



FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Faculty Senate

Joseph M. McShane, S.J., Hon. President

Anne E. Fernald, President

Andrew H. Clark, Vice President

J. Patrick Hornbeck II, Secretary

Dominic Balestra
William Baumgarth
Martin Chase, S.J.
James A. Cohen
Aimee Cox
G. Larry Farmer
Mary Ann Forgey
Christopher GoGwilt

Richard Gyug
Hugh Hansen
Margo Jackson
Judith Jones
Eve Keller
Dorothy Klotz
Micki McGee
Harry Nasuti

Jennie Park-Taylor
Berish Rubin
Henry Schwalbenberg
Esther Solomon
Grace M. Vernon

Excused: Senators Farmer and Hansen
Absent: Senator Chase

Meeting: South Lounge, Leon Lowenstein Building, Lincoln Center Campus

Guests: Dr. Stephen Freedman, Provost
Dr. Jonathan Crystal, Associate Chief Academic Officer and Associate Vice President,
Office of the Provost
Dr. Peter Stace, Vice President for Enrollment; Co-Chair, Continuous University Strategic
Planning (CUSP) Committee

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Anne E. Fernald at 12:31 p.m. in the South Lounge, Leon Lowenstein Building, Lincoln Center Campus.

2. Invocation

Senator Schwalbenberg delivered the Invocation.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meetings of January 22, 2016, and February 26, 2016

Senator Jackson moved, and Senator Baumgarth seconded, the adoption of the revised minutes of the January 22, 2016, meeting of the Senate. The minutes were adopted, 16-0-5.

Senator Baumgarth moved, seconded by Senator Cohen, that the previous draft of the minutes of the January 22, 2016, meeting of the Senate be declared null and void. The motion carried, 13-0-8.

Senator GoGwilt moved, and Senator Clark seconded, the adoption of the minutes of the February 26, 2016, special meeting of the Senate. The minutes were adopted, 14-0-7.

4. Matters Presented by the President of the University

Fr. Joseph M. McShane, S.J., President of the University, addressed the Senate. He began by offering condolences on the passing of Fr. Gerard Reedy, S.J., whom Fr. McShane described as a talented teacher,

administrator, colleague, and friend. He was a force of nature.

Fr. McShane reported on a series of rankings and ratings of the University and of specific Fordham programs that had recently been published. He noted as well that the School of Law had recently had a very successful accreditation visit from the American Bar Association. With regard to the *U.S. News and World Report* graduate program rankings, Fr. McShane reported the following developments:

- The part-time MBA program was previously ranked 91st, now 55th; the full-time MBA program is not in the top 63.
- The Graduate School of Education was previously ranked 59th, now 45th.
- The School of Law was previously ranked 34th for its day division and 3rd for the evening division; now it is ranked 37th for the day division and 2nd for the evening division.
- The Graduate School of Social Service was previously ranked 11th, now 22nd. However, Fr. McShane noted that this ranking is largely impressionistic, and the Graduate School of Social Service remains Fordham's most highly ranked school.

In addition to the *U.S. News* rankings, the QS World University Rankings have recently been published. Fr. McShane reported that Fordham is ranked among the top 200 universities in the world. The English Department went from being ranked in the top 201 to 250 to the top 150 to 200. The Philosophy Department remained ranked in the top 50 to 100. The School of Law went from being ranked in the top 100 to 150 to being ranked in the top 150 to 200.

The final set of rankings to appear this year will arrive on April 1 and will include rankings for the undergraduate business and executive MBA programs.

Next, Fr. McShane reported that the Continuous University Strategic Planning (CUSP) Committee is well along in its work. He indicated that he was impressed by the pace and quality of the committee's progress. The committee is seeking to present a draft of the University's new strategic framework to the Board of Trustees in late April. This framework document will set the terms of planning throughout the university, and local planning will ensue thereafter.

