

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Tuesday 26 June 2009 - 2:30pm
Behrakis Grand Hall (Creese)

1. Minutes of Tuesday 26 May 2009 electronically approved by Senators
2. Report of the Chair (10mins.)
3. Faculty Recognition Dinner and Awards Ceremony June 3, 2009

Faculty Senate Congratulates the following Senators

Stephanie Brooks, LCSW, LMFT

College of Nursing and Health Professions Teaching Excellence Award

Jennifer Taylor, Ph.D., MPH

School of Public Health Teaching Excellence Award

Roberta Waite, Ed.D.

Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundation Minority Junior Faculty Award for Career Enhancement

Timothy Kurzweg, Ph.D.

Christian R. and Mary F. Lindback Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence

4. Vice Provost for Research Committee (attached)
5. Drexel Green Academic Committee Report (30mins.)
Presenter: Kimberly E. Stott, Ph.D.
Interim Director & HR Partner
6. Senate Budget, Planning and Development Committee, (30mins.)
Eva Thury, Chair – report attached

7. Senate Committee on Academic Affairs, Joseph Martin, Chair

Review SCAA proposals by going to the following link:

<https://committees.moss.drexel.edu/coursechange>

Login: your username, type `drexel/{username}` - example, `drexel\bjc6`

SchLaw (SP 200) Law 623 co-op course change

CoE (SP 242) Engineering Management - Sept. 2009(Sacramento, CA)

LeBow

(SP 234) Graduate Prerequisite Changes

Major restructuring of MBA program offerings and concentration requirements

(SP 240) The number of concentrations will be reduced from eleven to the following four: (1) finance, (2) marketing, (3) entrepreneurship / innovation management (4) Customizable option. Each concentration offers two tracks – global and management.

Students opting for a concentration (12 credits) would be required to take **minimally two three-credit courses** from the required column and **maximum of two three-credit courses** from the elective column (see Table 1 next page). Students could opt to take all four courses from the required column.

CNHP (SP 236, 238, 239)

NURS 576, 578, 579 – Course Changes

IST

(SP 243) New Concentration for MS(LIS) Program - New Courses in Archival Studies: INFO 560, 561, 750, 751

(SP 213) INFO 664 Prerequisite change

8. Senate Nominations Committee, Rena Cumby, Chair
2009-2010 Nominations received from the following Academic Units
College of Medicine
College of Arts & Sciences
College of Engineering
School of Public Health

9. New Business (5mins.)

Tuesday 18 August 2009 – 2:00pm

Adjourn

Drexel University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday May 26, 2009
Minutes

Present: Kennedy (Chair), Cumby (Vice Chair), Campbell (Secretary), Goldberg, Thury, Joe Martin, Reilly, Maragah, Cernansky, Waite, Gardner (alternate for Cornelius), Scheffer, Weiner, Carney (alternate for Handel), Matus-Medoza, Zarro, Taylor, Hayes, Kurzweg, Reynolds, Neuhuber, Prehatny, Gonzalez, Farouk, Urias, Seligman, Weinberger, Polansky, Clay, White, Reisman, Lelkes.

Meeting convened at 2:35 PM

1. **Minutes of March 17, 2009** – See Item 2 below (Report of Chair) for discussion of minutes, amendments and approval.

2. **Report of Chair** – Michael Kennedy conducted the following discussion regarding the minutes from the March 17, 2009 Faculty Senate meeting:

