate statutory amendments. This trial plan developed by Academic Affairs was deliberately modeled on the procedures approved for the appointment of Distinguished Professors and included faculty in the nomination and recommendation of fellows. Dr. Freedman added that the goal was to emphasize a process that was best for the faculty and would reflect the positive intentions of the President.

Senators commented that the fellowships could play a role in retaining junior faculty and the role of faculty in making such appointments was appreciated, although even more substantial research funding would help. Others asked whether there should be a limit on the number of nominations, to which the response was that the intention was not to limit nominations, hence the option of self nomination. A Senator commented that departments would be acting reasonably, therefore, in nominating every eligible member, although it was noted that this would then be ceding academic discretion to the nomination committee.

Several senators then commented that the entire process was rushed. The Senate had been provided with the proposal only on the previous day, and many wanted to reflect on the proposal or consult their constituencies before commenting. Would, for instance, it be appropriate to insist on a proportional distribution of fellowships among departments? The name was also questioned, since magis is a specific term in the Jesuit tradition and not what was meant by the fellowships. Was the original intention to reward service, and if so, how was it recognized in the proposal? Other Senators noted, however, that the discussion and concept were not new and the Senate had already provided Academic Affairs with considerable feedback. In addition, an interim implementation would allow for clarifications to be incorporated in the statutes after thorough review and testing. The statutes for the appointment of Distinguished Professors appear, for instance, to need clarification because of seeming anomalies such as a lack of role for the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (others noted, however, that this was deliberate and intended to preserve the appointment authority presented in the previous statutes). As procedures were modified, those for Magis Fellowships could be modified in parallel before being finalized in the statutes.

Discussion then focused on the underlying principles and plan. Senators commented that 5-7 appointments represented a large percentage of eligible faculty, and had the potential to create more divisiveness and retention problems than it addressed. The resources might more effectively be directed toward lesser improvements for the entire cohort, perhaps through mechanisms already in place such as research course reductions or research funds, which were widely understood, accepted and thoroughly accountable. Another option would be to stress greater selectivity, which would not create undesirable distinctions that might perpetuate faculty doubts about administrative motives. Others noted that such competition might not be bad.
Dr. Freedman commented on the timing of the proposal, and expressed a willingness to wait if that was the Senate’s recommendation. It was important, however, to act if appointments were to be made this year. Dr. Freedman summed up the discussion by commenting that Academic Affairs had been asked by the Senate to make a proposal and develop a procedure for appointment. He had been assuming this was mostly procedural, but now realized there were other faculty concerns with the concept, and it might have to be rethinked. He would discuss the issue with Fr. McShane, who had asked for clarifications in order to make appointments next year.

7. Report of the Faculty Life Committee

Senator Anne Mannion, chair of the Faculty Life Committee, presented the final report of the committee (Executive Summary attached as Appendix II, full report to be available through <http://www.fordham.edu/senate>). Many of the recommendations had been approved in earlier presentations to the Senate (i.e., recommendations nos. 1-7 on p. 29), but Dr. Mannion drew the Senate’s attention to recommendations 8 and 9 on discrimination and mentoring:

“8) **Discrimination.** The committee recommends that the university create a specific plan addressing issues of professional conduct, including, but not limited to discrimination broadly defined.

9) **Mentoring.** The committee recommends that the SVPAA/CAO provide a report to the Faculty Senate on specific mentoring activities by school or academic division.”

Dr. James Wilson, a member of the committee and guest of the Senate, commented on the findings with respect to discrimination, noting that the committee had grouped responses by tenure status and gender but needed to aggregate responses across schools and units in order to preserve confidentiality. In the report, discrimination was defined broadly to include gender, sexual and racial categories. Among the responses, a high percentage had experienced “some experience” of discrimination, which was a matter of concern. The report did not, however, include specific recommendations regarding how the Senate and administration could address the concern, but avenues of appeal and redress should be considered.

In discussion of the report, Senators asked for further information and clarifications on several points. Responses noting discrimination on the grounds of gender were higher among female than male respondents, but the term should not be confused with sexual discrimination. For instance, a higher percentage of female than male faculty share offices, which might be discriminatory, but would not be sexual harassment (see Table 4 in the report). The findings of discrimination, though similar to those in other universities, were particularly troubling, and Senators asked how they could be highlighted.

Senators asked what the most useful follow up to the report should be, both by the Senate and the Administration. Senate President Reidenberg responded that many of the recommendations had already been passed and deadlines set. They would be acted on, although the relevant committees had been slow in forming this semester. For the current meeting, the first order would be a
resolution thanking the committee; the Senate could then resolve to accept the report, affirm its recommendations, and instruct the Senate President to distribute the report to the faculty and administration. The recommendations could then be assigned to the appropriate bodies for implementation. Responses could vary; for instance, the report of discrimination (no. 8) would require an administrative response, but recommendations for mentoring (no. 9) would be more discretionary. Senators recommended further that the resolution include a timetable for reviewing the responses and follow up. Dr. Wilson noted the Senate could review the data provided in the report and ask if further recommendations should be made. Dr. Wilson explained, however, that some areas lacked baselines suitable for framing recommendations; for instance, responses on disabilities, unlike those on gender, could not be assessed as percentages of a group.

After this discussion, the following motion was adopted:

   The Faculty Senate thanks the Faculty Life Committee and, in particular, Dr. James Wilson for the work on this report.

   (Vernon/Massa, 17:0:0)

The Senate further moved the following resolution:

   The Faculty Senate accepts the Faculty Quality of Life Report and its recommendations for distribution by the President of the Senate to the faculty and administration, and the Senate requests comment from the Administration on the recommendations and implementation plans with a status report to the Senate by May 1.

   (Massa/Blumberg, 17:0:0)

Dr. Freedman commented that informal discussions on the report had already begun with the president and legal counsel, and he was looking forward to formal receipt of the proposal. Dr. Freedman respected the deadline and considered it appropriate.

8. Report of the Salary and Benefits Committee

Senator Bruce Berg, chair of the Salary and Benefits Committee, reported that the expanded committee had met in February. All the subcommittees were formed and beginning to meet. The subcommittee on benefits would be considering in particular questions of housing; the salary subcommittee was reviewing the 80th-percentile benchmark and alternatives; and the data management subcommittee was considering questions of salary compression between ranks and the intercampus differentials among Arts and Sciences faculty.

In discussion, Senator Keller followed up on questions from the last senate meeting and asked how the decision to limit pension plans to TIAA-CREF and Fidelity was reached. Senator Berg
would ask Human Resources to re-investigate viable options. Senator Sen asked if the data subcommittee could disaggregate salary averages by school. Senator Schwalbenberg affirmed that the committee was in the process of doing so.

9. Old Business

Senate President Reidenberg announced that the question of faculty development and responses to the Strategic Plan discussed at the meeting on February 1 had been reviewed by the executive committee, as proposed. He would be reporting on their discussion at the April meeting.