Fr. McShane reported that the site visit from the Middle States Association will take place in early April. Already Fordham's documents have been distributed to the members of the visiting team, which includes the president of Boston College and the president-elect of the University of Dayton. Fr. McShane indicated that there would be ample opportunities for members of the faculty to meet with the visiting team during its time on campus.

Finally, Fr. McShane reported on the subject of diversity, noting that there had been another bias incident at the Lincoln Center campus. He had published a memorandum to the university committee to condemn bias of this sort as repugnant and un-American, completely at odds with the University's ideals. Fr. McShane indicated that the presidential task force on race and diversity is continuing its work and has begun a series of town hall meetings with members of the campus community. He asked Senators to encourage their colleagues and students to attend.

Fr. McShane responded to questions from Senators. One Senator asked, in relation to the CUSP process, how the CUSP Committee relates to the University's established governance structures. The Senator said that it was important to examine how CUSP is relating to existing bodies in the University and to make sure that the relationships between CUSP and such bodies are as clear as possible. Fr. McShane

responded that he had recommended to Dr. Stephen Freedman, the Provost, that each college and school use existing bodies to advance the work of local planning. In addition, Fr. McShane said that it was necessary to continue examining the University's committee structure. This year, the Commencement Committee has been very active. He added that throughout the year, he has introduced several new features of shared governance: CUSP; the President's Advisory Council made up of vice presidents, deans, and the faculty co-chair of CUSP; and regular reports from the Senate President to the Board of Trustees.

Another Senator asked whether the draft CUSP report has been conveyed to the visiting team from the Middle States Association. Fr. McShane responded that a draft has been sent, but the document remains a work in progress. Senate President Fernald added that it is one of her goals to help connect the CUSP and Middle States processes, so that both could be informed by one another.

Fr. McShane wished members of the Senate a happy Roman Easter, noting that both Passover and Eastern Orthodox Easter fall this year after the Senate's next meeting.

5. Salary and Benefits Committee Report

Senator Clark, in his role as Chair of the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee, delivered the committee's report.

1. UnitedHealthcare

Senator Clark reported a resolution with regard to the dispute between the University and UnitedHealthcare with regard to two mental health procedure codes. The codes, details about them, and the response received from UnitedHealthcare follow.

90837

- 53 members filed this code with UHC
- Allowed amounts are: \$66,847.87
- Paid amounts were: \$36,711.77 (This difference in allowed vs paid is mainly due to the 50% reduction in benefits as many members did not properly pre notify the services.)

90838

- 10 members filed this code with UHC (Two of these members are also in the 90837 grouping)
- Allowed: \$7,215.34
- Paid: \$4,462.71 (This difference in allowed vs paid is mainly due to the 50% reduction in benefits as many members did not properly pre notify the services.)

After a strong encouragement from the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee, Fordham's Chief Counsel wrote a letter to UnitedHealthcare dated January 22, 2016 requesting reprocessing of all claims related to CPT codes 90837 and 90838. UnitedHealthcare previously agreed to remove the pre service notification requirement for the 2016 plan year as requested by the Chair of Salary and Benefits and Mercer during the meeting with UHC last fall. UHC agreed to this as a prospective plan change for the policy's renewal on January 1, 2016.

In reponse to the letter dated January 22, 2016, UHC also agreed to reprocess all claims associated with CPT codes 90837 and 90838 incurred by your members in 2015 where a non-notification penalty was applied. Members will not have to take any action for the reprocessing of these claims. UnitedHealthcare will reimburse the member the difference originally withheld unless the member initially assigned the benefit payment to the provider. In this scenario, UHC would have originally sent the out of network reimbursement to the provider and not the member (per the members request.) As such, if the benefit was previously assigned to a provider the additional payment will go to the provider. The member will receive an explanation of benefits from UHC regardless of assignment which means they will be notified that these claims were reprocessed.

