



FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Faculty Senate

Joseph M. McShane, S.J., Hon. President	William Baumgarth	Tracy Higgins	Harry Nasuti
Grace M. Vernon, President	Diana Bray	J. Patrick Hornbeck	Leonard Nissim
Andrew Clark, Vice President	James A. Cohen	Margo Jackson	Michael Pirson
Mary Ann Forgey, Secretary	G. Larry Farmer	Judith Jones	Barbara Porco
	Anne Fernald	Merle Keitel	Berish Rubin
	Christopher GoGwilt	Eve Keller	Aditya Saharia
	Richard Gyug	Micki McGee	Henry Schwalbenberg
		Barbara Mundy	

Ombuds Committee: Dr. Diana Bray/FCRH (ext. 1-4433) bray@fordham.edu
Dr. Leonard Nissim/FCLC (ext. 8-6331) nissim@fordham.edu
Dr. Berish Rubin/FCRH (ext. 1-3637) rubin@fordham.edu
Dr. Aditya Saharia.BUS (ext. 8-6286) saharia@fordham.edu

Meeting: O'Hare Special Collections,
4th Floor, Walsh Library,
Rose Hill Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Provost
Dr. Jonathan Crystal, Associate Vice President and Associate Chief Academic Officer

Excused: Senators Tracy Higgins, Judith Jones, and Aditya Saharia

Call to Order

At 12:50 PM the Senate President Grace Vernon called the meeting to order in O'Hare Special Collections, 4th Floor, Walsh Library, Rose Hill Campus.

1. Invocation

Senator William Baumgarth offered the invocation.

2. Matters Presented by the President of the University

After wishing everyone a Happy Easter and Happy Passover, the Rev. Joseph M. McShane, President of the University, presented on the following issues:

Retirement FAQ document: Fr. McShane reported that in response to Senator Eve Keller's request at the last Senate Meeting, he was able to move the development of the FAQ document along. He emphasized that he is concerned about this issue and that he wants to make sure that it gets done right. He requested Senator Eve Keller to provide an update to the Senate at the end of his report as to where things stand.

Fund Raising Campaign: Fr. McShane expressed his delight that the fundraising campaign for this year has come to a close with a total of 540 million having been raised. He pointed out that one full payer is equivalent of a million and a half endowment.

Enrollment: Fr. McShane reported that enrollment is 12% ahead of last year and provided the following breakdown by schools: FCLC 218 students (44% to its goal and barely keeping pace with last year) FRH

556 students (52% of its goal and running ahead of last year) Gabelli 209 students (about even with last year), Gabelli LC 45 students (90% to its goal).

Fr. McShane stated that the average SAT scores of students accepted thus far are off by 6 points. Since the goal is to have 5 point increases each year, the scores are off by 11 points. However, the average score could increase substantially since only half the class has signed on and the higher SAT scorers are the ones that hold back. Fr. McShane is also concerned about the new financial aid patterns of other schools. For example some of our competitors are giving packages of \$20,000 compared to our \$4000.

With regard to the professional schools, the Law School enrollment is sluggish. Graduate Social Service is doing well and is the strongest of the professional schools. Grad Education is still wrestling but this reflects a trend among these schools. Grad Business is being tracked closely, as this is a very challenging moment for them. Certain “niche” programs are doing well and others are missing the mark. Fr. McShane characterized the enrollment at Grad A & S as “thin.” Fr. McShane stated that this is an unusual moment in Fordham’s history with the Undergraduate Schools since they now make up 50% of the enrollment, compared to 38% when he first came to Fordham. At that time, the professional schools were much larger and were much more of the anchor, than they are now. Fr. McShane also noted that while our Undergraduate enrollment is one of our strengths right now, our competitors e.g. Holy Cross and Boston College, are experiencing declines in the size of the undergraduate schools. Given this trend, Fr. McShane cautioned that, although we are in good shape, we need to be sure that we are not caught off guard.

Washington: Fr. McShane referred to the requirements reported today in Inside Higher Ed on the current Administration’s insistence on requirements for teaching education. The education community is fighting back on these wrongheaded and punitive policies that hold schools and teachers responsible for the success and failure of students. This type of policy provides incentives for education graduates to only want to teach in wealthy areas, where the schools are well funded and the students are more prepared. This is a concern for Fordham because we are a school committed to preparing teachers to teach in underprivileged communities.