10. New Business

The Senate moved acceptance of the nominations for the University Research Council:

Resolution

The Faculty Senate nominates the following candidates for Presidential appointment to the University Research Council:

Arts & Sciences--Rose Hill (3 vacancies each for a 3 year term)

- Ipsita Banerjee, Ph.D (Ass’t Professor, Chemistry)
- Michael Baur, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, Philosophy)
- Benjamin Crooker, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, Physics)
- Damien Lyons, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, Computer & Info Sci.)
- Darryl McLeod, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, Economics)
- Nina Rowe, Ph.D (Ass’t Professor, Art History & Music)
- Troy Tassier, Ph.D. (Ass’t Professor, Economics)

Arts & Sciences—Rose Hill (1 vacancy for leave-replacement)

- Catherine Batt, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, English)
- Glenn Hendler, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, English)

Arts & Sciences--Lincoln Center (1 vacancy)

- Monica Rivera Mindt, Ph.D (Ass’t Professor, Psychology)
- Arthur Werschultz, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor, Math & Computer Science)

Graduate School of Education (1 vacancy)

- Jairo Nelson Fuertes, Ph.D (Assoc. Professor- Magis, Counseling)
- Chun Zhang, Ph.d (Assoc. Professor, Curriculum & Teaching)
11. Announcements

(a) Senate President Reidenberg announced that the report and discussion with the Vice President for Technology, Dr. Frank Sirianni, would be deferred to a future meeting.

(b) In the fall semester, Dr. Nancy Busch, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Chief Research Officer and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, had reported on the research grants awarded to the faculty and university. Senate President Reidenberg announced that Dr. Busch reported an additional 20 research grants have been awarded from agencies such as the N.I.H, New York State, the Internal Revenue Service, and that these awards ranged from $10,000 to $950,000.

At 3:34pm, the meeting adjourned (Mannion/Chase).
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1) Q. What do you do if you have an emergency in class?

Answer:

Our Fordham University Emergency Management Plan is detailed on our website’s Safety and Security link http://www.fordham.edu/campus_resources/safety_security/index.asp. There are a number of appendices, which more specifically list key Administrative Staff from various University Department / areas, and their responsibilities during an emergency. Department appendices are part of our plan to provide recalls and guidelines for the University to operate during a crisis. For us to be truly successful in emergency management, faculty involvement is essential.

Faculty have specific expertise, which can provide important assistance and adult responsible leadership for our students during a crisis. We will attempt to provide our faculty and students with the most current accurate information possible. The specific event will dictate whether it is most appropriate to "shelter in place", move students to designated campus buildings, or to follow evacuation plans determined by the Office of NYC Emergency Management. Faculty may also be requested to accompany their students to the campus "shelter in place" locations. Obviously simply dismissing classes without accountability would not be helpful. While we cannot mandate that people follow the University’s recommendation, we will attempt to provide the community with the best information available at that time. We will monitor events, transportation and traffic to assist our faculty, students and staff to make informed decisions.

The University has Emergency Operations Centers located at each campus. These E.O.C.’s are only activated during an emergency event as detailed in our Plan. At Rose Hill it is the Safety / Security building at Thebaud Annex. At Lincoln Center it is the McMahon Hall ground floor Residential Life Offices. At Marymount it is the Facilities Operations Offices in Rita Hall.

Emergency Operations Centers will be responsible for transmitting all internal and external communication for the University during major emergency events. University resources available to us include the following;

1. Send a Magnalert Voice or Text Message to all listed emergency contacts for students, faculty, staff and parents.

2. Interrupt Campus Cable TV stations to provide alert.
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3. Fordham Channel 3 - Security has the capability to override the broadcast and provide emergency information on a scrolling message at the bottom of the screen.

4. Utilize Public Address Systems where available at Rose Hill (Keating Hall and Faculty Memorial Hall) and Lincoln Center.

5. Issue a system-wide broadcast telephone voice mail. This will enable a voice mail message to be left on the Fordham University phone system.

6. Send Group cast e-mails to all students, faculty and staff.

7. Update the University Emergency Telephone # 877- 375- HELP as needed. This number will be used to provide faculty, students and staff with accurate information during a major emergency.

8. Update University Home Web Page at www.fordham.edu as needed.

9. Use of bull horns.

10. WFUV to broadcast live emergency information.

During a major emergency faculty may call our Emergency Operations Centers with questions and speak to the Security Administrator at the following numbers:

   Rose Hill – 718-817-2222
   Lincoln Center – 212-636-7100
   Marymount – 914-332-8375

We welcome your reply with any ideas or suggestions as to how you specifically can be more involved. One example is in the event of an emergency during class, faculty will be requested to provide an attendance list and have it delivered to the aforementioned Emergency Operations Center on their respective campus. Another example may be our Psychology, Sociology or Social Work professors working with our Counseling Professionals to provide assistance to the University community during the emergency. Please e-mail me at jcarroll@fordham.edu with your recommendations.

Fordham is part of a consortium of private Universities and we will have a staff person seated inside the N.Y.C. Emergency Operations Center to provide us with accurate up to date information during major N.Y.C. emergency events. Fordham Security is updated continually from the N.Y.C. Office of Emergency
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Management, the N.Y.P.D. through our NYPD Shield membership and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

2) Q. How to register a phone/cell for emergency messages?

Answer:

Faculty should contact Human Resources to register and they can e-mail any changes to HRISinfo@fordham.edu or write to Human Resources, Faculty Memorial Hall, 441 E. Fordham Rd, Bronx NY, 10458, attn: DeMarie Cardona and include all the following:

- Your Emergency Home Phone Number
- Your Emergency Cell Phone Number
- Emergency Contact Name
- Emergency Contact Relationship
- Emergency Contact Cell/Home Number
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fordham University has established a number of strategic goals for the next decade, many of which are intended to elevate Fordham’s national reputation and visibility. The Faculty Senate firmly believes that the faculty body is integral to achieving those goals. As a consequence, it is important to understand the issues that affect faculty satisfaction with and attitudes about their work environment, and especially those that are directly related to faculty recruitment and retention. As the primary advocate of faculty issues and concerns within the university, the Fordham University Faculty Senate recognizes that there are substantive issues that are of concern to all faculty, and that there are important issues that may be specific to various subpopulations within the university community. In the fall of 2005, the Faculty Senate authorized and tasked the Senate’s Faculty Life Committee with exploring various dimensions of faculty life. The Faculty Life Committee developed a “quality-of-life”, or “climate” survey (hereafter, FQOL) and administered it to all tenured and tenure-track Fordham faculty in March/April 2007. The survey broached a number of issues that were considered to be of critical interest in faculty recruitment and retention based on previously developed faculty surveys and discussions within the Faculty Life Committee. Key findings from the survey include:

Institutional Commitment and Satisfaction

- Eighty percent of all Fordham faculty believe that their careers are progressing satisfactorily or very well.
  - However, about 25% of untenured women and 20% of untenured men express some level of overall job dissatisfaction.
  - In addition, more than one-third of untenured faculty give considerable thought to leaving Fordham.

