IRis

Northeastern University

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

January 01, 2005

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes : 03/23/2005

Charles H. Ellis Jr.
*Northeastern University*

Recommended Citation

Ellis Jr., Charles H., "Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes : 03/23/2005" (2005). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes.* Paper 65.
http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004592

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: CHARLES H. ELLIS, Jr., SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2004-05 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 23 MARCH 2005

---

Present: (Professors) Alper, De Ritis, Ellis, Futrelle, Glod, Hansberry, Herman, Krishnamoorthy, Kruger, Lowndes, Margotta, McKnight, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee, Reynolds, Robinson, Schaffer, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wray
(Administrators) Abdelal, Falcon, Finkelstein, Moore, Onan, Soyster, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Bansil, Bannister, Blank, Bobcean, Heiman, Marshall, Wiseman
(Administrators) Hill, Spieler

Provost Abdelal convened the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

I. **Approval of Minutes**. The minutes of 16 February were approved.

II. **SAC Report**. Professor Lowndes reported the following.

A. **Meetings**. SAC met twice in regular session since the last Senate meeting.

B. **Temporary Changes in Senate Meeting Format**. As was communicated in a recent memo, rather than attempt to add still more meetings to address the growing list of agenda items, SAC has decided instead to try to recover some time from the remaining meetings as follows:

First, we ask that everyone try to arrive as early as possible so that we can start the meetings on time.

Second, as temporary measures, SAC has taken the following steps to increase the time available for Senate deliberation and action:

- The SAC Report and the Provost's Report will be presented in written form only.
- Question Time will be moved to the end of the meeting agenda. In the event that no time is available for Question Time, Senators will have a 24-hour window following the end of the Senate meeting to send questions electronically to the Provost and/or SAC Chair and/or others. Responses to all questions will be sent electronically to all Senators within 48 hours of the end of the Senate meeting. All questions and answers submitted electronically will be included in the Senate minutes.

SAC regrets that we must adopt these temporary measures. However, we feel that the Senate has a responsibility to address the many reports on important issues and new programs that so many faculty and administrators have worked on throughout this year. We believe that the slight change in real-time that our temporary changes, if needed, will make to Question Time should not undermine, for the short term contemplated, the valuable transparency and accountability that Question Time offers.

**C. Senate Agenda Items:**

**<u>Agenda Items Awaiting Action</u>:**

Calendar Change: Spring Break
Handbook
2003-04 FDC Report: Resources for Teaching Effectiveness
2004-05 FDC Reports:
- Online Courses
- Employee Tuition Benefits for Study Abroad Programs
- Access to E-mail for Retired University Employees

Library Operations and Policies Committee Report
SPCS Program Proposals:
- "Direct Entry" Master of Science Degree in Respiratory Therapy

- Master of Professional Writing and Information Design
- Graduate Entry PharmD

CAS Program Proposal:

- Professional Masters Degree in Marine Biology

Graduate Student Activity Hours

Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Council Report

**Agenda Items Expected:**

Academic Policy Committee Report: General Education

Financial Affairs Committee Report: Budget Process Reform

Information Systems Policy Committee Report

Research Policy Oversight Committee Report

D. **Resolutions**. President Freeland and the Trustees have approved Senate resolutions on the following new programs:

- BS in Organizational Communication (SPCS)
- Transitional doctoral degree in Physical Therapy (tDPT) (SPCS)
- Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) programs for Acute Care Nurse Practitioner, Community/Public Health Nursing, Neonatal Nurse Practitioner, Nursing Administration, Nurse Anesthesia, Primary Care Nursing Adult Nurse Practitioner, Pediatric Nurse Practitioner, Family Nurse Practitioner, Psychiatric/Mental Health Clinical Nurse Specialist, and Psychiatric/Mental Health Nurse Practitioner in the School of Nursing
- MS in Corporate and Organizational Communication (SPCS)
- MS in Regulatory Affairs for Drugs, Biologics, and Medical Devices (SPCS)

E. **New SPCS Program**. The Graduate Certificate in Construction Management has been approved at each of the levels required, and SAC, having no objection, transmitted it to President Freeland.