Funding Front: Fr. McShane reported that we have a total of 826 Pell recipients, approximately 23% of our undergraduate student body. The Pell funding has remained level but given the lost buying power over the last 5 years, the level of funding is actually less. HEOP is also in trouble. This is very concerning because both Pell and HEOP students are very important to us. There continues to be an interest in STEM but not enough money to support it. The Federal Government has increased slightly (2%) the Research and Development money. An increase in funding is proposed for the National Science Foundation (NSF) from 83 million to 7.26 billion but he believes that this probably won’t pass.

Fr. McShane summed up what is happening in Washington. There are pitched battles on the education front due to an increase insistence on 1) more regulation in higher education and 2) for performance evaluation’s based on the outcomes of job placement; job creation; and salary levels, when students enter the work force. In essence, Fr. McShane believes that these policies, now being pushed by the current Administration in Washington, whose members are all graduates of liberal arts colleges, are resulting in the reduction of education to work force preparation. Given this emphasis, large sums of monies are going to community colleges, rather than liberal arts colleges, to prepare students for specific jobs.

Discussion: Senators congratulated Fr. McShane on the success of the capital campaign. Senators questioned where the capital campaign stands in total? Fr. McShane responded that as of last month it was at 540 million. The money went into four different “buckets”: academic program assistance;

financial aid; endowed chairs; and facilities. According to Fr. McShane, we did well within the first three categories but not as well in facilities, which was disappointing. Fr. McShane believes this is due to the fact that “people invest in people”.

Senators asked how other institutions have been able to increase their financial aid packages so significantly. In response, Fr. McShane said that it was due to several factors. First, discount rates, that is, the net tuition discount rate for freshman is being increased. Second those institutions where a majority of their students are in STEM fields e.g. Santa Clara University are doing very well and as a result are able to redirect their undergraduate budgets. Third, many institutions are shaving money from other parts of the budget in order to increase their financial aid packages.

Fr. McShane asked Senator Keller to report on the status of the retirement FAQ. Senator Keller reported that a group of Senate and non-Senate members are in the process of putting together a list of questions. This draft has been sent to Mr. Perretti two weeks ago and hopefully a response draft will be forthcoming by mid-May. The plan is to then run this draft FAQ by S & B Committee, as well as others, to get a sense if there are any gaps. The goal is to have a finalized Retirement FAQ by the end of June. Fr. McShane stated that he has asked Senator Keller to copy him on all correspondence in relation to this. Fr. McShane ended by thanking the Senate for the honesty of the conversation and for the extraordinary work that the faculty does with our students.

3. Matters Presented by Dr. Stephen Freedman, Provost

Dr. Freedman began by thanking the Senate for its outstanding work on behalf of the University. Dr. Freedman then addressed the following agenda items:

Integration of the Business Schools: At the Board of Trustees meeting next week, the integration plan approved by the Business School faculty and the Faculty Senate will be put forth for a vote. Following this vote, an announcement will be made to inform the entire University.

A & S Restructuring: Dr. Freedman stated that he is continuing to listen to a range of faculty groups, as well as department and program chairs. He is also continuing to meet with various councils in order to get their perspective. At the RH Council, the pros and cons of doing a search for a permanent dean were explored. Given this process of seeking broader feedback from a wide range of faculty, he will need time to reflect and will be taking the summer to do so.

Closing of the Center for Teaching Excellence: Dr. Freedman explained that the decision to close the Center was based on the need to provide a greater faculty support structure for teaching. This support would be in relation to both pedagogy and technology resources. As he received feedback from faculty over several months, and from the Senate a year or so ago, he became less convinced that the current structure was effective in supporting faculty. The main question right now is whether it is possible to develop resources that could be made available to faculty in a more decentralized way, but still be unified in purpose and more impactful. He asked Senators to give him and Dr. Crystal feedback about this in the weeks ahead.