- Substantial proportions of both tenured and untenured faculty report having shared office space during the past year at all campuses.
  - Faculty overwhelmingly indicated lack of community space as especially problematic—this is also tied to the perception of lack of community at Fordham in general.
  - For untenured faculty, lack of office/research space is an especially important concern.

Culture and Climate

- Eighty-five percent (85%) of Fordham faculty report being satisfied with the degree of academic freedom within the university.

- Forty-five percent (45%) of women and persons of color report being subject to behavior that is clearly unprofessional in a work environment (i.e., discrimination broadly defined as bias, favoritism, prejudice, intolerance and/or harassment).
Approximately 70% of those who report experiencing such unprofessional conduct indicate that they felt that they had no ability to address such incidents.

- Nearly 80% of untenured faculty expressed this feeling.

**Research**

- Research is clearly very important to faculty at Fordham.
  - Faculty also perceive a lack of institutional support for research activities—these include such issues as competing demands for teaching and service-related activities without sufficient resources for all, and the lack of an effective institutional office for research and grants.

**Compensation and Other Benefits**

- Approximately 60% of faculty express dissatisfaction with the salary and overall benefits.
- Although substantial numbers of faculty cite NYC as a place they want to be, they also indicate in large numbers the problems associated with cost-of-living, housing, and long commutes.
- Faculty see various forms of faculty assistance or benefits as essential when working at Fordham
  - About 90% indicate the importance of housing subsidies or low interest loans
  - Ninety percent (90%) cite the importance of college tuition assistance
    - Nearly 90% of untenured faculty also indicate primary/secondary school tuition assistance compared to 60% of tenured faculty
  - Slightly more than 80% of untenured faculty indicate onsite/near-site childcare as important compared to 70% of tenured faculty
  - Nearly two-thirds of all respondents see spouse/partner employment assistance as important
  - Both short-term course reductions and moving expenses are seen as priorities for new faculty members.

**Recommendations**

Given the survey findings, the Faculty Life Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate consider the following initial recommendations in part or in full:

1) **Teaching Load.** The committee strongly supports the University’s efforts regarding the implementation of an across-the-board University-wide reduction in faculty teaching load. This is an important aspect of faculty development for many reasons, including the advantages that it would confer for better teaching and for greater availability of faculty to students, for additional opportunities for research and scholarly publication, and for enhancing the academic quality and prestige of the University. It is already evident that the University’s commitment to reducing faculty teaching load has had a positive
influence in allowing departments to hire those whom they identified as first-choices. We also expect that the implementation of this plan would assist with faculty retention.

2) **Suitable Informal/Community Space on Each Campus.** The faculty survey underscores a substantial dissatisfaction by all categories of respondents with the lack of such facilities. Mindful of the severe limitations at LC we support the build-out of a larger space for the faculty dining room, combined with its availability for faculty use when not in service as a dining area. At RH, we recommend that provision be made for the use of Duane Commons as a faculty lounge, able to be reserved for other functions, but managed to accommodate the faculty.

3) **Suitable Work Space for Faculty.** Lack of suitable office and research space dominated the concerns of the untenured faculty as well as tenured women. A significant number of full-time tenured faculty shared office space with colleagues and adjunct faculty. Shared office space can clearly have a detrimental impact upon those faculty who carry substantial advisement and/or mentoring responsibilities as well as those who use this space for research and writing.

4) **Housing Assistance.** The University must address the question of housing assistance, especially for the newly hired. While the prospect of a professional career in NYC is a strong positive in faculty recruitment, the cost of living (and particularly the cost of housing) is an equally strong negative. The FQOL survey presented several possible approaches (housing subsidies, low-interest loans, etc.) – all of which were valued as important initiatives by at least 80% of all faculty.

5) **The Committee refers a wide range of benefits issues (see Figures 3, 4, 5) to the Salary and Benefits Committee for further action.**

6) **Institutional support for Research.** The Committee asks the VPAA’s Office to review the existing overall institutional support for research. The committee was particularly concerned that a significant proportion of the faculty – especially the untenured – indicated that the lack of research support was a consideration in a potential decision to leave Fordham. Ten percent (10%) of the tenured faculty concurred. Financial and technical support, structural and staffing considerations and overall institutional recognition that these are priorities are fundamental. The Committee views support for research as an investment in Fordham’s future and consistent with the direction to which both Fordham and its faculty aspire.

7) **Workload.** The University should undertake a comprehensive look at the percentage of classes taught by staff other than full-time tenured and tenure track faculty. Although
only tangentially addressed here, questions concerning the use of clinical instructors, adjuncts, post-doctoral teaching fellows, visiting faculty, etc. seem to be emerging with greater frequency. Part of the issue here seems to involve the deferral of increasing the number of full time faculty lines to match the growth in student population in recent years. However, the increased use of such positions creates an environment where tenured and tenure-track positions are bearing a greater burden in terms of workload not assigned to such positions (e.g., student advising, committee work, etc.). This issue is further compounded however, by the need to have adequate faculty to compensate for the reduction in faculty teaching loads.

8) **Discrimination.** The committee recommends that the university create a specific plan addressing issues of professional conduct, including, but not limited to discrimination broadly defined.

9) **Mentoring.** The committee recommends that the SVPAA/CAO provide a report to the Faculty Senate on specific mentoring activities by school or academic division.
1. Call to Order

Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order at 12:50pm.

2. Opening Prayer.

Senator Joseph Koterski, S.J. delivered an invocation. The Senate observed a moment of silence out of respect for the late Rita Guare, Ph.D, a former President of the Faculty Senate who served first as adjunct instructor in 1988, earned her Ph.D. from Fordham in 1991, and then was a member of the full-time faculty of the Graduate School of Education since 1993. The Senate then also observed a moment of silence for Martin Luther King Jr. on the fortieth anniversary of his death.

3. Reading and approval of the minutes.

The Senate approved (10:0:8) a motion to approve the minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting of March 7, 2008 (Acevedo/Vernon).

4. Matters presented by the President of the University.

After paying testimony to Rita Guare for her many contributions to the University, including her work as a President of the Faculty Senate, Father Joseph McShane, S.J. addressed the Senate on the topics of admissions, development, and faculty life and compensation.

(a) Admissions. The University has received approximately 23,800 undergraduate applications this year, an increase of seven and a half per cent. The quality of the applications remains high across all three undergraduate schools. The University has accepted a small percentage of the approximately 7,000 applicants in the early action pool, which tends to have very high quality applications; the SAT average for those accepted from this group is about 1290. By the end of
April 2008, Fordham plans to have accepted a class whose average SAT will show a rise of 10 to 15 points, while remaining steady in regard to diversity and geographic distribution. The effect of changes in the nation’s economic situation on the yield rate is not yet clear, but the University is prepared to be flexible with regard to our discount rate.