F. **Matthews Distinguished Professorship Selection Committee**. SAC has appointed Professors Suzanne Ogden and Sheila Puffer to the Committee. Other members are: Matthews Professors Mardges Bacon and Stephen Reucroft, and Professors Jeffrey Hopwood, Graham Jones, and Ron Willey.

G. **Faculty Senate Bylaws**. The ballots for the vote by the teaching faculty on the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws have been distributed. To be counted, ballots must be returned to the Senate Office by 4 April 2005. Please encourage colleagues to participate.

H. **Next Meeting: Thursday, March 31 at 2:50 p.m. in Raytheon Amphitheater (240 EC)**.

III. **Resolution on Spring Break Calendar Change**. Professor Lowndes moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the new academic calendar recently approved to commence in the 2005-06 academic year be changed so that the Spring Break will now usually take place during the first week in March and usually during the eighth week of the semester.**

Professor Lowndes explained that the request for the proposed change had come from Registrar Allen to address problems raised by the athletics programs, whose directors had not been consulted on the earlier resolution. He yielded the floor to Registrar Office Systems Manager David Thornton who explained that the NU baseball team's spring-break training in Florida and what has become an annual game against the Red Sox, attended by 700 alumni this spring, would be adversely affected by a week's delay in the break. Track and Field also trains and has intercollegiate competition in Florida during the same week.

Professor Herman pointed out that the Academic Policy Committee had agreed that this amendment would not be substantive, since it is a one-week move back, and Spring Break will take place halfway through the spring semester.

There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 24-0-2.

IV. ***Ad Hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook**. Professor Ellis moved Resolution #2 and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

Resolution #2 – Section VI.C:

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.C (Special Academic Appointments: Lecturer, Research Professor/Scientist/Scholar, Clinical Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Visiting Faculty) presented in the Revised Draft (11/10/04) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*.**

Professor Ellis explained that this was the last part of the Handbook to cover an essentially cradle-to-grave section on each of the major categories of faculty. These are faculty that in the existing handbook are mentioned not quite in passing but in terms of what rights or privileges they do not have. This tries to set up a description of their rights and privileges and what the limits are.

Professor Alper, referring to section 1.b, asked whether the research professors/scientists/scholars would be included on dissertation committees. Professor Herman responded that those are matters traditionally left to departmental discretion. They are specifically excluded from Faculty Senate elections and participation in other institution-wide activities. Professor Ellis added that an individual in this category could always be appointed as a non-departmental member of a dissertation committee.

Professor McKnight read the following sentence on page 3, item 3.b: "A research faculty member may supervise graduate and post-doctoral research, direct graduate student theses and/or chair graduate committees."

Professor Onan urged that there be correspondence between the graduate bylaws, which state that the faculty member directing a dissertation must be full-time, and the Handbook so that the regulations are not at cross purposes.

Professor Vaughn noted that research faculty are often full-time, even if they are not of the professoriate. If a conflict arises between any other handbook and the Faculty Handbook approved by the Senate, the other document should be modified to conform to the Senate rules.

Professor Onan recalled that the thinking at the time the graduate bylaws were written was that the professoriate was full-time and not two-thirds time and no one had term appointments. She was asking for correspondence to ensure clarity.

There being no further discussion, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 29-0-0.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #3, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section II.C.3 (Selection and Appointment of Academic Administrators) presented in the Revised Draft (3/10/05) from the *ad hoc C*ommittee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the *Faculty Handbook*.**

With respect to other parts of section II which do not require Senate passage, Professor Ellis explained that the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook had revised the original committee's draft of the section by deleting two subsections created by the initial committee that would have established for deans and unit

heads detailed descriptions of their duties, terms of their appointments, and evaluation and salary raise procedures.

As to this resolution, he pointed out that, at the Agenda Committee's suggestion, the committee returned the language found in the current *Faculty Handbook* to replace the earlier committee's broad revision of the academic administrator search procedures. . The only differences from the current procedure are the updated list of titles to which the process applies and renumbering of the section and subsections to fit the new handbook's format.

There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED, 31-0-0.

V. **2004-05 Faculty Development Committee Report – Access to E-mail for Retired University Employees**. Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution, and the motion was seconded.