Senators expressed dismay that the decision to close the Center was done without consultation with the CORE Curriculum Committee, since CTE has been essential to CORE in its implementation, training etc. Senators asked Dr. Freedman how he intended to carry out the role that CTE played in creating the robustness of the CORE.

Dr. Freedman responded that he was indeed aware of the resources that would be necessary for CORE. He also acknowledged that CCC should have had more forewarning and been a greater part of the process. But he reiterated that he believed a better structure was needed to implement the resources and that he was concerned about the support needs of all of the schools. He wants to develop a structure comparable to CTE that could work with all of the schools in more integrated way. He does not want anyone to think that he is devaluing CORE and he does not expect to see budgets lowered for CORE, but rather he wants to give support to other places as well. He indicated that it wasn't a budget decision but rather a desire to be more impactful.

Senators again raised concerns about the abruptness of the decision, its compatibility with Cura Personalis, and the fact that when CTE was set up there was no assessment process built in. Dr. Freedman responded that the Faculty Senate itself had been critical of CTE. He stressed again that he was concerned about impact and the need to take a more comprehensive view of the resources needed both to teach on campus, online and in a blended learning. It will be important to look at what resources other institutions have available for teaching, and also to make data driven decisions.

Senators pointed out that CTE was underfunded from the beginning and therefore was not set up to succeed. It is unfortunate that it was shut down in the way it was. Senators urged Dr. Freedman to look at institutions that have robust resources for pedagogy, and to make sure that there is an assessment plan in place from the beginning. In response, Dr. Freedman acknowledged that the CTE was under resourced and agrees that assessment of impact will be key. He indicated that Dr. Crystal will play a dominant role in getting it right this time.

Senators questioned what resources will be available during this transition period. Dr. Freedman responded that the Administration will have to communicate how support services will be made available in the interim. Senators pointed out that some faculty had funds for this summer from CTE with matching funds from other parts of the University, which will now be cancelled. Dr. In response, Dr. Freedman stated that there will be support for projects that have already been funded. He asked that if there are other faculty's projects that have been affected by the closing, the plan is to enhance those funds, not to eliminate them.

Senators raised concerns about the amount of financial commitment the University is willing to put toward this. It was pointed out that the Blended Learning Committee has been looking at Georgetown's program, which has a staff of 25, and even with that amount of staffing, they believe that they are severely underfunded. Senators stated that the Administration must realize that "one person in an office does not a center make." Dr. Freedman agreed that it was unfair to expect one person to have the impact of 25. He believed that pointing out the example of Georgetown is appropriate, and that we do need to do better. He added that the two new task forces i.e. Blended Learning and Liberal Education are informing his thinking with regard to these decisions.

Senators pointed out that CTE did not benefit certain schools in anyway e.g. the Business School and therefore the decision to cut the program is one that faculty from these programs would congratulate the Provost on. However, Senators stated that it was not clear how much, if at all, performance measures are used in making these kind of decisions. There needs to be much more of a discussion about what measure(s) are being used for "excellence." Dr. Freedman acknowledged that he has heard about the need for engaging in this kind of discussion from a large number of faculty.

Senators pointed out that we need to be clearer about what inadequacies we are trying to correct with respect to teaching. There has really been no systematic study of this. Dr. Freedman suggested that the

Graduate School of Education might be able to take the lead on this. He asked the Senators from Graduate Education if there are leaders in their school that could help with this. Senator Keitel responded that she could bring this back to the Graduation School of Education for discussion.

Senators also asked Dr. Freedman if he would be willing to create another separate committee to explore this issue of measurement. Dr. Freeman responded that it would take time, but that he would be happy to do this.

Senators stated that before a new task force is formed it would be important to have Dr. Freeman report to us on the work of the other two task forces and how exactly they are informing this current conversation about teaching support and structures.

4. Reading and Approval of the Minutes

The Senate approved the minutes of the meeting of March 28, 2014, as amended (Cohen/, Porco) 20-0-1.

5. Announcements

Dr. Vernon announced that we have reached a final agreement with Fr. McShane on Courseload Relief and that the co-chairs of the Salary and Benefits Committee will report on this in more detail.

There will also be a need to have a meeting of the current senate before the new Faculty Senate meets. The current Senate, therefore, will meet at 4:00 pm on May 5th.