Although privacy reasons prevent UHC from providing Fordham with a list of members that this project will impact, they will however report back the final claims dollars and volume of claims reprocessed by their claims team. They expect resolution on this project to take approximately one month.

This is a clear victory for Fordham faculty and staff and demonstrates our commitment to ensuring UHC assures their contract with Fordham University in spirit and word.

2. *Compression*

After 2-hour weekly meetings since the beginning of October, the Compression Committee, whose members were Bruce Berg, Andrew H. Clark, John Drummond, Micki McGee, Berish Rubin, and Henry Schwalbenberg from the faculty and Ben Crooker and Mike Mineo/Nick Milowski from the administration, has finally finished its analysis and made its recommendation. As I've mentioned before, Dr. Crooker made this committee work and his work should be praised by the Administration and Senate. I would also like to commend Dr. Rubin, whose rigor and extra analysis of each iteration of the data assured the greatest objectivity and that no individual would be left unexamined. Finally everyone else on this committee should be applauded. Nick Milowski took over for Mike Mineo when Mr. Mineo needed to leave for personal reasons, and I think we all agreed on the committee that it has been great working with Mr. Milowski. In fact, this was a model committee for transparency, collaboration, and a common purpose.

As you know, we were never given a dollar amount by the administration despite numerous requests. We thus worked in good faith to analyze the data and present the compression we discovered. Of course, compression can be addressed at many different levels. We noticed that most compression occurs because of a low initial offer. This low initial offer can be due to market conditions at a given moment or more commonly to the actions of a chair, dean, or the lack of negotiation by an incoming faculty member. Compression also affected full-professors, and this is largely due to the salary policy we have practiced in the Senate for a long time. Compression also exists between ranks due to changing markets.

- a. The total works out to \$215,230 broken down by school as: A&S: \$121,955; GSE: \$10,126; GSRRE: \$6517; GSSS: \$5655; Business: \$70,977
- b. We also addressed a few anomalies that didn't fit with the trend lines that were established. To address these anomalies required an additional cost of \$16,000.
- c. For A&S and the professional schools (not including business) trend lines were determined based on different schools and groupings within the schools so that we were

not comparing scientists to French scholars. Salaries were adjusted to remove all merit for the last 10 years and each trend line was to a specific rank. All identifiers of faculty were removed and salaries were given as adjusted figures with respect to the various elements and thus no real salary figures were given. We were constantly having Dr. Crooker re-tweak the parameters each week to get more consistent and objective data. All of these schools (excluding Gabelli) had clearly recognizable trend lines. These were easy to visualize on a graph and pick out the individual dots that were significantly below the trend line. The trend line was plotted with years in rank and salary as the x and y axis. We determined a standard deviation from the trend line and all cases below that standard deviation were addressed.

- d. The Gabelli School unfortunately could not use the same criteria to perform our analysis. It should be remembered that the vast majority of the \$300,000 that was spent on compression 3 years ago, was spent on Gabelli. Whereas trend lines were easily identifiable in all the other schools, the only trend lines in business were downward and even that slope could not be consistently plotted. So in Gabelli we came up with another model. It consisted of making sure that no person in a given rank makes less than the lowest paid person in a lower rank. Thus if an associate professor of marketing was making \$180,000 but all assistants were making at least \$200,000 then that associate professor's salary would be raised. As compression was particular present between ranks in Gabelli, this appeared to be the most objective solution. Although it was argued at times that since Gabelli faculty have the opportunity to double their salary in some cases by teaching overloads, weekend courses, or summer school, that they can take on external consulting which often results in massive external pay, and that their stipends for administrative responsibilities are paid at a similar rates as these overloads, and that these extra financial sources should be taken into consideration when making any adjustments, the committee felt strongly that it was impossible to assess objectively any additional pay or capacity for additional pay and thus we should only address actual salary.
- e. The amount has been shared with Martha Hirst. I reminded her that this amount is not to be considered as part of the annual salary negotiation.