- a) Minute format – The minutes are intended to capture the general nature of the discussion and provide an overview of the significant issues covered. They are not intended, and cannot be expected, to capture the blow-by-blow description of the statements made by individual Senators. The Steering Committee discussed the role and nature of Faculty Senate minutes at its April 7, 2009 meeting and concur with this philosophy. Individual senators have the option to request amendment of the proposed minutes at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- b) The minutes submitted by the Recording Secretary and distributed to the Faculty Senate in preparation for today’s meeting were opened for discussion.
 - 1. Professor Cernansky presented an amended version of Section 8 New Business as submitted (See EXHIBIT I – pages 5-8 below). Senator Goldberg motioned that EXHIBIT I be placed on the floor for discussion and the motion was seconded by Senator Reilly.
 - 2. An extended discussion of Professor Cernansky’s amended version of Section 8 followed:
 - i. During this discussion Professor Thury asked that references to her in the document be removed from the amended Section 8 (EXHIBIT I) since she did not feel they represented her comments at the meeting (i.e., first sentence of para. 2 “Senator Thury suggested.....Section 9.4 of the Charter” and the following 3rd bullet in the Additional discussion followed, including section: “Removal of PAC from the T&P..... the Senate Steering Committee.”
 - ii. There was considerable discuss regarding the structure of the Provost Advisory Committee (PAC) including the following: whether PAC should be part of the formal P&T process and whether a candidate should or should not have right to review PAC discussions. Professor Maragah commented that the Faculty Affairs Committee he Chairs is working with the Provost’s Office to improve the process as part of the P&T process overhaul that is taking place.
 - 3. Vote on the amended version of Section 8 submitted by Professor Cernansky with the modifications noted in the previous section was taken and the amended version of Dr. Cernansky’ Section 8 was adopted (i.e., with Professor Thury’ remarks removed. **The motion passed 13 for – 7 against- 0 abstentions.**

3. Provost Mark Greenberg comments and discussion – The Provost was acknowledged and indicated that he felt the discussion regarding the PAC was an important discussion and he appreciates the healthy discussion taking place and that he looks forward to working with the Faculty Affairs Committee to improve the process.

- a) He stated that based upon his experience in working with the PAC as a dean and now as provost is that it helped create rough “equity” across the University and that he believes that it should be known by the faculty that the PAC is part of the process. He also noted that he needs to look at all the cases and will do what he believes is in the best interest of the University. Finally, he also believes that we should be looking forward rather than at the past in this matter.
- b) There was considerable discussion on the “Draft Resolution” submitted by Professor Cernansky and a decision was reached that a vote would be taken on the “resolved” questions presented in the Draft Resolution presented to the Faculty Senate. Professor Goldberg proposed an amendment to remove the 13th Whereas paragraph and questions 1, 3, and 4 (leaving only question 2). Professor Cernansky accepted this friendly amendment.
- c) **The above amended draft resolution (3b above) was voted upon. The vote was 7 for, 11 against and no abstentions. The Draft Resolution was rejected by the Faculty Senate.**

4. Carl (Tobey) Oxholm III, Senior Vice Provost: Mr. Oxholm presented an overview of the University’s current Sacramento program initiatives, facilities, and plans for the immediate future. His full presentation will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

5. Standing Committee Reports:

Nominations Committee – As reported in the Agenda for the meeting, academic units have been notified of Faculty Senate and Standing Committee Nominations for 2009/2010.

Committee on Academic Affairs – Professor Martin presented the Consent Agenda as presented in the Agenda attached for **SoE, IST, CNHP, Westphal** to the Senate. The Senate **unanimously** approved the Consent Agenda as presented.

Committee on Faculty Affairs – Hazem Maragah reported that the committee is working with the Provost’s office on revisions to the Promotion and Tenure process and will keep the Faculty Senate informed.

Committee on Academic Support – no report.

Committee on Student Life – Professor Gordon’s report attached to the agenda distributed for today’s meeting.

Budget, Planning and Development Committee – Professor Thury’s report attached to the agenda distributed for today’s meeting.

6. New Business – none

Next meeting June 16, 2009 at 2:30PM.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:25PM

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Tuesday 26 May 2009 - 2:30pm
University Club Reserved Section (6th flr. MacAlister)

1. Minutes of Tuesday 17 March 2009 electronically approved by Senators
2. Report of the Chair (15mins.)
3. Provost Mark Greenberg (15mins.)
Questions/Discussion (20mins.)
4. Carl (Tobey) Oxholm III, Senior Vice President (20mins.)
5. Standing Committee Reports (45mins.)