6. Salary and Benefits Report by Co-Chairs, Dr. Andrew H. Clark and Dr. J. Patrick Hornbeck

The Co-Chairs of the Salary and Benefits Committee reported on the following items:

Courseload Relief

The Co-Chairs reported that they are seeking the Senate's approval on a final version of the Courseload Relief policy, so that it can be voted on at next week's Board of Trustees meeting. The final version includes changes required by Fr. McShane based on a concern that faculty who take in short term foster care children may seek leave when the policy is meant for those who engage in long term foster care commitment. In response to this concern, the Co-chairs agreed to add the words "intended to last a minimum of twelve months" and at Fr. McShane's request also agreed to add the word "familial" before foster care, as an additional way to differentiate this type of care from short term foster care.

Senators raised concern about the term "familial foster care", pointing out that there was no such official term used within the foster care system, and therefore this term could create confusion about eligibility. For example, "familial foster care" could easily be confused with "kinship foster care" which is the official term for those families who take in foster children who are relatives. Since the proposed policy is not limited to this type of relative care, but also includes long term "non-relative" foster care, those providing this type of care may not realize that they are eligible. Senators recommended that at the very least the term "familial" be defined somewhere to avoid any confusion as to what type of care is eligible. Senators suggested that a FAQ be created as a way of clarifying any areas of the policy that might be confusing.

Senators also felt it was important to point out that the original proposal also included elder care. This part of the proposal was put on the "back burner" for pragmatic reasons but Senators recommended that it be revisited.

The Senate approved (20-0-1) the following motion (Hornbeck/Cohen):

The Senate approves the policy §4-05.11 (1) Courseload Relief (Appendix A). This approved policy, that includes all of Fr. McShane's required changes, will be voted on at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees on April 29, 2014.

Salary Negotiations

The Co-Chairs reported that the first conversation with Mr. Lordan about salary was in January. At that time he told the S & B Committee that the placeholder for faculty was 0%, but that this could be increased provided that the health care discussions progressed. After a number of health care discussions, Mr. Lordan proposed a 1.5% increase inclusive of merit. This translates to a .9% "across the board" increase plus merit awards of approximately \$1250 for half the faculty. In response to this proposal, the Salary and Benefits Committee presented a counter-proposal of a 3.7% increase, inclusive of merit, which would translate to a 3.1% increase for all faculty members. This proposal follows the "purchasing power" model developed by Senator Rubin. The proposal built in a 1.7% increase to keep up with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) measure of inflation; 1% to increase faculty members' purchasing power; 0.4% to make up for lost purchasing power last year; and funds for merit. Also proposed at this time was a three year agreement, which Mr. Lordan appeared to be the most responsive to.

Dr. Vernon reported that there is a full Salary and Benefits Committee meeting scheduled for this Tuesday (April 29) at which time the committee will vote on Mr. Lordan's proposal. She is hoping that there will be a reply from Mr. Lordan, in relation to the S & B's counter proposal, prior to this meeting.

Health Care

The Co-Chairs stated that at this point in time nothing has been decided in relation to health care, and it is possible that there will be no changes. The Co-chairs emphasized that until the Committee is comfortable with something to go to the Senate and beyond, nothing will happen. The Co-Chairs indicated that the *ad hoc* Committee is meeting weekly with the Administration; that the Committee has been cooperative with the Administration in these discussions, that overall the discussions have been very illuminating; and that the *ad hoc* Committee has been using the resources of the Senate's consultant. The concern is about transparency. The Co-Chairs characterized Mercer, the company hired by the Administration, as a professional company, who thus far has been conducting an open process.

Senators asked if health care for retired faculty is being considered within the discussions. The Co-Chairs responded that yes, it is part of the discussions. Senators brought up the fear that many faculty have expressed about any changes in health care and in particular the % that faculty pay for health care. The Co-Chairs responded that the statutes protect us by limiting any % increase to the % in which faculty salaries increase, and by requiring the Senate's approval of any changes to this.