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the recommendation of the 2004-05 Faculty Development Committee that retired employees be able to continue in their University-given (non-sponsored) e-mail accounts for as long as they express a desire to do so and as long as that privilege is not in conflict with statutory regulations relating to security or other legitimate concerns.**

As background, Professor Herman explained that faculty who have retired from the University discover, to their distress and with no notice, that their e-mail privileges are cut off after thirty days, and they are cut off from the major way in which the members of our community learn what is going on at the University. In terms of maintaining the community and even utilizing retired faculty and staff as important contact points and participants, a number of retirees have asked why this was happening and if some way might be found to allow them to retain their contact with the University.

Professor Herman suggested adding, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That this privilege be available retroactively to all retired employees who request it." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Peterfreund emphasized that the amendment makes clear that the Senate is taking a stand on principle in making the resolution applicable not only to faculty but to all employees.

Provost Abdelal noted that this is a national norm.

The floor was yielded to Professor Wertheim who reported that IT had raised a few questions concerning regulatory issues with regard to employees having access to certain information, which is the reason for the provision about "statutory regulations relating to security or other legitimate concerns" in the resolution.

Discussion followed on points of transfer regarding private or University e-mail accounts for retirees.

Leslie Hitch, Director of Academic Technology Services, explained that the complications reported by HRM involve security and licensing, and how to coordinate the resources, and this will require a full-fledged discussion before addressing the technology side.

Provost Abdelal asked about extending e-mail privileges to alumni. Dr. Hitch replied that alumni can sign up and go to the alumni page at alumni@neu.edu.

Professor Lowndes pointed out that the spirit of the resolution was to try to do something that is reasonable and fair for retired people, alumni and others, and the intricacies or difficulties to be surmounted should not be the focus of discussion on the floor. Access to e-mail for retired people seems like a straightforward issue that is happening at virtually all other universities. He urged the Senate to take a vote and get the job done.

Dean Finkelstein agreed and pointed out that this was an example of where we are not clear on policy.

Professor Shafai wondered whether implementation should be done in a centralized or decentralized fashion.

Provost Abdelal pointed out that, without getting into the technical details, retired employees should have access by whatever is the appropriate means and someone has to figure that out.

Professor Alper added that access should also be to the University Libraries and other resources to which they had access previously.

Several Senators expressed concern that the e-mails they had stored in Lotus Notes might no longer be a resource after retirement, which could cripple future professional endeavors.

Professor Sherwood called the question, and there was no objection.

Vote: PASSED, 30-0-0.

VI. **2004-05 Faculty Development Committee Report – Tuition Waiver (Employee Benefits) for Online Courses**. Professor Peterfreund moved the following resolution and the motion was seconded.

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the recommendation of the 2004-05 Faculty Development Committee that the Northeastern Tuition Waiver Program (under Employee Benefits) include Northeastern-based online courses.**

The floor was yielded to Professor Wertheim who explained that there had been a $70 fee per student for an online course, the rationale for which was that online courses, unlike regular tuition-waived courses, created out-of-pocket costs for the University. Recently, the contract has changed so that a flat fee is paid to an outside vendor and so the rationale for charging for online courses no longer exists.

Professor Herman added that, when the original rule went into effect, online courses were few and far between. Adult education is moving at a rapid pace to online hybrid courses so that, because many courses are now available only online, not approving this would actually cause the tuition benefit to contract.

Professor Onan reported that she had talked with Vice President Pendergast who indicated that HRM was generally in support of the change and was reviewing it independently.

Dean Finkelstein wondered whether the short continuing education courses being offered through SPCS would also be covered under the employee tuition benefit because that issue will be brought forward at some point.

Dean Soyster noted that the issue was subtle because, for example, Engineering this semester is offering about sixteen video-streaming courses in a real-time setting, but in future years the courses could be offered offline in sequence, which would change the marginal resources. When you put an additional student in a live class, you do not need an additional instructor or resources, but in the video-streaming context and the associated business model the prevalent costs to deliver the courses are not as straightforward as one might think.