Senate Nominations Committee, Rena Cumby, Chair

Academic Units have been notified of Faculty Senate and Standing Committee Nominations for 2009/2010

Senate Committee on Academic Affairs, Joseph Martin, Chair

Review SCAA proposals by going to the following link:

<https://committees.moss.drexel.edu/coursechange>

Login: your username, type drexel / {username} - example, drexel\bjc6

Consent Agenda

SoE - (share point 128) Graduate Literacy Electives: EDLS 501, 503, 505, 507, 509, 512, 515, 519, 521, 529

IST – (share point 216) INFO 320, 321, 330, 340, 365, 370 – pre-requisite changes

CNHP – (share point 201-212) Creative Arts Therapies – course changes: ARTS 621, 637, 634, 639, 651, 655, 658, 659, 660; ARTS 652 (share point 235)

New courses: ARTS 625, Thesis Only; ARTS 699 Independent Study in Creative Arts Therapy

Westphal – (share point 217-221)-course changes: DSMR 211, 312, 322, 399, 433, 477

DSMR Housekeeping: DSMR 211, 322, DSMR 477: restriction change

DSMR 312: prerequisite change

DSMR 399: remove – must have the following classifications: Junior, Senior

DSMR 433: remove – this is a writing intensive course – course is going through

a name change as part of DSMR major revisions that are currently in the SCAA approval process.

END CONSENT AGENDA – CONSENT AGENDA ENDS – CONSENT AGENDA ENDS –

Senate Committee on Student Life, Mary Gordon, Chair - report attached

Senate Budget, Planning and Development Committee, Eva Thury, Chair – report attached

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, Hazem Maragah, Chair

6. New Business

Faculty Senate meeting Tuesday 16 June 2009, 2:30pm

Adjourn

EXHIBIT 1

Drexel University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday March 17, 2009
Minutes

(Amendment Offered by Senator Cernansky, from the College of Engineering)

Replace:

8. New Business – Professor Cernansky submitted a “*Draft Resolution – On the Provost Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Offered by Senator Cernansky, from College of Engineering) March 17, 2009*” (See ATTACHMENT 1 below). Motion to accept the “Draft Resolution was made by Cernansky and seconded by Martin. There was considerable discussion of the “Draft Resolution” and it was decided to table the motion on the floor to adopt the resolution until the next faculty senate meeting and ask the interim provost to come to the next meeting to discuss the resolution.

With:

8. New Business – Professor Cernansky submitted a “*Draft Resolution – On the Provost Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (Offered by Senator Cernansky, from College of Engineering) March 17, 2009*” (See ATTACHMENT 1 below). Motion to accept the “Draft Resolution was made by Cernansky and seconded by Martin.

There was considerable discussion of the “Draft Resolution.” Senator Cernansky provided a brief summary of the recent events that motivated the formulation of his Draft Resolution on the Provost’s Advisory Committee on tenure and Promotion. Specifically, Senator Cernansky stated that: (1) general background material on PAC was provided in his 2/9/09 e-mail with two attachments, which was sent to all Senators in response to Interim Provost Greenberg’s message about PAC and PAC processes transmitted by Chair Kennedy on 1/28/09; (2) the two attachments included a 2/5/09 three page letter to Senators on PAC responding to the Interim Provost’s message, and an eight page ‘white paper’ on PAC transmitted to Interim Provost Greenberg on 12/8/08; (3) as noted at the 2/24/09 Senate meeting, these materials were remanded to the SCFA by Chair Kennedy for consideration as part of the current discussions with Vice Provost DiNardo about updating the current T&P policy; (4) following Senator Cernansky’s 2/9/09 e-mail, several Senators approached him indicating that a discussion of the issues by the full Senate is warranted; and (5) in response to this input, Dr. Cernansky distilled the two documents to one double sided page in the form of a Draft Resolution, including some specific Senate actions for consideration. (Dr. Cernansky subsequently noted that the second “Be it resolved” item is already under way and it is included merely to formalize it as a Senate position.)