Fr. McShane noted that one factor complicating the situation is the challenge that New York State faces with regard to balancing its budget. Still at issue in the budget negotiations are the fate of the TAP and HEOP programs (both of which provide direct aid to students) and the Bundy program (which provides a small amount of aid directly to universities). The public institutions have been lobbying against the provision of any aid to private institutions. There is also concern about the fate of the 4-to-1 match program for building construction. We would qualify for about $4.6 million if this program remains in place.

(b) Development. The University has raised about $180 million this fiscal year and is hoping for over $200 million before end of June 2008. Among other gifts there are anticipated donations for several more endowed chairs, including one in Orthodox theology, and probably one in American history, with the possibility of donors for still others. But the current economic situation has slowed the completion of these gifts as donors continue to assess the fiscal situation.

(c) Faculty Life and Compensation Issues. Fr. McShane reported that he perceives some overlap between the recently submitted report of the Faculty Life Committee Report and the soon-to-be completed report of the consultant on faculty compensation. He discussed the merits of attempting to reconcile the two reports in some way, especially by way of prioritizing the concerns mentioned in these documents. Some of the issues raised in the Faculty Life Committee’s report (such as the questions about discrimination) need to be addressed immediately, but others may require further time to work out (such as office space). He will plan to discuss this topic with the Senate again in September 2008.

In the ensuing discussion with the Senate, Father McShane also reported on the status of efforts to have New York State provide low-interest student loans. He said they were making progress with the previous administration, but that this discussion will need to begin again afresh with the new administration, for there has been a thorough change of staff in the Governor’s Office. The Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities has listed this loan-interest loan program as third among its priorities after the protection of TAP and HEOP programs. Father McShane also noted the importance of not having a single-party government in Albany as in the best interests of private education, for the division of control tends to keep some legislators committed to the protection of upstate and of private institutions.

In reply to a question about the timeline for construction at Lincoln Center, Father McShane explained various details about the review process that the City conducts. The University hopes to break ground in January 2009 at the latest, for every month of delay means increased construction costs. He also noted that the real estate market in Manhattan has been bucking national trends, and that the continued strength of this market should increase the value of the sale of our property when the actual transfer occurs.
5. Reading of Important Communications.

Senate President Reidenberg noted that the Office of Human Resources (HR) will send a clarification to the faculty regarding the notice of the Roth 403(b) pension savings option. The original HR notice only mentioned Fidelity. According to HR, TIAA/CREF does not yet have the capacity to implement the changes, but HR will inform the faculty that this option will become available with TIAA/CREF as soon as it is able to implement the Roth 403(b).

He also called the attention of Senators to a handout from the Office of Research, indicating that various faculty members had received about $7 million in grants during the last quarter. (See attached Appendix I).

Lastly, he reported that Dr. Jim McCabe, Director of University Libraries, has indicated that there are plans to provide some shelving in the reserve room area to replace the shelving lost when the periodicals room was converted to museum use.

6. Matters Presented by the Senior Vice President & Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Stephen Freedman.

After thanking the Senate for its candid discussion at the last meeting regarding the decanal organization of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, Dr. Freedman reviewed the discussions that he has conducted with department chairs and deans. He noted that he will shortly be sending a communication to Arts & Sciences (A&S) faculty about the appointment of an interim Dean of A&S Faculty for academic year 2008-2009 and that he will begin a national search (open to internal and external candidates) for an independent Dean of A&S Faculty as soon as possible. He thanked the Senate for its discussion of the matter and explained that he continues to hope for organizational changes that will benefit the University, its students, and faculty in this sphere.

Dr. Freedman then informed the Senate that on Monday April 7, 2008 he will announce the appointment of Dr. Joel Reidenberg as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Chief Academic Officer, effective July 1, 2008. Dr. Freedman explained how important this appointment is for his own hopes of best serving decision-making at the University in the areas of academic and budget planning and for the need to provide a presence for his office on the Lincoln Center campus. The primary responsibilities will include improving the efficiency through which the Office of Academic Affairs functions, especially in supporting the various offices under the direction of Academic Affairs, and will evolve. Dr. Freedman noted the great loss this will be to the Faculty Senate, especially in light of the projects that Dr. Reidenberg had set as special goals during his term as President of the Faculty Senate, but explained that he felt it important to announce the appointment at this time, so that the Senate can have time to plan for new leadership. Dr. Freedman also noted that he had consulted with the Law School, with the senior administrators, and with his own office in preparing for this appointment. Dr. Reidenberg will remain a tenured member of the Law School faculty and hopes to teach there as time allows and to continue a research agenda through his directorship of the Center on Law and Information Policy. Finally, Dr. Freedman indicated that we can expect there to be other restructuring and other personnel changes in addition to what has already been done, but that this will be announced at a later date, after further consultation.
Many Senators indicated by their comments their esteem for Dr. Reidenberg and their appreciation for Dr. Freedman’s plans. In the ensuing discussion, Dr. Freedman explained that there are other Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs: Dr. David Stuhr, who deals specifically with personnel, and Dr. Ron Jacobson, whose primary duties for the next two years will revolve around Fordham Westchester.

Senate President Reidenberg noted the mixed feelings with which he will leave the Senate and thanked Dr. Freedman for the honor of this appointment. This part of the discussion concluded with a round of applause.

7. Report of Committees
   
   Salary & Benefits (S&B). Senator Bruce Berg developed the point made earlier in the meeting by Father McShane about the report on faculty compensation. The final meeting of the consultants and the S&B representatives will take place on April 18, 2008. Senator Berg explained that the report still does not provide the information that had been hoped for at the outset, namely, tangible benchmarks regarding some of our aspirant institutions for purposes of comparison. But in some benefit areas the report does give a catalog of what some other universities are doing, and thus the report could help in thinking about our options regarding housing, retiree health benefits, etc. The report will be public and could be distributed.

   In the ensuing discussion about what we can learn from this experience, Senator Berg explained that when this consulting firm was chosen over two other competitors, there was a consensus among the faculty representatives and the representatives of the administration that this firm had the greatest potential for being able to get the relevant disaggregated data from aspirant universities. As it turned out, the other institutions in questions simply refused to give us any of the relevant data. In the consulting firm’s presentation, the executives gave the impression of having successfully done this sort of project before; should this sort of consultation ever take place in the future, we will need to follow up the references more carefully in advance, e.g., by checking whether the institutions for whom a given firm has worked have been satisfied with the results.

   Senator Berg then explained that the March/April issue of Academe is not due for another two weeks or so. Once it is published, S&B will have the data needed to address compensation issues with the administration, for presentation at the Senate’s next meeting in early May.

