1. Call to Order.

At 12:45pm Senate President Joel Reidenberg called the meeting to order. He then thanked the many individuals, and especially the retired faculty members, who came as guests for this meeting of the Senate, and he briefly reviewed the Senate’s use of Robert’s Rules of Order for governing its procedures. Finally, he asked all present to remember in their thoughts and prayers the recently deceased sister of Senator Henry Schwalbenberg.

2. Invocation.

Senator Marcia Flicker delivered the invocation.

3. Readings and Approval of the Minutes of the February 24, 2012 Meeting.

The Senate adopted (16:0:3) a motion (Jackson/Koterski) to approve the minutes of its meeting on February 24, 2012, as corrected.

4. Matters Presented by the President of the University.

Father Joseph McShane, S.J., the President of Fordham University, asked the Senate to add to its remembrance of the sister of Henry Schwalbenberg thoughts and prayers for the recently deceased father of Lesley Massiah of the Office of Government Relations who was so instrumental in gaining the necessary permissions for the current Lincoln Center construction. After wishing everyone a blessed Passover and blessed Easter, Father McShane addressed the Senate on the following topics.
Government Relations. Funds for the programs of TAP, C-STEP, and HEOP have been protected in the New York State budget. In the near future Father McShane will be lobbying in Washington, D.C., for federal support for higher education and especially for the protection of Pell grants. As he did in several previous meetings of the Senate, Father McShane explained his opposition to the way in which the Obama Administration is placing emphasis on efficiency and productivity in such a way as is likely to be harmful to higher education. He urged the Fordham community to attend the upcoming presentation of Mr. Abe Lackman on Monday, March 25, 2012 (in person at Rose Hill and to be made available by webinar elsewhere) on current trends in higher education, and he plans to discuss the matter further with the Senate at its April meeting.

Admissions. Father McShane reported that the University has thus far received over 34,000 applications for undergraduate admission, and he noted that we may gain as many as twenty-five points in our SAT average, with the Gabelli School of Business in particular expected to show considerable improvement. Noting that there will be an open house on both campuses during the weekend of April 14, he thanked the faculty in advance for supporting this endeavor. He also noted that the Graduate School for Social Service has raised its national ranking to #11, and that the Law School rose one spot in the US News & World Report ranking and reached #20 in the Law Journal. In addition, he reported that the lawsuit brought against a number of law schools for their reporting of employment statistics was recently dismissed.

Development. Father McShane mentioned that the annual Founders Dinner will take place on Monday March 26, 2012 and that the University is expected to receive about $2.2 million from the event.

Bias Incidents. Father McShane discussed his disappointment at the recent incidents of intolerance, prejudice, and discrimination (two at Rose Hill and one at Lincoln Center). He noted that from the start the full force of the University has been involved in responding to these incidents, including security, student affairs, and campus ministry, and that the New York City police department has also been investigating. After admitting that it is doubtful we will ever identify the individuals behind these events, he observed that we must make it unequivocally clear that we remain a welcoming and inclusive community and one that expects that its members will welcome everyone and discriminate against no one. He indicated that the attention given to inclusiveness in the University’s fall orientation programs will be supplemented throughout the year by appropriate programs on tolerance and by various efforts to remain united in our quest to build a more just community.

In the ensuing discussion various Senators suggested additional approaches, including role-playing situations and other types of training for the residence life staff. The Senate’s Student Life Committee will take up this matter at its next meeting. After noting that the gravity of these infractions merits expulsion if the identity of the perpetrators can be discovered, Father McShane re-emphasized his frustration at not being able to determine who is responsible and he voiced his commitment to assisting students to give witness to the values that are central to the institution. Father McShane left the Senate meeting at 1:10pm.

5. Reading of Important Communications

Senate President Reidenberg welcomed Thomas DeLuca to the Senate as the replacement (by special election) for Senator Shapoor Vali. President Reidenberg also noted the difficulties recently experienced in conducting elections because of continued problems obtaining from the Administration accurate campus address information for the faculty. The Senate Elections Committee has now successfully resolved the most recent problem and has developed an appropriate protocol for the future.

President Reidenberg reported that the Executive Committee has recently received communications
from various academic units concerning nominations for Distinguished Professors. President Reidenberg noted that at the September 2011 meeting of the Senate he had reported the appointment of an ad hoc committee to look over the relevant University Statutes. The ad hoc committee will be suggesting clarifications to the Statutes for the description of Distinguished Professors and for the nomination and appointments the process. The committee will report back at the April meeting of the Senate.