Professor Peterfreund observed that the matter is not straightforward even without the benefits issue. If an extra section is needed for a first-year writing course and a number of benefits-eligible individuals sign up, that section probably would be put online and the cost associated with it would be managed by the unit. If we look at tuition benefits as extra work or extra resources to be committed, why do we have them at all? The answer is that they are a benefit for people who have chosen a career with us that may not be particularly lucrative, and this is a benefit that we are proud to offer as a way of making the University a good place to work. Either way, we are committing extra resources -- but we are committed to doing it in principle anyway.

Professor McKnight pointed out that the discussion was about a tuition benefit rather than compensation for teaching a video-streaming course not on a regular schedule that might require some fraction of tuition. At this time, a person taking a course as an employee benefit would not pay tuition. He thought the situation should be handled internally.

Professor Onan explained that Dean Soyster's point is one of the elements HRM has been concerned about and is addressing. In the past, continuing education courses were offered on a space-available basis as signed off by the director of UC. For another section to be mounted, there would be real cost and there may not be the signoff to permit the person to take the course.

Professor Herman responded that the resolution simply states that these kinds of courses be included in the Northeastern tuition waiver program. It does not waive any other aspects of it. Employees can take courses that their supervisors consider necessary for their continuing professional development. We are including this sort of course as a category covered by the same rules and regulations that exist for any other courses under the tuition waiver program. Vice President Hopey has convened a committee for SPCS to look at the entire arena of course development, delivery, and payment regulations. How broadly that will be construed is not yet known, but Vice President Hopey is generally supportive as long as the language regarding the tuition waiver program covers all exigencies.

Professor Ellis referred to Dean Soyster's comments, pointing out that the tuition benefit does not cover added fees and noted that for individual lessons in Music the tuition is covered, but the per-lesson fee is like a lab fee and is not covered by the tuition waiver. If something requires one-on-one incremental time on the part of an instructor, this is one way to deal with that. Last year the spouse of a faculty member enrolled in an online course that was also offered in classroom sections with the identical course number; a grievance resulted when the tuition was not waived.

Professor Onan asked if the benefit regulations apply to both day colleges and SPCS courses. Professor Ellis responded that the benefit rule applies to any of them but there are some exclusions, such as the School of Law, and the fact that an employee needs the supervisor's permission to take a day course during working hours.

Professor Kruger called the question and there was no objection.

Vote: PASSED, 28-1-1.

VII. **2003-04 Faculty Development Committee Report**. Professor Glod moved Resolution #3 (formerly #4) and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

> **BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate urges the University to budget for a sum of $1000 to be allocated to each faculty member each year to support the development of his/her teaching effectiveness.**

Professor Glod explained that one of the charges to the committee was to foster teaching excellence in the University, and at present no standard allotment is available for teaching remediation, innovation, discipline update, experimental pedagogies, or other training that would foster teaching excellence. The committee looked at other institutions and found that the normal amount of funding there amounted to up to $5K.

Professor Peterfreund noted that the resolution allowed no discretion and no variability in the development needs of individuals and units, and this creates a problem for someone who has not signed on to this or whose teaching is at a level of competence that qualifies as excellent or effective. He wished there were some way to make this per capita, budgeted to units but allowing some discretion within units as to how best to allocate the money.

Professor Glod responded that the committee had recommended that no formal approval be necessary so that individuals would have some flexibility. The committee also recommended that the faculty develop 3-year plans to enhance and support their teaching, and the University would fund these plans on a *pro rata* basis based on total funding available.

Professor Peterfreund thought this would be another job that faculty did not sign onto when they signed their contracts.

Provost Abdelal voiced concern that the wording of the resolution did not capture the substance of what the report was saying.

Dean Soyster had served on the committee with enthusiasm because one of the issues the University should address in a consistent and regular manner is the continuous improvement of our teaching capabilities. In that spirit, what the committee is recommending should be of the highest priority to the Senate. He did have some sympathy for the notion that uniformly giving a check to everybody is not the best way to optimize the process. He favored taking the equivalent amount of money and providing it to the departments to develop plans for faculty who are very good and those who are not so good.