3. *Wellness*

As you know we passed a motion for Donald Perretti to step down from Chair of the Wellness Committee. Unfortunately, the Administration did not believe, given Donald Perretti's role and title, that he should be removed from this position. Our motion also included that there be a new co-chair appointed by the Senate. This too proved to be difficult. After many conversations with Martha Hirst on this subject and insistence that there be a co-chair if Donald Perretti remained, Ms. Hirst conceded to a co-chair but offered Kathleen Malara, Director of Student Health Services, and member of the Wellness Committee as the person. I discussed this option with the faculty members of the Wellness Committee and Kathleen Malara reached out to answer any questions from them and/or meet with them. Although at least two of these members noted frustration in seeing the Senate's motion disregarded by the Administration, they all voted in favor of having Kathleen Malara as co-chair of the committee. As the wellness director position interviews were already being scheduled by the Administration, it was vital that the decision be made quickly so that the interviews didn't occur with Perretti as the only chair.

Ultimately, the Wellness committee and wellness initiatives should be the responsibility of a robust and effective HR division and not run by faculty. I think Kathleen Malara is a suitable solution. It assures that we have a very qualified and effective leader as co-chair and it keeps faculty from having

to perform another job that we should not.

I'm confident with Malara's leadership and the participation of our faculty Wellness Committee members that include members of this Senate and Faculty Salary and Benefits, that we will be to engage a wellness director that will be more effective.

The Wellness interviews are supposedly coming in the next couple of weeks. Hopefully there will be some thought about wellness when we choose our new vendor for food services.

4. Salary & Benefits

As you know we have argued for an increase in purchasing power increment in our salary negotiations for the past few years. Our salary negotiations have thus focused on CPI + a purchasing power increment + merit. We have successfully negotiated over the past 6 or so years that I've been chair of this committee to tie in all recurring figures to the across the board increase. Thus minimum salaries, promotion increments, merit, and now stipends will all increase the same amount as the across the board. Dr. Rubin, who has argued eloquently and effectively for the purchasing power model in both the Senate and elsewhere has refined the model through work on his salary subcommittee in Salary and Benefits. They have opted to support a purchasing power increase of 60% over the 25-year career of a FU faculty member not including merit but including two promotions. As they have currently configured it, this would mean we would need a 1.6% increase above CPI each year in order to achieve this increase in purchasing power. It is possible that this increase could also be achieved by having a slightly lower increment coupled with larger promotion increments. We have discussed this model with Martha Hirst and others in the administration. They have been responsive to the model's clarity, its transparency, and its ethos. Given that this year, CPI is -.3%, it might be the year to put it into place. We've made it clear that we would have to see this as a multi-year agreement and that if it were so, we would also entertain a vote in SnB and the Senate to change the salary raise policy to a straight percentage raise based on individual salary and no longer on rank. It is unclear whether the administration will sign on to a longer deal. They are interested in it, but want to make sure that there are the appropriate windows on both sides if CPI is too low or too high and if the finances of the institution are too poor or too great. However, without a multi-year deal, the recommended offer from the Faculty Salary and Benefit Committee will be different.

We met today at 11 am. Martha Hirst had already been presented with our model.

5. Phased Retirement

This is being looked at in the Provost's office and should be officially approved soon I imagine.

Following the report, Senator Clark responded to questions from Senators. One Senator asked how many faculty members were identified as being subject to compression. Senator Clark responded that it was approximately 10%. Senator Rubin, as a member of the compression sub-committee, added that not all cases of compression were addressed, but only those that fell outside a certain threshold.