Senator Thury suggested that the motion should be ruled out of order as she believed that Whereas #4 of the Draft Resolution stating that PAC cannot be considered a University Advisory Committee (UAC) is incorrect and that PAC does indeed satisfy Section 9.4 of the Charter. Senator Cernansky responded that UAC’s are for policy matters only, not personnel matters, so the Whereas is correct as stated. Senator Maragah agreed that

UAC's are for policy matters only and cannot address personnel matters. A few other Senators agreed with the response and the suggestion to rule the motion out of order was not acted upon.

After a brief exchange on how to proceed with discussing the Draft resolution, Senator Martin asked Senator Cernansky to give a 5 minute overview of the underlying problems and issues with PAC. Senator Cernansky stated that his 2/9/09 e-mail and attachments to Senators contained the relevant background material, but the key issues are:

- The PAC on T&P cannot be considered a UAC
- The Provost has every right to form and use Advisory Committees on any matter he or she sees fit; however, if such a committee is formed to review Tenure and Promotion cases, then this committee must follow Drexel's T&P policy (and should be fully integrated into the T&P policy including approval by the Faculty Senate, the President, and the Board of Trustees)
- The present mode of operation of the PAC does not follow Drexel's T&P policy (e.g., votes are taken but not recorded or reported to anyone, not even the candidates' supervisors, i.e., Department Head and Dean)
- Faculty Senate must look out for and advocate for the interests of Faculty (especially Tenure Track faculty), to make sure that they are treated fairly, professionally, and ethically, and in a manner consistent with our open and approved processes

Additional discussion followed, including:

- The argument that the votes by PAC are merely "straw" votes and therefore do not need to be recorded or reported: Senator Cernansky opined that signed secret ballots where comments and the strength of support for or against individual candidates is indicated (as occurred in 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08) are very much "real" votes, and must be documented and reported per our T&P policy.
- The PAC brings the T&P evaluation process at the Provost's level into the open with faculty participation. A concern was raised that the resolution might drive the process underground. One senator believed that this is a step backward; candidate does not have a chance to respond.
- Removal of PAC from the T&P calendar and Provost's Website: Senator Thury stated that removal of all reference to PAC in this year's T&P calendar and the Provost's Website was done at the suggestion of the Senate Steering Committee.

Actions: As time was running short, the motion was tabled until the next Senate meeting on Tuesday, 14 April 2009 where the resolution will be placed on the regular Agenda for continued discussion, consideration, and action. The Draft Resolution will be sent to absent Senators and Alternates. The Interim Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will be invited to participate in the discussion.

ATTACHMENT 1
Draft Resolution
On the Provost Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion
(Offered by Senator Cernansky, from the College of Engineering)
March 17, 2009