Motion. Professor Peterfreund suggested adding "per capita to be allocated by the colleges to fund the teaching effectiveness development plans for faculty" after $1000". The motion was seconded.

Professor Vaughn suggested adding "department or academic unit". Professor Peterfreund did not accept this as a friendly amendment.

Professor Lowndes spoke against the amendment and in favor of the original resolution. His sense was that the committee wanted faculty to face no barriers in the pursuit of teaching enhancement and development and not have to write a plan or proposal to one or more committees or administrators for such modest sums. Whoever writes the rules can specify what the money can and cannot be used for. The money should trigger some thinking on the part of faculty on how to use it to enhance their teaching. A similar plan for faculty development in Arts and Sciences has worked well. The focus of the committee report is to encourage all faculty to explore teaching enhancement. So the money should not go just to a small group as would likely be the case if the amendment passed, but rather to everybody. If the plan does not work, it can be always changed.

Professor Powers-Lee reported that the faculty in her department have routinely used their decentralized faculty development funds for teaching as well as for research purposes. Professor Glod responded that this was not the case for all of the University. For example, travel funds were centralized in her college and not readily available to those who could put them to good use.

Professor Alper wanted to know what the Financial Affairs Committee thought about committing $500K every year for teaching improvement and whether it was a priority among the members of the CFP. He wondered if this were the best way to proceed with allocating these resources.

Professor Kruger responded that the issue of having a fund to improve teaching effectiveness never came up and, after having served on the Financial Affairs Committee and the CFP, his feeling was that, in general, the faculty do not get enough support in terms of resources. He spoke in favor of the resolution and recalled that, until recently, development funds in his college were not guaranteed for tenured and tenure-track faculty. A decade ago many other universities were providing $1K to faculty, but that amount is inadequate today for any kind of faculty development in teaching or research.

Professor Vaughn added that neither the Financial Affairs Committee nor the CFP was able to get enough information to tell us where to find $500K and so could not answer the question. He thought the money should be routinely available and decentralized. He took exception to any comments by administrators that faculty do not spend enough time on their teaching.

Professor Lowndes reported that, although teaching effectiveness money was not discussed in the Financial Affairs or CFP sessions, all the deans and the Provost pushed very hard for professional development and faculty development funds, and this could embrace teaching effectiveness. The education of our students is the primary *raison d'être* of the University. Despite this, there are no funds to support and encourage people to pursue innovation in and enhancement of teaching. He urged the body to vote down the amendment and support the resolution.

Provost Abdelal observed that there is much evidence to show that teaching is taken very seriously at the University in terms of how to further enhance teaching effectiveness and to support faculty development,

whether teaching or scholarship, both of which are important. By increasing the operational budgets of academic departments his intent is to provide money that departments can use to support teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and the means to invite faculty from elsewhere to come and talk about different issues and enrich the department's intellectual life. He did not sense disagreement among the faculty, deans, Provost and President in the commitment to teaching effectiveness. All academic units' operating budgets simply need to be enhanced so that faculty work is supported.

Professor Peterfreund thought that the usefulness of his amendment is to highlight the fact that support moneys are inadequate, but it does not follow that throwing a thousand dollars in "chump change" at each faculty member will solve the problem; discretion is needed. As a chair, he would be concerned about having the discretion to allocate money to a faculty member who has gone research-inactive. That person will need some help to get his or her act together.

For the person who is assigned five courses, a *quid pro quo* would be to assure that this teaching load will comprise a bigger component of merit score, and funding the tools to improve teaching makes the experience more enjoyable for both teacher and student. Discretion is needed, and $1000 will not solve the problem.

Dean Stellar thought the teaching commitment of the faculty to be unquestionable. However, he agreed with Dean Soyster that we do not have a stake in the ground on teaching as part of our ordinary business. We need to raise it up, particularly as we have a new crop of highly qualified students who are looking for that from us. While faculty have multiple roles, it is teaching that helps us get our salaries every year. While he understood the intent of the committee, he was against the resolution to give everyone $1000 because it seemed to show a certain form of disrespect to the process in that it does not involve any local scrutiny. He would be happy to have this reside entirely in the departments to minimize the bureaucracy involved and to adjudicate the allocation of these resources.