Senate President Fernald asked how faculty would be notified of any changes in their salary related to compression. She also asked if the compression data revealed inequalities with regard to gender. Senator Clark said that while there had been no discussion of the dissemination of this information to faculty members, he expected that faculty would be notified as part of their annual salary letters from the Provost's Office. He also indicated that while the compression sub-committee was very sensitive to the

question of gender, no major discrepancies were identified. Responding to a follow-up question from another Senator, Senator Clark added that perhaps a Vice President for Diversity could set up a mechanism to investigate gender and racial disparities in compensation. Senator Rubin said that there are a number of events that can result in salary compression, including the appointment of a faculty member at a higher rank (in such a case, the individual would not receive the usual promotion increments).

Senator Rubin reiterated his request that the Chair of the Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee be compensated for his work, either with a stipend or a course reduction. Senators asked Senate President Fernald to convey the Senate's support of this request to the Provost.

6. Matters Presented by the Provost

Dr. Freedman began his report with two brief announcements. The first was that Dr. George Hong has been appointed as Chief Research Officer, effective July 1. Dr. Hong is a scholar of the humanities who appreciates how many Fordham faculty members approach research in a multi-disciplinary way. The search committee was enthusiastic about Dr. Hong, and Dr. Freedman is eager to begin working with him.

Second, Dr. Freedman reported that he is in the final stages of the first round of strategic hiring. He would be working through Dr. John Harrington, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, to make offers to the chosen candidates in the next several weeks. He noted that this is just the beginning of long-overdue work to promote diversity among the faculty.

Dr. Freedman asked Dr. Jonathan Crystal, Associate Chief Academic Officer and Associate Vice President in the Office of the Provost, to provide an update on the Middle States process.

Dr. Crystal began by noting that there are two purposes of the Middle States process: first, to demonstrate to external auditors that we meet the fourteen standards for accreditation, and second, to give the University community an opportunity to reflect upon our effectiveness at fulfilling our mission. Middle States is interested in the question of whether Fordham is achieving its mission. It is not Middle States' role to decide for the University where we want to go; that is a function of strategic planning. Therefore, the work that has been undertaken in recent years on Middle States has served as a foundation for the CUSP process.

The visiting team will be on campus on April 4, 5, and 6. On Monday, April 4, they will be at the Rose Hill campus, and on Tuesday, April 5, at the Lincoln Center campus. An open forum for all members of the faculty will take place Monday at Rose Hill, from 1:00 to 2:15 pm. A separate meeting with members of the Senate will take place Tuesday at Lincoln Center.

Dr. Crystal encouraged Senators and members of the faculty to prepare for the visit by reading the University's self-study report, particularly the sections concerning governance and assessment. He noted that the visiting team does not expect perfection and that its members are peers interested in providing constructive input to the University.

The visiting team will deliver an initial report on Wednesday morning, April 6, at Rose Hill. This may include what Middle States calls suggestions, recommendations, or requirements. It is exceptionally unlikely that Fordham will not be reaccredited; it is quite possible that we will receive one or more suggestions or recommendations, as some 70% of institutions undergoing reaccreditation, including major institutions like Cornell University, receive notations of this sort.

Dr. Freedman encouraged Senators and their colleagues to attend the open forum and closing session, and he especially encouraged Senators to attend the meeting between the visiting team and the Senate. He thanked Dr. Crystal and his team for the more than two and a half years of preparation that have gone into the Middle States process.

Dr. Freedman and Dr. Crystal responded to questions from Senators. One Senator asked whether Dr. Freedman and Dr. Crystal wished Senators to encourage the visiting team to make any specific recommendations. Dr. Freedman said that he hoped that the visiting team would focus on the issue of cross-school collaboration, and Dr. Crystal noted that the self-study report already contains several recommendations, including changes to the annual report process, the clarification of the authority of the Provost, and the disclosure of governance policies.

Another Senator asked what progress has been made since the previous Middle States visit on the issue of the assessment of deans by members of the faculty. Dr. Freedman responded that he already seeks wide input in his annual evaluation of deans.

Another Senator observed, with regard to the self study's recommendation that there be greater collaboration or interchange across units of the University, that this recommendation could be made even more robust. It should be more than just "knowing what the neighbors are doing."