Senators asked about the process for involving faculty in the decisions about health care changes. Specifically if an agreement is reached between the *ad hoc* Committee and the Administration, Senators asked how does it go to the faculty. The Co-Chairs clarified that any agreement reached by the Ad Hoc Committee and Administration would go first to the Salary and Benefits Committee, and then onto the Senate for approval. Senators asked how the faculty will be involved in this process. The Co-Chairs responded that there will need to be Faculty Fora explaining the different options and other educational outreach efforts to faculty prior to a Senate vote. Regarding the timeline, the Co-Chairs believed that it will most likely be in September when a decision will be made. Senators questioned if this timeframe was realistic given that it will take time to get faculty input. Senators pointed out that at the last meeting

there was a recommendation that a secure Blackboard site be set up for the purpose of keeping faculty informed about health care options and proposed changes. It was recommended that the Blackboard site be set up well in advance of any agreement being reached so that information about health care options and the decision making process around any changes can be made available to faculty in a timely and on-going way. It was further suggested that an email should also go out apprising faculty of the current status of the health care negotiations. Given the changes ahead, Senators emphasized the importance of keeping faculty informed all along the way.

Elections: TRAC Elections

7. URC Nominations

The Senate approved (15-0-0) the following motion (Keller/Porco):

The Senate approves the nominations for the University Research Council Nominees.

8. Faculty Life Report by Co-Chair Dr. Barbara Porco

Senator Barbara Porco reported (Appendix I) on the following initiatives of the Faculty Life Committee: Child Care; Research Office; Mentoring Initiative; Space.

9. New Business

Senators expressed dismay at the lack of control of the Senate agenda and the amount of time taken up by verbal reports by the Administration. It was again recommended by Senators that these reports be provided in writing to the Senate in advance. This will allow time to review them and prepare questions for discussion. Senators also recommended that the Provost, rather than coming to every meeting, be invited on an as needed basis.

At 4:00 PM the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Mary Ann Forgey

Appendix A

§4-05.11 (1) Courseload Relief

(a) Courseload Relief

A faculty member faced with the demands of being the primary caregiver to a newborn child, newly adopted child, or new familial foster care or guardianship placement intended to last a minimum of twelve months, or who has newly established custodial care of a child may be granted, at the faculty member's request and with the concurrence of the Provost, either one (1) semester of relief from classroom teaching and administrative committee work or two (2) semesters of half-relief from such duties, based on the individual's normal yearly courseload. The faculty member receives full salary and benefits during the courseload relief period. Where it is not possible to divide a faculty member's normal yearly courseload precisely in half, the number of courses to be taught will be rounded up to the next whole number.

As used in this statute, "primary care-giver" is defined as the person who has primary responsibility for the care and welfare of the child during normal working hours. "Custodial care" means daily nursing-home-like care required by a faculty member's child, foster child, or child in a guardianship placement with the faculty member.

(b) Qualifying Event

A qualifying event occurs when the faculty member first assumes primary responsibility for the care of a newborn child, a newly adopted child, or a new foster care or guardianship placement, or has newly established custodial care of a child.

(c) Multiple Caregivers

Only one (1) person may be considered the primary care-giver for another. If two Fordham faculty members care for the same person, only one (1) care-giver may be considered the primary care-giver, but each eligible faculty member may sequentially request a semester of half-relief if the primary care-giver changes. However, the total amount of available courseload relief for the qualifying event may not increase.

(d) Eligibility for Courseload Relief

Courseload relief is normally available, at the faculty member's option and with the concurrence of the Provost, beginning either in (1) the semester in which the child is born; the adoption or foster care or guardianship placement occurs; or custodial care is first undertaken; or (2) the semester immediately following.

(e) Responsibilities of Faculty Members

Courseload relief is not a form of leave, as faculty members are expected to make themselves available to the extent reasonable and practicable in consultation with the Dean or the Chairperson for their customary responsibilities of research, student consultation and advising.

(f) Application for Courseload Relief

Faculty members who wish to avail themselves of courseload relief shall submit a Courseload Relief Application Form to his/her Dean or Chairperson as soon as possible and in sufficient time to permit academic planning, unless the events leading to the request make it impractical to do so. The faculty member shall also submit a copy of this Application Form to the person responsible at his/her School for processing the request, as listed on the form. Details of the courseload relief arrangement will be decided in consultation with the Dean and/or Chairperson and with the Provost. The Provost will make the final decision as to whether courseload relief will be granted.