After reporting that he has asked Dr. Jonathan Crystal to convene the recently dormant Faculty Development Committee, Provost Stephen Freedman then discussed the topic of academic planning for space usage on the Lincoln Center campus. He explained that in recent months the deans have been asked to work with the special taskforce appointed last year for this purpose, and that they have been reviewing various options, including a plan to establish a presence for the Gabelli School of Business on the Lincoln Center campus, beginning in 2014 with about 50 students but intended to grow to some 200 students by 2018.

Dr. Freedman noted that there is need for this idea to be given careful consideration not only by the Business School faculty (undergraduate and graduate) but also by the Arts & Sciences faculty, especially with regard to curriculum design. He noted that the University will not go forward with this plan without the engagement of the relevant faculties in reviewing the curricular aspects and without faculty approval for any curricular changes. While he hopes that the program can begin in 2014, he recognizes that the review may be lengthy, for it will need to involve a broad range of conversation about designing a curriculum based on themes. He suggested that the process used in this case may become a model for further curriculum development on both campuses. Dr. Freedman also explained that the plan under review includes a number of ideas from the vision of FCLC expansion brought forward by Father Robert Grimes, S.J., the FCLC Dean, and that this proposal is designed to prepare the University for the growth in student population that is expected to occur between 2015 and 2019.

In the discussion that followed a number of Senators critiqued the level of transparency in regard to academic planning and expressed concern about sufficient attention to shared governance. Specific concerns were voiced about the lack of faculty involvement in the initial stages of the planning for the academic space usage at Lincoln Center, and especially about establishing a presence of the Gabelli School on the Lincoln Center campus rather than using the space being vacated in the Law School’s current building for the relief of overcrowded conditions in other academic units housed at Lincoln Center.

In particular there were questions about whether faculty input was only being sought for the implementation of a plan already decided upon by the Administration and not on the relative worth of the plan in comparison with other programmatic uses of this space. Dr. Freedman restated his commitment to broad faculty involvement in the review process of this plan before any vote on the approval of a curriculum, and he offered to take responsibility for any shortcomings in regard to devising opportunities for faculty involvement thus far. He assured the Senate that if establishing the Gabelli School of Business is not judged prudent, there will be revisions in the plan, and he expressed a willingness to attend weekly meetings of the faculty at Lincoln Center for the remainder of the spring 2012 semester if that would be helpful.

A number of Senators raised questions about whether the Gabelli initiative is part of an effort by the Trustees or perhaps by the Administration to re-brand the identity of the University toward undergraduate professional education and emphasized the need for faculty involvement at an early stage in any such decision. Senators also noted the importance of involvement by faculty from the graduate and professional schools as well as from the undergraduate colleges. Dr. Freedman commented on the need to dispel the rumors that have sometimes surfaced, such as an effort to emphasize business at the expense of liberal arts or the relocation of one or another of the professional
schools to a building off the Lincoln Center campus. He stressed that the plans being considered for a Gabelli presence at Lincoln Center continue to envision a liberal arts basis for a business education and that no shift of the center of gravity of undergraduate education is being considered. Various Senators noted the importance of dialogue: not just the communication of accurate information but real input into the planning process.

In addition to the comments about planning for academic space usage, senators also raised questions about the choice of the commencement speaker recently announced and they objected to the lack of faculty involvement in the process of making this decision. President Reidenberg noted that each year the Senate appoints two faculty members to serve on the Commencement Committee, but that the Administration has not convened this committee in recent years.

7. Presentation on Retirement Benefits.

President Reidenberg extended the Senate’s welcome to Mr. Michael Mineo (Human Resources) and Mr. Donald Peretti (Director of Benefits). Mr. Peretti then introduced the representatives from Cigna and from Aetna, to discuss the medical plans that their companies offer to retirees.

Ms. Patty Davis (Client Service Partner from CIGNA) made a presentation on retiree benefits as it relates to payments made by Medicare, by Cigna, and by individuals using the following scenarios: (1) an emergency room visit, (2) a visit to the office of a doctor who accepts Medicare, (3) laboratory tests, (4) a visit to a doctor not recognized by Medicare, and (5) an in-patient hospital stay at a Medicare-recognized healthcare facility. She also discussed the pharmacy policy that is part of the Fordham University Retiree Plan. She characterized the Cigna policy as using a “maintenance of benefits approach” that is designed to make certain payments after Medicare has paid its responsibilities. Cigna is liable for unassigned healthcare providers, for drugs, and for benefits not covered by Medicare. For a copy of the report that she presented, follow the link “Reports to the Faculty Senate” on the Faculty Senate web page: http://www.fordham.edu/senate.