Another Senator observed that the self-study's recommendation that Fordham develop a multi-year process for faculty hiring would be compelling to many colleagues. This Senator observed that publicizing this recommendation might help boost faculty attendance at the various events with the Middle States visiting team.

Another Senator asked, concerning the Provost's strategic hiring initiative, whether any of the projected hires are senior members of the faculty. Dr. Freedman responded that these positions would most likely be at the assistant professor rank.

Senator Cohen moved, seconded by Senator Baumgarth, the following:

In light of the spirit of current and previous Middle States self-studies, to implement the Senate's previous motions that academic administrators be assessed annually by faculty, to start as soon as practicable.

Discussion ensued. Senator Schwalbenberg moved, seconded by Senator Cox, that the motion be referred to an *ad hoc* committee that would be charged with producing specific recommendations with regard to a policy for faculty evaluation of deans. The motion to refer the matter to an *ad hoc* committee was carried, 17-4-1. Senate President Fernald appointed Senators Baumgarth, Cohen, and Cox to the committee.

Dr. Freedman thanked the Senate for taking the University's participation in the Middle States process seriously.

7. Continuous University Strategic Planning (CUSP)

Senate President Fernald introduced Dr. Peter Stace, Vice President for Enrollment and one of the co-chairs of the CUSP Committee. Senator Hornbeck, as another co-chair of the committee, joined Dr. Stace for his presentation.

Dr. Stace thanked Senate President Fernald and the Senate for the opportunity to continue to discuss the CUSP process. He apologized for the late arrival of the draft CUSP document, noting that it was being rewritten up to the very last minute, since the committee is working on a very aggressive timetable. Dr. Stace also noted that one objective in the draft strategic framework had been changed in response to feedback from the President's Advisory Council and from members of CUSP.

Dr. Stace noted that the CUSP process differs from a traditional strategic planning process insofar as the immediate goal is to produce a strategic framework, rather than a strategic plan. Once the framework has been produced, the second phase of the process will involve planning guided by the framework being done locally, within individual academic and administrative units. The upside of this process is that there has been greater discussion around a common set of ideas; the downside is that the document is a bit more amorphous than perhaps might be expected.

The CUSP Committee is currently in the process of seeking feedback on the draft framework from the President's Advisory Council, the Senate, and the Board Strategy Committee. It will be shared with the campus community as a whole, and there will be town hall meetings to discuss the document on March 30, at Rose Hill, and April 1, at Lincoln Center. Another version of the framework will come to the Senate for further input at its April meeting, and a penultimate draft of the framework will go to the Board of Trustees for its review and feedback at its meeting on April 21. The final draft of the framework will be presented to the Board for its approval in September.

Dr. Stace noted that the current draft of the framework focuses on six priority areas that are central to what Fordham is and how it is to move forward.

Senator Hornbeck added that the CUSP process continues to be a transparent and open one, and he encouraged Senators not to be stinting in their criticism of the draft document. Now is exactly the right moment for the Senate's feedback to be integrated into the strategic framework.

Dr. Stace and Senator Hornbeck responded to questions from Senators. One Senator asked about the section concerning teaching and learning. The Senator observed that the document does not do an effective job at identifying the key concerns of liberal education and asked that sections 3(a) and 3(b) be rewritten accordingly. Other Senators joined this point.

Another Senator observed that with at least 11% of postsecondary students nationwide identifying with one or more disabilities, the document should include language about ability and disability status. This Senator encouraged the CUSP Committee to include this material in priorities 1 and 3.

Another Senator observed that some of the priorities articulated in the document do not speak sufficiently to the question of what is unique about Fordham. There needs to be a holistic integration between and among the priorities related to the University's overall mission. How do research, teaching, and service differ at Fordham as opposed to elsewhere? Dr. Stace responded that the document will eventually include a preamble that seeks to integrate these concerns.