- WHEREAS:** Drexel University established an open Tenure and Promotion Review Policy (the Policy), which was formally approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees in 1996, which is posted on the Provost's website;
- WHEREAS:** Key tenets of the Policy were to ensure openness and clarity of the decision making process, to both the candidate and the Drexel community;
- WHEREAS:** Provost Director established in AY 2005/06 the Provost Advisory Committee (PAC) for faculty Tenure and Promotion (T&P) purposes, whose Membership includes all deans/school directors, selected administrators, and several faculty members from various colleges/schools;
- WHEREAS:** The PAC cannot be considered as a University Advisory Committee per Article 9.4 of the Charter of Faculty Governance which addresses only policies matters regarding the academic enterprise of the University and not personnel matters;
- WHEREAS:** The establishment of the PAC was never publicly announced, was not explicitly listed on the Provost website as an integral step in the T&P Review process, was not reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees, and its existence is not known to most faculty members and the T&P candidates;
- WHEREAS:** Unlike all other tenure and promotion committees at Drexel, the selection of faculty members to serve on the PAC is not transparent; There are no criteria (e.g., qualification of the faculty members, requirements of collegial representation – based on the candidates' affiliation) set forth for this selection; Potential for conflict of interest is substantial (e.g., PAC member(s) were seated by the Provost/Senate on the University Tenure Appeals Committee);
- WHEREAS*:** At prior meetings of PAC, members of PAC voted on each candidate individually on a single ballot and passed their signed ballots to the Provost at the end of the meeting (including their written comments), they did not share their votes or comments with their colleagues on the Committee, and they were not informed of the results of these ballots;
- WHEREAS*:** PAC does not issue a final report and the results of the PAC ballot are not shared with anyone, resulting a situation where the candidate and her/his academic supervisors (i.e., the dean and department head) are not informed of the results of the deliberation, which is contrary to any other T&P review body at Drexel;
- WHEREAS:** The above clearly indicates that the mode of operation of PAC violates the fundamental requirement as stated in the Policy itself, as is posted on the Provost's website, stating that: "*When a tenure and promotion review committee is established, formal procedures must be followed. General orderliness of record is important regarding dates and attendance of meetings, evidence considered, votes taken, manner of voting and outcome.*", where the intent of this policy statement is to clearly ensure that this requirement applies to all tenure/promotion review committees, including PAC;
- WHEREAS:** The overwhelming majority of the PAC membership is from disciplines and fields which are outside of any individual T&P candidate's field (i.e., 'outside members'), raising serious doubts regarding the professional qualifications and propriety of those 'outside members' to pass judgment on the accomplishments, credentials, and academic potential of a candidate from a different discipline/field, while these same 'outside members' could be swayed either way of the debate on any T&P candidate, a situation which is particularly acute in borderline cases;
-

* The process described herein was followed by PAC in AY 2005/06, 06/07, and 07/08. The process adopted by PAC in AY 08/09 is unknown. Furthermore, even the obtuse reference to PAC that appeared on the Provost website detailing the T&P review process has now been removed.

WHEREAS: Although PAC is labeled as “Advisory” to the Provost, it cannot be considered as such since the Provost chairs its meeting and expresses his views on the qualifications of the candidates, tainting the evaluation process by affecting the votes of the members, most of whom are ‘outside members’ and most of whom (with the exception of the faculty members) are administrative subordinates to the Provost, who may choose not to comment and vote in writing in objection to the expressed views of the Provost;

WHEREAS: Any feedback by PAC to the Provost on T&P matters must be viewed in light one of the key tenets of Drexel’s T&P Policy which states that: “*The reports early in the process are critically important as being closest to the evidence and to persons best technically equipped to judge that evidence.*”, and therefore PAC and the Provost must have strong and clear reasons to not support tenure for applicants who were recommended by the Department Tenure Review Committee, by the Department Head, by the many letters of references submitted by national and international peers, by the tenured faculty of her/his department, by the undergraduate and graduate student committees, by the College Administrative Council, by the College Advisory Committee, and by the Dean;

WHEREAS: The flawed process raises serious questions on the legitimacy of the entire decision making process, particularly so in cases when the Provost denies tenure to a faculty member who was supported for tenure by all the academic and administrative committees throughout the academic ladder;

WHEREAS: The refusal of the Provost to provide faculty members who are denied tenure with a report (including the findings of the PAC), beyond the factual statement of the decision made, is a clear violation of the University’s Tenure and Promotion Policy which states that: “*Candidates will be sent a copy of the Provost’s report (as endorsed by the President)*”, and it is a clear violation of the policy of The American Association of University Professors which states in its *Policy Documents & Report*, under its *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure* (tenth edition, p. 23), that:

- “*When a decision not to renew an appointment has been reached, the faculty member involved will be informed of that decision in writing by the body or individual making the decision; the faculty member will be **advised upon request of the reasons which contributed to that decision.** The faculty member may request a reconsideration by the body or individual making the decision.*” (Emphasis added)
- “*If the faculty member so requests, the reasons given in explanation of the non renewal will be **confirmed in writing.***” (Emphasis added)

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE:

1. Considers the inclusion of the PAC in the T&P decision process, as it is currently constituted, a violation of the fundamental process and basic premise as approved by the Board of Trustees;
2. Calls on the President to work together with the Faculty Senate to streamline the Tenure and Promotion Process and formulate new rules that will ensure that the tenure and promotion review processes can stand the scrutiny of any ethical and professional review. These new rules should be reviewed and approved by the same University bodies that approved the current policy, including the Board of Trustees, and subsequently be posted on the Provost’s web-site;
3. Calls for the PAC on Tenure and Promotion to be disbanded until such a revised process is formulated, approved, announced, and posted;
4. Calls on the President to review all tenure and promotions cases that were denied by the Provost since AY 2005/06.

2009 VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Vadake “VK” Narayanan, CHAIR

John Bielec

Pete Frisko

Yury Gogotsi

Chuck Haas

James Herbert

Brian Keech

Peter Lando (external member)

Bob McGrath

Mary Moran

Kim Morrison (Diversified Search)

Rita Naremore

Craig Newschaffer

Banu Onaral

Cherie Wright (HR)

MINUTES* OF THE MEETING OF THE
Senate Committee on Academic Support
May 12, 2009
1:30 p.m.
302 Hagerty

*Agenda reproduced at the end of this document.

Present: Rachel Reynolds (COAS), Chair; Kevin Owens (COAS); Xia Lin (IST); Dov Jaron (School of BME); Jason Silverman (School of Education); Joan Mazuchowski (Legal Research Center); Peter Egler (Legal Research Center); Nicole Vaughn (SPH); Chaomei Chen (IST); Arnold Smolen (DUCOM); Lenore Hardy (Library); Dorothy Schwartz (Library).

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN VACANCY

After introductions, Lenore Hardy gave a brief update on the hiring of the new University Librarian. An ad was placed in major national job listings soliciting CVs for review starting in mid-May. The hiring committee, chaired by IST Dean David Fenske, will be meeting shortly to review applications. This hire has not been affected by any hiring freeze.

HAGERTY LIBRARY UPDATE

Dorothy Schwartz provided information on Hagerty's ongoing and upcoming scheduled renovations have included HVAC being fixed; cosmetic upgrades including carpeting; more seating for students, and the addition of a Taco Bell express to the Bookmark Café.

HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY UPDATE

Lenore Hardy told the committee that renovations are planned for the Hahnemann library during the summer and fall. Unused space and a number of group study rooms will be converted into two classrooms (64 and 120 student rooms) for use in health sciences programs. In exchange, the library will be funded to replace old stacks with student use areas and additional group study rooms. It was suggested that avenues to donate removed print materials be explored.

LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER

Peter Egler told the committee that the Law library will continue to share Hagerty Library space (the third floor) for the foreseeable future, as no new discussions for building a permanent law school building have come up. The new library director, Mark Bernstein, who comes to us from St. Louis University Law school, starts on July 1. An inquiry was made as to whether the ABA feels the law school has adequate library space. The space was provisionally approved by ABA during an evaluation visit for the whole law school. Contemporary law libraries do need less space because of electronic collections, however, student use is very high and seating for students might be called for. An inquiry was made to whether law libraries and undergraduate libraries sharing space was common. Egler said the only other law school in the country that shares space with undergraduates is Liberty University.