In the ensuing discussion, various Senators as well as current and retired faculty members attending the meeting as guests raised questions about details as well as questions about the difference between what Cigna received in premiums and what Cigna paid out in claims for Fordham retirees. Retired faculty noted that the last update they received on the plan benefits was dated 2004. Mr. Peretti agreed to provide updated information to faculty beneficiaries on their respective plans (revised from the July 2004 copy that appears to be the more recent edition supplied to retired faculty). The Cigna officials explained that the basic plan has not changed since 2004 but that there have been some changes in details because of a number of reforms in healthcare law. Mr. Peretti and the Cigna representatives also agreed to provide the information on premiums and claims to the Senate’s Salary & Benefits Committee. A number of the individuals who addressed the Senate urged that the University make available some alternative to the Cigna program.

Ms. Tina Capobianca (from Aetna) then explained that she has worked on the Fordham account for seven years. She presented various aspects of the Aetna plan (for a copy of her presentation, follow the link “Reports to the Faculty Senate” on the Faculty Senate web page: http://www.fordham.edu/senate).

In the discussion that followed her presentation, there were also questions about details and about the general approach. Recognizing the desire of many current faculty members as well as the interest of retired faculty, Senate President Reidenberg invited representatives of the two companies to return to campus for an open-forum on their programs, and Mr. Peretti and Mr. Mineo agreed to organize such a session in the near future.
8. Reports of the Committees.

The Senate unanimously agreed to a motion (Vernon/Sen) to alter the order on the agenda and take up the New Business item “Lincoln Center Campus Academic Planning and Faculty Governance.”

9. New Business: Lincoln Center Campus Academic Planning and Faculty Governance

Senator Vernon asked the Senate to continue the discussion begun earlier in the meeting on the question of transparency and shared governance in relation to academic space planning on the Lincoln Center campus. After noting that the issue is broader than merely the question of establishing a presence for the Gabelli School of Business at Lincoln Center, she reviewed the way in which an innocuously captioned email (“News and Events”) was sent to the University on the afternoon of March 16, 2012, the Friday at the start of Spring Break, to communicate news about various plans being made for the use of space on the Lincoln Center campus. After calling attention to a number of details, she explained that the taskforce charged with creating these plans consisted only of five vice-presidents and no faculty members.

In the discussion that followed, a number of Senators observed that the only apparent place for faculty involvement seems to be in providing input about the enactment of the plan and not about its creation. The Senate then discussed whether there is a statutory requirement for having faculty participation in these matters and noted that Dr. Freedman had emphasized participation in matters of content and curriculum “when appropriate” rather than in regard to devising new programs and deciding upon whether they will be undertaken. Senators noted that the initial decision on new programs necessitated faculty participation to avoid backdoor curricular planning. A number of comments were also made about faculty participation in the past on the Space Advisory Committee.

Senator GoGwilt reminded the Senate of the text of the University Statutes §4-01.02, second paragraph:

The University Faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

Various Senators urged that the recognition of the faculty’s statutory role in programmatic and curricular matters pertains here.

At the conclusion of a lengthy discussion, the Senate approved (22:0:0) the following motion (Mannion/Keller):

**Appropriate shared governance by the Faculty is both a Fordham tradition and practice as stated in the University Statutes, Article 4, Chapter 6. The Senate therefore strongly objects to the exclusion of faculty from the University’s Presidential Task Force on Space Allocation, a Task Force whose decisions have an impact on research and teaching resources available to faculty and students across multiple schools, the expansion of academic programs, the creation of new academic divisions, as well as a host of faculty and student life issues that “relate to the educational process.”**

The Senate directs the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to meet with the President and Provost to convey the following:

**The Senate requests the President to move immediately to freeze implementation of the Task Force decisions and convene an emergency conference with equal numbers of faculty**
appointed by the Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee and administrators to review all
the work of this Task Force relating to research resources and access, faculty hiring,
deployment, or teaching assignments, student academic programs of any kind, and any
other issues relating to the academic life of the University.

Further, the Senate calls on the President to affirm and insist on the Provost’s authority
and obligation to include faculty and academic deans of affected schools as participants in
decisions with academic implications for students and faculty.

10. Reports of the Committees.

At the request of Senator Piotrkowski, the Senate unanimously agreed to re-order the agenda and to
consider next the report of the Taskforce on Gender and Racial Equity.