Another Senator asked about the draft framework's language about access to student leadership opportunities. Dr. Hornbeck responded that the committee sees curricular and co-curricular, academic and non-academic activities holistically. The goal should be to encourage students to grow as leaders and to build a student culture, especially at Rose Hill, where students are empowered to undertake new initiatives. This would include a new campus center and stronger partnerships with our neighbors.

Another Senator asked whether this framework might be an appropriate place to include specific proposals, such as the creation of a Humanities Institute to safeguard the role of humanities at Fordham. Dr. Stace responded that the committee's hope is that such proposals would come forward as part of the local planning process.

Another Senator asked that the next iteration of the document contain additional material about online education, especially in light of Fordham's Jesuit identity. Dr. Stace noted that the committee has considered this point in light of Fr. McShane's reminder that Jesuits have historically operated at frontiers. The question is how should a Jesuit institution such as Fordham deliver online education.

Senate President Fernald brought the discussion to a close, thanking representatives of both the Middle States and CUSP processes.

8. Unfinished Business

Senate President Fernald noted that the Senate was about to reach the conclusion of the third hour of its meeting and entertained a motion to extend the length of the meeting. Senator Balestra, seconded by Senator Jackson, moved to extend the time, and the motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

Senate President Fernald asked the Senate to recommend to the University President two nominees for a vacant seat on the University Research Council. Senator GoGwilt moved, and Senator Balestra seconded, the recommendation of the nominees. The motion carried, 17-0-0.

At 3:35 p.m., Senator GoGwilt moved, seconded by Senator Cox, that the Senate go into executive session. The Senate emerged from executive session at 3:45 p.m.

Senator Balestra moved, seconded by Senator Baumgarth:

*So that there is no ambiguity henceforth (3/11/16) as to wherein lies the final Statutory authority of the Faculty Senate vis a vis the Senate President and/or the Executive Committee of the Senate, **be it resolved that such final authority lies with the Senate as a whole**, according to the Senate By-Laws, Article IV and Article IV, Section 1 and specifically Article IV, Sections 5 (a) through (d), which circumscribe and delimit the responsibilities of the Senate President and the Senate Executive Committee and their actions so as not to exceed the authority of the Senate as a whole.*

Senator GoGwilt moved, seconded by Senator Gyug, to postpone the motion indefinitely. In discussion, one Senator recommended that the Handbook Committee review and recommend changes, if necessary, to the relevant sections of the Senate's By-Laws. Senator McGee moved, seconded by Senator Nasuti, to table the motion to postpone indefinitely. The motion to table carried, 16-0-0.

On the motion of Senator Cox, seconded by Senator Hornbeck, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by J. Patrick Hornbeck II, Secretary

Appendix I
ARTICLE IV [By-Laws of the Faculty Senate]

Committees

Section 1 - There shall be three kinds of senate committees:

- (1) An Executive Committee;
- (2) Standing Committees;
- (3) Special Committees.

The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the University.

Section 2 - Except as otherwise provided, all members of all committees shall be appointed by the President of the Senate with the consent of the Senate, and the number, charge and composition of the standing and special committees shall be determined in the same way.

Section 3 - The members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed at the May meeting in which officers are elected by the President with the consent of the majority of Senators present. Members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed for one year and no member of the Executive Committee shall be appointed for more than three successive terms except when he is a member ex officio as hereinafter provided.

Section 4 - The Executive Committee shall consist of five members, two appointed as previously provided and the officers of the Senate ex officio shall be the remaining members.

Section 5 - The Executive Committee shall:

- (a) arrange the agenda for senate meetings, and shall serve as the channel through which any member of the Senate may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate. It shall include in the agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or 20% of the members of the Senate;
- (b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate;
- (c) **act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;**
- (d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

Section 6 - There shall be the following Standing Committees: **Constitution and Bylaws**, Election, and Faculty Handbook.