   Senator Berg then reported on four recommendations to the Senate from the S&B Committee:

   (1) In light of the University’s decision to grant the 11% pension contribution to those hired on or after July 1, 2007 with commensurate/prior experience at another university, the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee recommends that faculty hired between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2007 receive an equivalent compensation adjustment.

   (2) Given that pension benefits granted to faculty making a lateral move from another university (see above) benefits a small and targeted group, the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee
recommends that monies going to fund this benefit not be counted towards the University’s achieving the 80th percentile for faculty compensation.

Senator Berg explained that these two resolutions were developed in light of a change made in the retirement plan made by the Trustees last year that was initiated by the administration without consultation of the Faculty Senate and without the Senate’s approval. The purpose of the first recommendation is to urge a special effort at compensation for a group of faculty who were not included in that change.

In the lengthy discussion that followed, the Senate took note not only of what some called the “significant but still relatively modest” amounts of money involved here but also of the problem of precedent presented by the unilateral nature of the change that took place without Senate consultation and approval. Senate President Reidenberg reviewed the exchanges that he previously reported to the Senate regarding his communications with the administration last summer on this matter as well as the apology that he received from the administration and the commitment that he received that no such unilateral changes will be made in the future. He also indicated the good faith that the administration has shown in this area by subsequently requesting consultation in several other such matters.

After thoroughly vetting the issues raised in these recommendations and considering various possible ways of dealing with the issues, the Senate approved (22:0:0) the first recommendation (Berg/Nissim) and then approved (23:0:0) an amended version of the second recommendation (Berg/Nissim), so that its directives to the S&B committees are as follows:

(1) In light of the University’s decision to grant the 11% pension contribution to those hired on or after July 1, 2007 with commensurate/prior experience at another university, the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee recommends that faculty hired between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2007 receive an equivalent compensation adjustment.

(2) Given that pension benefits granted to faculty hired after July 1, 2007 making a lateral move from another university was implemented without consultation of the Senate, the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee recommends that monies going to fund this benefit not be counted towards the University’s achieving the 80th percentile for faculty compensation.

The Senate then considered two other recommendations from the S&B Committee. It approved (22:0:0) the following resolution (Berg/Vernon):

(3) The maximum dollar amount of the Flexible Spending Account (pre-tax dollars) for health/medical care should be raised from $5000 to $10,000.

Finally, after a concise presentation of the background material by Senator Nissim, the Senate approved (23:0:0) the following resolution (Nissim/Piotrkowski):
(4) Retired faculty eligible for Medicare be given the choice to purchase a Medicare supplemental care plan of their own choosing, and that the University reimburse those faculty up to an amount not exceeding the University’s net cost of the Aetna or Cigna Medicare supplemental plans (those plans currently offered by the University), whichever is greater.

In reply to a question about the status of the S&B Committee’s promised investigation of gender and equity issues in faculty salaries, Senator Berg explained that the committee charged with data collection is still in the process of getting the relevant data on this issue and on other issues, such as compression. After discussing a number of issues pertaining to the proper methodology for the analysis of the data, the Senate approved (22:0:1) the following resolution (Flicker/Vernon):

The Faculty Senate directs the S&B Committee to form a Taskforce by May 1, 2008 to gather data and report back to the Senate on gender equity in salaries by Nov. 1, 2008, using the AAUP’s methodology.

8. Old Business.

   Faculty Development Task Force. In response to the Senate’s discussion at the meeting on March 7, 2008, the Executive Committee prepared a draft statement entitled “Task Force on Faculty Development within the Mission of Fordham University.”

   After discussion of the main objectives being proposed for this taskforce, the Senate remanded the issue to the Executive Committee for further work. In its discussion the Senate noted the difficulties in producing a document that would be applicable across the various Schools of the University while noting the importance of fostering discussion about how the faculty see themselves as contributing to the mission that the Trustees set for the University and describing how the faculty see themselves and their work in relation to the Jesuit identity of the University. There was also discussion of the relation of this proposed taskforce to the work of the Faculty Life Committee.


   Smoking. Dr. Brian Byrne asked the Senate to identify three buildings with which we might start the process of finding ways to deal with smoking near the building entrances, not merely by posting signs but also by providing shelters and ashtrays. The Senate suggested that the process begin with Keating, Dealy, and Lowenstein.

10. Announcements.

    Senate President Reidenberg announced that the global change in the University’s web pages and the corresponding unavailability of the WAVES system for departmental work this week has slightly delayed the electronic posting of the materials on standards and procedures for merit, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but that this material should be accessible by late next week through links from the Faculty Senate’s webpage. From the links on the Senate web page, faculty will pull up a Blackboard sign-in page that verifies permission to view the documents and
once the faculty member enters his/her ID and password, the faculty member will be able to view the documents. There will be a notice to all faculty when the material is available.

Senate President Reidenberg also noted that a proposal from the Elections Committee regarding the use of campus mail for ballot distribution (with email notification) should be available for consideration at the next Senate meeting.

At 3:43pm, Senator Mannion moved the adjournment of the meeting.