UPDATE ON BUDGETS

Dorothy Schwartz explained that the libraries (excluding the Legal Resource Center) have a combined budget of 7.9 million, with 5.7 million for personnel and 3.6 for materials. 446K is for dvds and books (electronic and otherwise), 1.7 million for serials, 1.4 million for databases, and 30K for microfiche. The flat budget

policy for next year's budget leaves the library unable to cover a 21K increase in serials/database fees to Science Direct, and 50K to other electronic resources providers.

An inquiry was made about reducing staff or not hiring staff who quit, but Schwartz responded that the student to staff ratio is very low compared to peer institutions, and staff have already been pared down. Additional savings were enacted last year by reducing duplications in serials to cut 61K in fees. As it stands now, the library will have to cut electronic holdings next year, and eliminate fulfillment of faculty requests for serials, and reduce fulfillment of faculty requests for dvds and books. Additionally, with slight increases in enrollment each year, the burden on an already barebones library staff and facilities will increase. Finally, with reduction in electronic holdings, there is possibly a reduction in numbers of concurrent users, i.e. some people may not be able to get to online databases when they are heavily in use. Thus, a flat budget for the library entails a reduction in crucial research and learning materials.

A question was asked about saving money through developing consortia.

A question was asked about if EZ Borrow/Interlibrary loan fees will also go up next year. Schwartz responded that last year, they were 145K of the budget, and they are going up next year, but the percentage fee increase is not yet available.

A question was raised about what percentage increase could keep the library able to provide current services. Kevin Owens mentioned that his calculations show that a \$4.40 per student increase would keep the library at current services. The library administration is going to provide this exact number to the SCAS in the next few days. One important figure is based on the current five year contract with Elsevier, which involves a 5% increase in fees each year. Schwartz said that she could try to renegotiate some of the contracts with electronic research materials providers.

A question was raised about increased revenues through the new Taco Bell franchise in the library. Schwartz responded that the library does not see that revenue, which is part of the Drexel contract with Sodexo.

Because a flat budget entails a reduction in library services, the committee decided to bring the library budget issue to the faculty senate meeting on Tuesday, May 19th, whereby we recommend that the university "increase the library budget specifically to include the cost of subscriptions in order to maintain current library resources."

LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Rachel Reynolds mentioned that the Library Advisory Committee has become moribund with the untimely death of the Libraries Director, Jane Bryan, last December. She will be contacting former attendees, as well as members of SCAS, for suggestions to find representatives for this committee from all university units. SCAS members are requested to speak with their department heads and deans to solicit ideas for the best members for the library advisory board.

ONLINE EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT

Michael Scheuermann provided an overview of IRT support services for faculty and staff. Notable services include Impatica, which compresses large PPT presentations to be more easily stored or sent via email, and a new Adobe program (coming soon) that will allow for remote conferencing. There is also a how to do

SKYPE brown bag lunch meeting scheduled for July. The committee asked that a copy of Scheuermann's PPT be appended to the minutes, so it is attached.

Draft prepared May 15, 2009 by Rachel Reynolds

AGENDA

I. Introductions (5 min.)

II. Libraries Update (30 min.)

- Update on hiring of University Librarian
(Lenore Hardy, Administrative Director, Health Sciences Library)
- Status Report on Hagerty Library
(Dorothy Schwartz, Interim Libraries Directory)
- Status Report on Legal Research Center
(Peter Egler, Interim Director & Joan Mazuchowski, Technical Services Interim Director)
- Status Report on Health Services Libraries (Lenore Hardy)

III. Revitalization of the Library Advisory Committee (Rachel Reynolds) (15 min.)

IV. Resources Provided to Faculty - Overview (Michael Scheuermann, Associate Vice President of Instructional Technology Support) (20 min.)