(g) Limitations of Time

Courseload relief will be limited to no more than two (2) qualifying events in any six (6) year period, whether the relief is full- or part time.

(h) Tenure Clock Stoppage

(1) Stoppage of the tenure/reappointment clock during the probationary period may be available, upon the request of the faculty member and with the concurrence of the Provost, during any one of, or combination of, the following circumstances: (a) during a period of full service, for faculty members who qualify for courseload relief but elect not to take such relief; (b) during a period when the faculty member is working less than full time for any one of, or combination of, illness/disability leave, maternity leave, personal leave, or courseload relief.

(2) Faculty members who wish to have their tenure/reappointment clock stopped shall submit a Stopping the Tenure/Reappointment Clock for Primary Caregivers Form to his/her Dean or Chairperson and to the Provost.

(3) Tenure/reappointment clock stoppage for up to one (1) year per qualifying event may be granted at the discretion of the Provost if the faculty member gives proper notice of his/her request in accordance with paragraph (2) of this section. Notice received after the end of the semester in which the faculty member qualified for courseload relief is not proper notice as that term is used in this paragraph.

(4) Stoppage of the tenure/reappointment clock is available for no more than two (2) qualifying events during the faculty member's probationary period. In other cases, a request for tenure/reappointment clock stoppage normally requires advance approval by the Chairperson or Dean and the Provost.

(5) The granting of tenure clock stoppage does not influence the granting of tenure in the future.

(i) Eligibility for Faculty Fellowship/Sabbatical Leave

Semesters spent on full or partial courseload relief will count as credit toward a faculty member's eligibility for faculty fellowship or sabbatical leave.

(j) Courseload Relief and Maternity Leave

This statute does not replace the statute on Maternity Leave (§4-05.10) unless the faculty member wishes it to do so. A pregnant faculty member must advise the Chairperson or Dean and the Provost whether she wishes to take courseload relief or maternity leave. She is ineligible for courseload relief for a particular qualifying event if she is granted a semester with pay for maternity leave for the same qualifying event.

(k) FMLA Eligibility

This statute is not intended to replace leave available to faculty members who are eligible for leave for the birth of a child, an adoption, or foster care placement under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA"). An FMLA certification must be submitted with the Courseload Relief Application Form to determine FMLA eligibility, and if a faculty member is eligible for FMLA leave, he/she must take that leave concurrently with the courseload relief available under this statute. Eligible faculty members may still elect to take unpaid FMLA leave for a particular qualifying event if they wish to provide no service while providing care for their newborn child, newly adopted child, or foster care or guardianship placement.

Appendix I

**Summary of Faculty Life Committee Initiatives
Report to Faculty Senate**

Respectfully submitted by:

Dr. Barbara M Porco, Chair Spring 2014

Status	Faculty Life Committee Initiatives
<p>Initiative is a priority for faculty senate therefore the FLC has offered to support members of the senate on promoting this important agenda for our faculty. Salary and Benefit Committee will lead on this initiative.</p>	<p>1. Child Care facility a. Hiring of child care consultant b. Commitment of funds from university leaders c. Set criteria for care eligibility i. Age ii. Limits iii. Legal issues</p>
<p>Father J. Koterski <i>See report submitted</i></p>	<p>2. Research office - Chris Wolf a. Additional funding b. Understaffed c. Ineffective communication process</p>
<p>Dr. Ann Higgins-D'Alessandro Dr. Karen Siedlecki <i>See report submitted</i></p>	<p>3. Faculty Mentoring Process a. Best practices i. Identify aspirant schools to determine external practices ii. Determine if any articulated structure exists</p>
<p>Dr. Nina Rowe <i>See report submitted</i></p>	<p>4. Communicate with Brian Byrne on a periodical basis to ensure faculty are best informed of critical university changes or issues pertaining to space. a. Transparency is desirable to avoid morale decline and "rumor mills"</p>

*Dr. Ann Higgins-D'Alessandro, Chair Fall 2013