Submitted by Joseph Koterski, S.J., Secretary of the Senate
### Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Napoli, Philip</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>phil</td>
<td>Phoebe Haas Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Internet Governance Forum: Conference Support</td>
<td>$7,158</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dubrovsky, Edward</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Molecular Basis of Juvenile Hormone Action in Insect Dev.</td>
<td>$100,063</td>
<td>$95,937</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ross, Robert</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>bio NIH/National Cancer Institute</td>
<td>Phenotypic Plasticity in Human Neuroblastoma</td>
<td>$119,471</td>
<td>$72,474</td>
<td>$191,945</td>
<td>see incr amt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ross, Robert</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>bio NIH/National Cancer Institute</td>
<td>Phenotypic Plasticity in Human Neuroblastoma</td>
<td>$29,486</td>
<td>$18,118</td>
<td>$47,604</td>
<td>$924,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rubin, Benish</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>NYC Department of Health &amp; Mental Hyg.</td>
<td>Investigate Therapeutic Modalities for Familial Dysautonomia</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wehr, John</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>bio</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>REU Site Proposal: Summer Undergrad Program</td>
<td>$69,739</td>
<td>$12,360</td>
<td>$82,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sternberg, Janet</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>cAlms</td>
<td>U.S. DoD/Force from U. Massachusetts</td>
<td>U.S. / Brazil Consortium: Building Social Responsible Leaders</td>
<td>$11,180</td>
<td>$896</td>
<td>$12,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cunningham, Maddy</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>SUNY @ Stony Brook / NYS DDS</td>
<td>Sexual Abuse Training for Child Welfare Staff - CC06</td>
<td>$100,191</td>
<td>$10,019</td>
<td>$110,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cunningham, Maddy</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>Westminster Dept Comm Mental Health</td>
<td>Early Step Forward Program</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cunningham, Maddy</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>NYC Department of Education</td>
<td>Training Delivers for Staten Island Family Assistants</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cunningham, Maddy</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>NYC Department of Education</td>
<td>Training Delivers for Brooklyn Family Assistants</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mitra, Sophie</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>eco</td>
<td>Vietnam Affairs Administration</td>
<td>Decomposition of Gender Diff. In Cholesterol Control w/est</td>
<td>$12,556</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mitra, Sophie</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>eco</td>
<td>Nathan Klein Inst Psychiatric Rsc/NH</td>
<td>Adapting a Health Capital Model, under Center</td>
<td>$12,809</td>
<td>$9,592</td>
<td>$22,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brownell, Patricia</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>John A. Hartford Fdn/NY Acad of Med.</td>
<td>Partnership Program for Professionalism in Elder Care</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Siddiqi, Asif</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Postdoc to the Global: The Making of Indian Space Progm.</td>
<td>$62,084</td>
<td>$35,912</td>
<td>$97,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Turan, Elif</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>Institute for Historical Studies / UT-Austin</td>
<td>Flashup: Univ of Texas @ Austin: Exploration of Global Borders</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dudaish, Susan</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>m/w</td>
<td>Medieval Institute @ U. of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Flashup: Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship in Medieval Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Stiber, Ellen</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>Eileen Fisher, Inc.</td>
<td>Mentoring Latinas – County Wide (student support)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Koterski, S.J., Joseph</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>phil</td>
<td>Institute for the Psychological Sciences</td>
<td>Visiting Fellow at Batchanars in Oxford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Koterski, S.J., Joseph</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>phil</td>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
<td>Bannan Fellowship for the Winter Quarter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shibaev, Piotr</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>phy</td>
<td>L'Oreal USA, Inc.</td>
<td>Novel Responsive Cholesteric Polymers for Cosmetic Applicat.</td>
<td>$35,004</td>
<td>$4,906</td>
<td>$39,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Panagopoulos, Costas</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>ps</td>
<td>Rockefeller Brothers Fund</td>
<td>Clean Elections: Public Finance Conference</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Higgins-D'Alessandro, A</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education to Rutgers</td>
<td>Evaluation: Character Education Program</td>
<td>$42,571</td>
<td>$3,406</td>
<td>$45,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nolan, J / Fuentes, Norma</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>psy</td>
<td>NIH / Ni of Health &amp; Human Dev</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity &amp; Psychological Adjustment among African...</td>
<td>$263,117</td>
<td>$68,197</td>
<td>$331,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Guare, Norma</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Children of Immigrants in School</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>O'Connell, Maureen</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>theo</td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>Sacred Beauty in Secular Blight: Community Murals...</td>
<td>$36,364</td>
<td>$3,636</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty total</td>
<td>$1,329,230</td>
<td>$400,280</td>
<td>$1,729,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Award Notices to the Office of Sponsored Programs
#### 3rd Quarter, 2007-2008
(includes December awards)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Notices to the Office of Sponsored Programs</th>
<th>3rd Quarter, 2007-2008</th>
<th>(includes December awards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I</td>
<td>Appendix I</td>
<td>Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,876,609</td>
<td>$445,528</td>
<td>$3,522,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting: 12:45 P.M., President’s Dining Room, Lowenstein Bldg, Lincoln Center

Excused: Senators Mark Chapman, Judith Jones, Walter O’Connor, Dominick Salvatore, Patricia Williams

Guests: Dr. John Hollwitz, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Martin Sanzari, Chair, Salary and Benefits Committee

Senate President Rita Guare called the meeting to order at 12:55 P.M. and invited Rev. Robert Cloney, S.J., to offer the opening prayer.

Matters Presented by the President of the University
Rev. Joseph A. O’Hare, S.J. thanked the Senate for an elegant and gracious evening at his retirement dinner. All schools and campuses were represented, a good omen in achieving unity.

He further commented that the diversity of his constituencies embodies some unusual differences. For example, when Fr. O’Hare went to bless the New York City Mounted Police, he met horse #105, renamed Officer O’Hare. Later that day, he was presented with a woven stole from Marymount College.

During his recent visit to Albany, Fr. O’Hare had the opportunity to do some lobbying. A strong consensus exists in both the Senate and the Assembly that most of the budget cuts relating to education will be restored. At this time, $3.5 billion has been allocated for capital projects for SUNY and CUNY. The Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities is proposing an initiative whereby an independent institution could match state funding at 3:1. This could be an investment in the future and an opportunity for economic development of New York State.

An honorary degree will be presented to the President of the Philippines, Gloria Macapagal Arroyo, on Wednesday, May 21, in the McNally Amphitheater.
Fr. O'Hare commented that progress on the radio tower is not as encouraging as he had hoped. A new site had been identified and gained community acceptance. Although the mayor of the municipality was enthusiastic, the legislature was not. Other sites have proved to be impractical for financial and technological reasons.

President Guare thanked Fr. O'Hare for his patience over the years and expressed hope that the new President would be as dedicated to the Senate as he.

Announcements by the President of the Faculty Senate
Senate President Guare informed the Senate that she and Senator Jones met with representatives from the Bookstore. C.J. Obregon told them that he was not aware of any particular incidents related to ongoing problems. President Guare reminded Senators of the necessity to be vigilant in making Mr. Obregon aware of serious issues relating to the bookstore. President Guare stressed the importance of having book orders submitted in a timely manner; however; she acknowledged that some of the problems are unrelated to timely submissions.

The Senate office is still waiting to hear from newly elected senators as to their willingness to serve on the Senate. They may email or telephone their decisions.

The organizational meeting of the Senate will be held on Tuesday, May 6, 2003.

Technology Report – Dr. Barry Rock, Chair of Technology Committee
Senator Rock, as Chair of the Technology Committee, addressed two main topics: infrastructure and internet capabilities. With respect to hardware, we are in good shape, especially since the installation of the fiber optic cable. One problem that does exist is that CIMS is under-resourced, as verified by two consultants. The benchmark is one computer technician for every 80 faculty; we are at approximately 1:160. It is possible that part of our ratio can be attributed to the amount of outsourcing that we do. Senator Rock commented that Vice President Charles Hodulik is committed to strategic planning and seeks faculty input. An item that is expected to be on next year’s agenda for Strategic Planning is Lotus Notes. The system is resource rich, but expensive and is not being used effectively.

Senators were given copies of a draft document, “Web Presence ANALYSIS,” prepared by Cindy Bonfini-Hotlosz, CIO of Jesuitnet. She sees WAVES as good technology that is not fully used here. The major problem we are facing is a lack of communication among the various web presences: marketing, administrative, and academic. The report contains both short and long term recommendations including:

- Establish a formal academic web presence.
- Create an academic web server linked to marketing.
- Establish a faculty committee to work with marketing.
Senator Rock commented that a member of the Technology Committee proposed the creation of different faculty sub-committees responsible for different aspects of web management and that they be coordinated by the main committee. President Guare suggested that it would be appropriate to wait until fall, when the new President arrives, before considering these issues.