Senator Piotrkowski summarized the report and recommendations submitted by the taskforce (for a
copy of the report follow the link “Reports to the Faculty Senate” on the Faculty Senate web page:
http://www.fordham.edu/senate). The Senate approved (17:0:2) the following resolution
(Piotrkowski/Mannion) and thanked Senator Piotrkowski and her committee for their hard work:

The Senate adopts the report and recommendations of the taskforce and directs the
Senate President to communicate the report and recommendations to the President of the
University, the Provost, and the Faculty.

Senator Anne Mannion then delivered a report on the recommendations being brought forward from the
Faculty Life Committee. The full report of more than seventy pages will be presented to the Senate
prior to its April meeting. Senator Mannion explained that the recommendations (see Appendix A)
were drawn up on the basis of the data obtained by the survey of faculty opinion taken in the fall 2011
semester and concern the following areas: (1) research support, (2) teaching load, (3) relation of
staffing levels and workload, (4) workspace and community space, (5) mentoring, (6) personal care
issues (workload relief, discrimination, retirement, transitions officer), (7) salary & benefits issues, (9)
transparency in academic procedures and financial matters, and (10) the need to reinvigorate the
dormant Presidential Faculty Development Committee. On the bright side, she noted, the survey
showed high satisfaction with academic freedom, a sense of community, and collegiality. Senator
Mannion thanked the members of this committee for their hard work. The finished version of the
Committee’s report will be presented at the April Senate meeting for discussion and vote.

Senator Diana Bray then gave a brief presentation of the preliminary results of her analysis of the filings
made with the Faculty Senate by each of the academic units of the University on their policies and
procedures in regard to merit, renewal, tenure, and promotion (for a copy follow the link “Reports to
the Faculty Senate” on the Faculty Senate web page: http://www.fordham.edu/senate). There will be
opportunity for further discussion of this material at the April Senate meeting.

As a way to confirm the initial analysis of the data, President Reidenberg urged all Senators to review
the data reported for their departments and schools and to consider whether there are policies that we as
the governing academic body may want to encourage across the University.

11. Old Business.

President Reidenberg requested that the Baumgarth/Balestra motion concerning salary negotiations be
deferred until the Senate’s meeting on May 1 and the transition to the new Senate. The Executive Committee has recommended that at that meeting we have a substantive discussion of how the Senate sees its role in faculty governance. Senators Baumgarth and Balestra agreed to this suggestion.


President Reidenberg noted that at the April meeting the Senate will discuss a resolution pertaining to the likely transfer of faculty email to the gmail system that is already in use for students. He offered a brief explanation of various issues that arise from Google’s policies on data mining the content of email messages and matching to data collected from uses of other Google services for purposes of targeted marketing and profiling.

Various Senators raised concerns over the choice of commencement speaker for 2012 and the Senate agreed that the Minutes should reflect this concern. President Reidenberg asked that a resolution be prepared for consideration at the April meeting.

At 4:00pm the Senate adjourned (Mannion).

Minutes submitted by Senator Joseph W. Koterski, S.J.
APPENDIX A

Faculty Life Committee - 2011 Survey Recommendations

1. Research.

Despite the University’s commitment to increase the research productivity of its faculty, the results of the survey indicated that the majority of faculty members is still dissatisfied with the overall level of support the University provides for conducting scholarly research. In particular, low levels of satisfaction were noted for summer research stipends, availability of university research funding, availability of travel funds, and assistance with obtaining resources for research. In addition, faculty indicated that the national ranking of Fordham continues to be a concern.

We strongly recommend that the University continue to find ways to increase overall support for research, including the allocation of appropriate resources to improve the infrastructure of the Office of Research.

2. Teaching Load.

In Fall 2007 the initial Faculty Life Survey indicated substantial faculty dissatisfaction with the faculty teaching load of 3/3. At that time the University had initiated an across-the-board university-wide move toward a 3/2 teaching load. At the time of the second survey (Spring 2011) this new model was basically in place. Faculty dissatisfaction with teaching load remains significant. Teaching load is an important aspect of faculty development for many reasons, including that it would facilitate better teaching and greater availability of faculty to students. Reduction in teaching load is closely linked to the University’s increased emphasis on research, grantsmanship and scholarly production. The overall expectation is to further enhance the academic quality and prestige of the University. It is already evident that the University’s commitment to reducing teaching load has had a positive influence in allowing departments to hire those whom they identified as first choice; it should aid in faculty retention as well. The overall findings indicate that the faculty continues to support efforts to reduce teaching load.

We recommend that there be continued implementation of reduced teaching loads to bring the University in closer alignment with teaching load models of our peer and aspirant universities.

