1. Opening Prayer

   Brian Conniff began the meeting with a prayer by Mother Teresa.

2. Roll Call

   Twenty-six of forty-one Senators were present.

3. Approval of Minutes

   The minutes of October 11, 2002, were approved.

4. Introduction of New Senators

   Fred Pestello welcomed the new senators and thanked the outgoing senators for their service, especially for their efforts during the presidential search. The current and incoming senators introduced themselves.

5. Summary Reports from the Standing Committees

   Faculty Affairs Committee: Harry Gerla reported that the committee addressed three issues this past semester.
   a. First, the committee was asked to comment on a revised Research Professorship proposal, having supported the original proposal in the Fall 2001 semester. The committee sent its response in a letter to Drs. Pestello and McCabe.
   b. The Faculty Affairs Committee also worked on a proposal to stop the “tenure clock” under particular circumstances; after some modifications and clarifications, that proposal is ready for a vote.
   c. And finally, the committee began a review of the maternity/paternity leave policies for the University’s faculty. Harry Gerla is drafting a letter to be sent to comparable universities inquiring about their maternity/paternity leave policies.

   Student Academic Policies Committee: Megan Telfair noted that scheduling difficulties and low attendance limited committee work for this semester.
a. The committee assisted SGA with its presentation on the 18th credit hour. The proposal was introduced at the October ELC meeting.

b. The SAPC also discussed the senior final exam grades issue and decided that it was of more concern to faculty than to students. It does recommend, however, that students complete all requirements before participating in the graduation ceremony. Committee members also preferred that the real diplomas be distributed at graduation, not through the mail.

Academic Policies Committee: Jim Dunne reported that the APC continues work on several issues.

a. General Education Program: A subcommittee, chaired by Dave Biers, is currently revising Section II, Rationale and Goals, of the 1991 General Education Policy. The proposed revision will likely be brought before the full Academic Senate early next term.

b. University Competencies Program: A subcommittee, chaired by Joe Saliba, has been reviewing the revised Quantitative Reasoning Competency policy in consultation with others. The revised policy should be ready for discussion at the January 2003 Academic Senate meeting.

c. Academic Calendar: The APC monitored the development of the academic calendar, paying particular attention to the minimum number of class meetings for all MWF and TTh classes.

d. Consultation across academic units: The APC also monitored the policy requiring consultation across academic units on any curriculum change that may affect other units. Communication between the Associate Provost and Associate Deans from each academic unit appears to work effectively.

e. University Policy on Residency/Minimum UD Credit Hours: The committee is working to develop consistent wording for these university policies in the Undergraduate Bulletin and the Graduate Bulletin. This proposal will probably come to the Academic Senate for approval next term.

6. Academic Senate Representative for Presidential Investiture Committee

Pat Palermo, Dick Ferguson and Amy Lopez, chairs of the Presidential Investiture Committee, are seeking a representative from the Academic Senate. Roger Crum has agreed to volunteer. Brian Conniff will forward this recommendation to Pat.

7. Budget Priorities

The Academic Senate, via ECAS, has the opportunity at the next ELC meeting to provide input on its priorities for the University budget. A summary of this year’s recommendations was presented at the November 15 faculty meeting. The slide show included proposed tuition increases, possible uses of new revenue and budget options; copies of the presentation were sent to the Academic Senate.

Brian Conniff recognizes that the Academic Senate is in the uncomfortable position of determining opinion far along in the budgeting process and recommends that the Senate find a more effective long-term solution. To that end, he suggests forming a standing committee that would engage itself in the budget process throughout the year.

Q: Is the technology line under debt funding for what has been done or is it for more enhancements?
A: This figure would cover what was already spent.

Q: What is the state of technology spending?
A: Funding is flat. There has been no increase except in soft funding.

Fred Pestello and Dan Curran prefer the first budget option, which allows for a modest compensation increase and a budget cut of $600,000 to $900,000. The reality is that the University cannot afford to fund all of the projects listed under possible uses of new revenue.
Comment: With so much new hiring, the issue of compensation becomes more critical. It is difficult to hire new faculty when the salaries lag behind the competition. There is also the added problem of salary compression between old and new faculty hires.

Q: What percentage of tuition increase goes to faculty salaries and benefits?  
A: Not sure, more than 50 per cent?

Q: What is the net impact of the 18th credit hour on the budget?  
A: Students pay $450,000 yearly.

Comment: In the College of Arts & Sciences that part of the cost is greater. More students in Arts & Sciences are paying for the 18th credit hour; the distribution is not even among the College and other Schools.

Q: Why are base housing costs inconsistent in the Tuition plans?  
A: The extra money is capital towards new housing.

Comment: One strategy is to raise tuition but increase value by including the 18th credit hour.

Q: Why is there an increase in tuition and aid? Why not just more aid?  
A: There is competition for students who have high need or high academic achievement. The competition is better at getting the students we want.

Q: Is there any data on why students come to UD?  
A: The Art & Science group researched this issue and made a presentation at last month’s faculty meeting. The final report is due in December.

8. **Proposal for “Suspending the ‘Tenure Clock’ for Tenure Track Faculty Members Eligible for Family or Medical Leave”**

Harry Gerla, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented Senate Document No. 1-02-03, to the Academic Senate for a vote.

This document was discussed at the October 2002 Academic Senate meeting. There were concerns about procedures for eligibility, which the committee clarified in the amended version.

Proposal summary: This document seeks to amend the current Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Regulations by adding a new Section 2(a)(4). FACAS recognizes that not all faculty members can afford to take family or medical leave when such a situation occurs, and that the tenure clock continues running during that time. In those instances, FACAS recommends that when a faculty member is eligible for family or medical leave, but does not actually take such leave, the faculty member is still able to stop the tenure clock for the time a leave might have been taken.

Additionally, the FACAS recommends two more changes to the Policy: that section 2(a)(1) of the document be amended to recognize foster care as a basis for stopping the tenure clock; and that the terms “serious medical condition” and “adoption of a child” as well as others in section 2(a)(1) be defined to be better aligned with the conditions set forth in the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

Favor: 26  
Oppose: 0  
Abstain: 0

Q: Because this proposal amends the current Policy on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Regulations will it go before the entire faculty and trustees?  
A: There will be an open hearing, to be determined, followed by a vote of the faculty.
9. **Update on Status of General Competency and Quantitative Reasoning, and Section II, the Rationale and Goals of the General Education Program**

Joe Saliba provided an update on the Quantitative Reasoning Competency revision. After working on the QRC implementation in 2000-2001, the Math Department reported major problems and developed revisions for the QRC. In September 2002 the APC charged a subcommittee to evaluate the new revisions. After consultation with all the Chairs and Deans of every division, the subcommittee recommends adopting the new revisions.

Timeline: The APC will be meeting next Friday to vote on forwarding the measure to the entire senate. It is expected that the revisions will be distributed in January to senate members and that an open meeting will be held before February so that a vote may take place at the February senate meeting.

Q: What is the Math Department's position on the current revisions? Are they able to deliver in February?
A: Yes. There are some implementation issues that the Math Dept. is trying to iron out before the Academic Senate meeting in February.

Dave Biers summarized the revision efforts for Section II of the General Education Program. Since the original document was created in 1996, the language is now outdated; there is no mention of such things as global issues, diversity, and social justice. The subcommittee is working to update the language, not to change the theme. It will consult with other academic units, with a target completion date of February 2003.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Heidi Gauder, Secretary of the Academic Senate.