On the motion of Nissim/Koterski the Senate approved the idea of having a separate server for academic use 19:0:0.

**Report of Salary and Benefits Committee – Dr. Martin Sanzari**

Dr. Sanzari distributed copies of the Committee’s recommendations, which include across the board increments of 3%, a merit pool to provide $750 to half the faculty, a compression supplement for associate professors, and a supplement from last year to bring assistant professors into the 80th percentile. He also reported on the meeting of a Salary and Benefits subcommittee with Dr. John Hollwitz, Mr. John Lordan, and Mr. Frank Simio. The discussion at that meeting centered on whether there should be a 4% increase in compensation. Senator Schwalenberg pointed out that the Committee members were under the impression that the 4% figure had been settled. Senator Rubin commented that Mr. Lordan felt 3% was sufficient to achieve the 80th percentile for all ranks. President Guare stated that the Salary and Benefits Committee wanted to solve the compression problem and not deal with the 80th percentile issue. At this time, the average salary differential between assistant and associate professors is about $8,000 and shrinking, so the compression issue cannot be ignored, especially when compared with the gap between associate and full professors. As a follow-up to the meeting, Mr. Lordan sent a letter to President Guare in which he stated that the 4% has been provided for, but 3% would have been adequate to achieve the 80th percentile.

The discussion that followed centered primarily on the extra 1% and the distribution of merit. President Guare commented that the 1% could not be tied to merit since the applications had already been submitted, and the faculty would have had to participate in such discussions in the Salary & Benefits Committee and then in the Senate. It is likely that we will be facing more intense negotiations of across-the-board/merit distributions in the future. Therefore, the Salary & Benefits Committee will need to be part of discussions much earlier in the year.

The following represents the recommendation from the Salary and Benefits Committee:

The distribution of monies shall take the form of a 3% across the board increase across the ranks. A $172,500 allotment will be set aside for the merit pool. This provides for a $750 distribution to half the faculty. A rank compensation supplement of $1,000 will be distributed per faculty member within the Associate Professor rank. There will be distributions made to Associate Professors who were promoted to Full Professor to ensure that they are equitably compensated.

On motion of Mannion/Balestra the recommendation was accepted 17:0:2.
Elections for Senate Committees

Tenure and Reappointment Appeals Committee (TRAC):

Results:
- Eric Chen - Graduate School of Education
- Mary Daly - School of Law
- James Lothian - School of Business

Salary and Benefits Committee:

Results:
- Bruce Berg - Fordham College at Rose Hill
- Sheldon Marcus - Graduate School of Education
- Henry Schwalbenberg - Fordham College at Rose Hill
- Falguni Sen - School of Business
- Patricia Williams - School of Business

The Faculty Senate Committee on Procedures for Informing Candidates for Contract Renewal and Tenure: Senate Response

Senator Guare asked Senators Michael Martin, Dominic Balestra and Berish Rubin to summarize the three positions of the Senate at the last meeting when Dr. Mark Caldwell presented the report. Senator Martin spoke in favor of the report. The report represents moving from a system of confidentially and no disclosure to one of providing disclosure to the candidate. He posed three questions: 1) What is to be disclosed? 2) When is it to be disclosed? 3) How are the participants to be provided assurance of confidentiality? The report has addressed all three, as well as providing proposed Statute changes.

Senator Rubin left before he restated some serious concerns with the document. However, Senator Balestra urged the Senate to consider substantive issues. The main concern that a few Senators expressed was that the majority of the faculty have not seen the report. Since the report represents a significant change, faculty should have a chance to discuss the report at a department/school meeting and provide feedback to the Senate. The following resolution was proposed:

The Senate accepts the draft document from the Faculty Senate Committee on Procedures for Informing Candidates for Contract Renewal and Tenure with the provision that the report be circulated to unit chairs for feedback to be given to the Senate before its October meeting.

On motion of Balestra/Vernon the resolution passed 17:0:0
Appendix I

**Salary Proposal**

Merit Fund $172,500

230 Faculty Members x $750 = $172,500

Across the board

Professors 157 x $2,700 = $423,900

Associates 188 x $2,080 = $391,040

Assistants 115 x $1,840 = $211,600

**Associate Rank Compression Supplement**

Associates 188 x $1,000 = $188,000

**Total = $1,387,040**

**Assistants 80th Percentile Supplement**

$241,500 Distributed evenly to 115 Tenure and Tenure Track Assistants.

Assistants 115 x $2,100 = $241,500
Meeting: 4:30 p.m. in the Walsh Library, Viewing Room #041, Rose Hill Campus

Excused: Senators Joseph Koterski, S.J., Falguni Sen, and Shapoor Vali

1. Call to Order
Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order at 4:40 pm.

2. Invocation
Senator Mark Massa, S.J., delivered the invocation.

3. Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2008-2009
(a) Senator Grace Vernon was nominated by Senators Bray and Berg to serve as President of the Senate for 2008-09 and approved by unanimous consent.
(b) Senator Joseph Koterski, S.J., was nominated by Senators Reidenberg and Procidano to serve as Vice-President of the Senate and approved by unanimous consent.
(c) Senator Richard Gyug was nominated by Senators Nissim and Bray to serve as Secretary of the Senate and approved by unanimous consent.
(d) Newly elected Senate President Vernon asked for confirmation of Senator Chaya Piotrkowski and Senator Henry Schwalbenberg to serve as members at large of the Executive Committee. The Senate confirmed them unanimously.

4. Announcements
Senate President Grace Vernon asked the new members of the Senate to introduce themselves, and thanked Senate President Joel Reidenberg for his initiatives and work during his year as President.

5. Report of the Salary and Benefits Committee
The Senate then moved into executive session for consideration of the ongoing salary negotiations (see the minutes of May 2, 2008).

At 5:30 pm, Senator Mannion moved the adjournment of the meeting.
1. Call to Order

Senate President Grace Vernon called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes from the Senate Meeting of May 2 and May 6

The minutes from the Senate meeting of May 2 were distributed and tabled until the next, regular meeting in order to enable Senators to review them.

The minutes from the Senate meeting of May 6 were distributed. The Senate approved a motion to accept the minutes (Saharia/Mannion, 18:0:1).

3. Report of the Salary and Benefits Committee

Senator Bruce Berg, chair of the Salary and Benefits Committee, reported on the continuing salary negotiations and distributed the proposals and counter-proposals received to date.

In keeping with the 4.5% placeholder established with the Administration in the fall 2007, the Salary and Benefits Committee proposed on April 25, 2008 the following increases in faculty salary:

A. Across-the-board salary increases distributed as follows:

   - Assistant professors $2950
   - Associate Professors $3200
   - Full Professors $4100

   (The across-the-board increases represent 3.83% of the mean non-law salary for each rank.)