3. Undergraduate Tenure-Track Faculty.

The University needs to take a comprehensive look at the percentage of undergraduate classes taught by staff other than full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty. Since the last survey the use of clinical instructors, adjuncts, post-doctoral teaching fellows, visiting faculty, etc. has emerged with greater frequency. Part of this practice is linked to the deferral of increasing tenure-track faculty lines to match a 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. The full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty are the core of departmental responsibilities. Student advisement, academic administrative assignments, and departmental/university wide committee work, writing letters of recommendation, etc. have fallen upon a critical mass of full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty. While the survey indicates that faculty, in general, are satisfied with their teaching schedules and course selection, there is increasing evidence of their concern over issues of time demanded for co-
academic activities.

The Committee recommends that the University authorize sufficient additional undergraduate tenure-track lines to address this problem by having at least 50% of undergraduate courses taught by tenure-track or tenured faculty within the next five years and 75% over the next ten years.

4. Work Space.

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 members who carry substantial advisement and/or mentoring responsibilities as well as those who use this space for research and writing.

We recommend that suitable work and research space be provided for each faculty member.

5. Community Space.

The paucity of usable community space, including dining facilities, is high on the list of faculty concerns.

In light of the size, complexity and mission of the University, the Committee recommends that the University provide dedicated community space in the current planning and build-out of facilities at both the Rose Hill and Lincoln Center campuses.

6. Mentoring.

The survey indicated faculty dissatisfaction with the adequacy of senior faculty mentoring of junior faculty, specifically with reference to senior faculty giving assistance/advice about publications and presentations. These results show that senior faculty and departments should do more to mentor new and junior faculty.

(1) The Committee recommends that departments (and, as appropriate, programs) develop procedures to ensure optimal mentoring of junior faculty. We recommend that full departmental meetings discuss the goals of faculty mentoring and develop procedures to ensure optimal mentoring, keeping in mind but not limiting the discussion to the four areas of: mentors as advocates, as guides to informal politics, as role models, and especially as helpful advisors regarding publishing and professional presentations.

(2) Although we strongly recommend that mentoring discussions and procedures be developed independently, we suggest that once mentoring procedures are in place they may contribute to a department’s assessment strategies and procedures.

7. Discrimination & Personal Care.

The overall findings indicate that faculty report very low levels of discrimination. However, the percentage of faculty members who did report discrimination and felt that they could not take action in response to the incident(s) was far greater than those who felt that they could do so. In light of this, in addition to current ombudspersons and reporting and compliance mechanisms, there is a need for
someone knowledgeable in issues of diversity and discrimination to help faculty in pursuing questions and complaints with a view toward informal resolution.

Another survey item suggests faculty members consider it important for Fordham to provide assistance across a variety of “personal care” areas. Moving expenses, short-term reduced course load for new faculty, appropriate treatment for faculty members who need special consideration because of family issues, college tuition remission and retirement were rated more important than some of the other areas.

The Committee recommends that the university enlist a person who is knowledgeable in the above areas and who reports directly to the Provost (1) to help faculty in pursuing questions and complaints involving discrimination with a view toward informal resolution, and (2) to act as a “transitions officer” to provide faculty with accurate information and professional advice about their special concerns on arrival, in mid-career and at the end of their career/retirement.


The survey reflected that the issues of housing, child-care, improved timeliness of reimbursement, tuition benefits and retirement advising are important to the faculty.

The Committee recommends that these concerns be forwarded to the Salary and Benefits Committee for consideration.


The survey indicated faculty dissatisfaction with the lack of transparency with respect to University finances and with the lack of clarity of the University Administration’s communication with the faculty.

We recommend that the Administration pursue a policy of increasing transparency about University finances, especially in areas appropriate to faculty involvement in University governance and in decision-making in academic initiatives. Further, we recommend that, where good stewardship requires a certain confidentiality, that the Administration pursue a policy of increasing transparency about the entirety of University finances through open communication in these matters with the Faculty Senate. We recommend that the University Administration pursue a policy of open and honest communication with the faculty, especially about policies and procedures that affect faculty.

10. Presidential Faculty Development Committee.

The recommendations of the initial Faculty Life Committee, while approved unanimously by the Faculty Senate, ultimately rely upon various areas of university administration for implementation. It was, in part, in response to this reality that the University President reactivated the Presidential Faculty Development Committee. This committee comprised of representatives of Faculty and the University Provost’s Office was constituted under the immediate direction of the Provost. After several meetings early into the process, this committee ceased meeting.

We recommend that the Presidential Faculty Development Committee be reconvened before the end of the spring semester so as to move forward on ways to implement the recommendations of the Faculty Life Committee of the Faculty Senate.