Professor Herman was opposed to the amendment. He explained that funds such as the IDF have been available in the past, and perhaps still are, to which faculty can apply for instructional development. Often the unit head is in the position of having to decide which relatively small item faculty members need to improve their teaching. Although he agreed with Professor Peterfreund that $1000 was "chump change," it nevertheless makes a difference because each faculty member has access to it. Once you turn it into another kind of activity, it changes the basis of it and creates a situation in which one wonders why we need the IDF if we are settling this money at the college or department level. He agreed with Provost Abdelal that while we need to enhance the operational budgets of departments that is not the same as faculty development money. His experience with faculty has been that, if they choose to spend a couple of hundred dollars on materials, such as DVDs, to improve their teaching, what is left is not enough to do the kinds of things that will enhance their scholarship. He was in favor of making the money available to each faculty member. Checks would not simply be handed out. Faculty members generally submit bills that are reimbursed, and expenditures, whether by ProCards or other means, are checked.

Professor Peterfreund observed that allocating the money to the colleges, which could then decide to let departments handle the process, would not be precluded under the amended language.

Professor Kruger would like to see a strong vote for the resolution to show the Senate's strong support for faculty getting more financial support for teaching.

Professor Futrelle thought one concern was the lack of feedback after the money is distributed. He pointed out that merit review committees would decide whether the money had been well spent.

Provost Abdelal noted that the University no longer uses ProCards.

Dean Soyster emphasized his commitment to continued improvement of teaching effectiveness. He indicated that he would vote for whatever would bring quick results and noted that he would prefer to give $5000 to some faculty and nothing to others.

Professor Sherwood suggested a friendly amendment to the amendment, which would read, "BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate urges the University to budget a sum of $1000 to be allocated to each faculty member each year to support his or her activities for the development of his/her teaching effectiveness. The support activities must receive prior approval of the unit head." He then withdrew his amendment.

Professor Lowndes was opposed to having the money go to unit heads because it could finish up going to just a small group of people and the effect would be contrary to the intent of the committee's report, which was teaching effectiveness for everybody. As dean, he had been forced to look carefully at how department chairs were using their faculty development money. They were not always using it for the general good but often for the select good of a smaller number of individuals. As a result, the distribution of faculty development money was changed to the current decentralized process whereby every faculty member receives an equal per capita amount. The process has been a success. He therefore urged that the teaching development money be similarly decentralized and go directly to the faculty members. The spirit of the resolution was to get everyone focused on teaching effectiveness.

Professor Glod pointed out that the committee's real spirit, particularly regarding the intention of this resolution, was that each faculty member deserves $1000 for teaching. Faculty development funds are used in other ways for other things. She was representing the eight committee members and urged the Senate to send the very important message in the resolution to the administration, to our peers who are full-time faculty members and term faculty members, and to students. She hoped that what she had heard about the Senate not being behind the spirit of the resolution was not true.

Provost Abdelal did not think that taking a particular course of action means that teaching effectiveness is not being supported. He has not seen any evidence of any department that is less than strongly supportive. Teaching effectiveness is essential when it comes to tenure and promotion. The Provost Office, as one of its highest priorities, will continue its efforts to increase the operational budgets of academic units in support of faculty work in every budget cycle. Much of the disagreement is really about how to do most effectively what we agree needs to be done.

Professor Onan called the question. The motion was seconded.

Vote to close debate on the amendment: PASSED, 21-3-2.

Professor Peterfreund noted that before the vote on cloture was taken the Provost had not asked if there were any objection. He objected.

Professor Peterfreund offered to withdraw his amendment and substitute a more unifying motion. As it was too late, he read his amendment: "BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate urges the University to budget for a sum of $1000 to be allocated by the colleges to fund the teaching effectiveness development plans of faculty members each year."

Vote on Professor Peterfreund's amendment: FAILED, 7-16-3.

Vote on cloture: PASSED, 19-7-1.

As a point of information, Professor Alper asked the meaning of "faculty." Professor Glod replied that it meant any full-time faculty member.

Vote on Resolution #3: PASSED, 22-5-0.

Adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Ellis, Jr.
Secretary