B. A merit increment of $1200 for half the faculty.
C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.

D. A fund of $270,000 to address salary compression in the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks.

The Finance Office responded two weeks later, on May 7, 2007, that the placeholder should result in a 3% increase in the salary pool with the following result:

For the academic year 2008-2009, the University will increase faculty compensation as follows:

A. Across the board salary increases distributed as follows:
   - Assistant Professors $1800
   - Associate Professors $1935
   - Full Professors $2500

   (the across the board represents a 2.33% increase of the mean non-law salary for each rank)

B. A merit increment equal to $1200 for half the faculty.

C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.

D. No change in merit procedures.

This interpretation of the placeholder contradicted the Administration’s prior statements to the Senate as well as the administration’s practice.

After further communications between the Administration and the Salary & Benefits Committee, the Administration presented the following proposal on May 12, 2008 offering an aggregate 4.00% pool:

A. Across the board salary increases distributed as follows:
   - Assistant professors $2570
   - Associate Professors $2765
   - Full Professors $3575

   (The across-the-board increases represent 3.33% of the mean non-law salary for each rank.)

B. A merit increment of $1200 for half the faculty.
C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.

The Senate then moved into executive session for discussion of the proposals.

When the Senate came out of executive session, it proceeded with the following motions:

(i) Graduate School of Education Merit List

In order to provide merit in an instance of a specific tie in ranked merit applications, the Senate approved the following motion:

That the Graduate School of Education be allowed to award a merit increment to 50% plus 1 (faculty member) of its faculty.

(Berg/Jackson, 17:0:0, and 2 not-voting)

(ii) Computation of AAUP Benefits

Because of inexplicable trends in the proportion of benefits to salary and Fordham’s unusually high proportion of benefits to salary, the Senate approved the following motion:

The Faculty Senate requests that Academic Affairs meet with Human Resources to verify and explain the computation and amount of benefits that gets reported to AAUP; and that this information be reported to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by July 1.

(Berg/Mannion, 19:0:0)

(iii) Salary & Benefits Negotiations

On the recommendation of the Salary and Benefits Committee, the Senate adopted the following motion rejecting the administration’s proposal of May 12, 2008 as inadequate:

The Faculty Senate rejects the 4.0% proposed increase (the administration's proposal as of May 12) in faculty salaries for the 2008-09 academic year.

(Berg/Acevedo, 17:0:0, and 2 not-voting)

The Senate then considered a proposal recommended by the Salary and Benefits Committee that an acceptable settlement should provide for no less than a 4.3% increase in the salary pool distributed to include across the board salary increases for each rank of 3.83%, merit of $800, and promotion increments of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor. This recommendation removes the $270,000 amount to resolve compression issues from an agreement at this time. After the Committee’s discussions with the financial administration, the committee chose to remove the fund for compression on the understanding with the administration that the issue needed to be addressed and would be considered comprehensively in the fall. The Senate rejected the following proposal as inadequate, chiefly because of its adverse impact on the merit increment:

The Senate offer to accept a settlement for an increase in the total salary pool of 4.3% or above as follows:

A. Across the board salary increases distributed as follows:
Assistant professors $2950  
Associate Professors $3200  
Full Professors $4100  

(The across-the-board increases represent 3.83% of the mean non-law salary for each rank.)

B. A merit increment of $800 for half the faculty

C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.

(Berg/Balestra, 5:12:0, and 2 not-voting)

After a brief discussion, the Senate adopted the following motion, which would permit merit to be raised $200 above last year to $1000 (still below the $1200 awarded in the past) and would compensate faculty within the AAUP 80th percentile benchmark:

The Senate authorizes the executive committee to accept a salary settlement at 4.4% or above for salary increases:

A. Across the board salary increases distributed as follows:
   Assistant professors $2950  
   Associate Professors $3200  
   Full Professors $4100  

   (The across-the-board increases represent 3.83% of the mean non-law salary for each rank.)

B. A merit increment of $1000 for half the faculty

C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.

(Schwalbenberg/Mannion, 14:3:0, with 2 not-voting).

The Senate understood further that comprehensive discussions on compression would start in the fall. If the administration could not make a proposal within these terms, the Senate would take up the matter again in the fall.

Senate President Vernon then proposed to report the adopted resolution to Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs/Chief Academic Officer Stephen Freedman, and asked if the Senate would be willing to hear any observations that he might have on the negotiations. After discussion whether this would in effect vitiate the resolution approved above should there be an immediate offer of less than 4.4%, the Senate rejected a motion to adjourn (Nissim/Rubin 7:9:0), which
would have left the executive committee authorized to act over the summer only within the terms of the resolution above.

Senate President Vernon left and returned with Dr. Freedman, who reported on continued discussions within the Administration to find common ground for an equitable salary agreement with the Senate. He then discussed a proposal which includes: a salary settlement of 4.25%, which would include across-the-board salary increases at 3.83%; a merit increment of $750 for half the faculty; and a promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor. In addition, Dr. Freedman proposed to allocate dollars from the Strategic Initiatives Fund and create a one-time $450 faculty development fund for each faculty member who receives a merit award for 2008/09. As a reimbursement fund for faculty development purposes, this $450 amount would not become part of the base salary. This fund would not be guaranteed for subsequent years.

After discussion and considerable opposition to a merit increment of $750 representing a reduction from the $800 awarded in the present year, Dr. Freedman indicated that an adjustment would be made to ensure that the merit increment would be $800 for each of the 224 faculty members receiving merit awards, but would have to limit the corresponding faculty development fund for those awarded merit to $400. Dr. Freedman then left the Senate.

After discussion in executive session, the Senate approved the following resolution:

The Senate reconsidered its motion authorizing the executive committee to accept a salary settlement of 4.4% as approved above.

(Saharia/GoGwilt, 12:0:0, with 2 not-voting)

The Senate noted that Dr. Freedman’s proposal meets the AAUP 80th percentile benchmark, enables an across-the-board increase and preserves this year’s $800 merit award while providing an additional faculty development fund for those receiving merit.

In recognition of the efforts that Dr. Freedman made in supporting the faculty to the President and to the financial administration and to the results of this process, the Senate adopted the following resolution:

The Senate accepts a salary agreement as follows:

A. Across the board salary increases distributed as follows:

   Assistant professors $2950
   Associate Professors  $3200
   Full Professors       $4100

   (The across-the-board increases represent 3.83% of the mean non-law salary for each rank.)

B. A merit increment of $800 for half the faculty

C. A promotion increment of $2800 for those being promoted to rank of Associate Professor and $4000 for those being promoted to the rank of Full Professor.
D. A $400 faculty development fund for each faculty member receiving a merit award for 2008-09. This amount will not be added to base pay.

(Balestra/Saharia, 12:1:0, with 2 not-voting)

At 4:50 pm, Senator Mannion moved the adjournment of the meeting.