V. Other Business (5 min.)

Senate Committee on Budget, Planning, and Development:
Report on the FY2010 Budget

Submitted to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, for the Senate, on May 12, 2009

Members:

Johnson Bowie (Athletics)

Bob Brehm (At large: Engineering)

W. Edward Bureau (Goodwin)

David Campbell (Lebow)

Carl Drott (iSchool)

Daniel Filler (Law)

Paul Hirshorn (Westphal)

Peter Lewin (BMES)

Kevin Owens (At large: CoAS)

Giuseppe Palmese (Engineering)

Doreen Saar (CoAS)

Mary Ellen Smith Glasgow (Nursing)

Eva Thury (Chair: CoAS)

Michael Weingarten (DUCoM)

Seth Welles (Public Health)

Executive Summary

The Senate Committee on Budget, Planning, and Development has been charged with analyzing the budget for a report to the Senate to be transmitted to the Board of Trustees before its consideration of the budget. This report presents the Committee's analysis which is based on its review of the budget process amid a national climate of uncertainty and an unexpected transition of leadership for the institution. The Committee was also able to review aspects of the proposed FY 2010 budget. Here follows a brief overview of the sections of this report, with some characterization of the material discussed in each:

- **The University Academic Strategic Plan.** The FY 2010 budget contains only \$1 million of new funds for the implementation of objectives and initiatives outlined in the Academic Strategic Plan. The current services budget has meant a delay in the implementation of the Strategic Plan. While we understand why this was necessary, we believe that further delay in the strategic planning process could be detrimental to the development of the academic enterprise.
- **The Burlington County and Sacramento Initiatives.** The FY 2010 budget provides greater transparency in its representation of the Sacramento initiative. However, examination of budget figures for the Sacramento initiative suggests there are aspects of the project that are not yet clear.
- **Allocation of Tuition Revenue.** The proposed FY 2010 budget continues positive trends with respect to the allocation of tuition revenue. For FY2010 the ratio of expenditures on College Programs to Net Tuition & Fees is 67% as compared to 66% last year. The proposed tuition discount rate for FY2010 is 33%, a number consistent with the general pattern Drexel has established. Given the current economic circumstances, the belief that we will be able to maintain our discount pattern is encouraging.
- **Space Needs.** The worldwide recession this year has meant a slowdown of the renovation plans needed to improve the University's space shortage. Given the importance of learning spaces to the success of the academic enterprise, and the expertise that faculty have in this area, more regular faculty input is needed in the design and redesign of learning spaces.
- **Faculty Compensation:** The Drexel Faculty Market Study of salaries has been released to the faculty. This study suggests that the University has been providing full-time tenure-track faculty with salaries at the median of their peer institutions. However, there are concerns the University may not be competitive with respect to adjunct faculty salaries; investigation is recommended.
- **The Library.** To meet contractual obligations, the Library will have to make significant cuts in materials or services to comply with the mandate for a flat budget. It is especially imperative to increase spending in order maintain current electronic collections, as unlike hard-copy books or journals, in many cases, access to both current and past issues disappears when subscriptions are cancelled.

Introduction

In accordance with the mandate in Section 10.7 of the Charter of Faculty Governance of Drexel University,¹ the Senate Committee on Budget, Planning, and Development (hereafter “the Committee”) has prepared this report after systematic and extensive study of the budgeting process at Drexel.

This has been an extremely difficult year for budgetary planning at Drexel University, as a result of negative forces in the economy as well as a sad transition of leadership in the institution itself. In preparing the FY 2010 budget, Drexel declared a “current services” mandate which was defined as flat, restricting expenses to last year’s levels or below. Although hiring continued in the University, there was a slowing of that as well. From the Committee’s perspective, major portions of the University’s budget were not available until the number of confirmed students could be known on May 1st, and some aspects of the budget have been undergoing last-minute changes to reflect the budgetary priorities of Acting President Chuck Pennoni.

As we are cognizant of the extraordinary financial challenges that our University faces this year, we wish to be seen as partners with the administration in promoting Drexel’s goals. As a result, the Committee felt that its best course of action was to look at areas of concern in the budgeting process and to weigh and prioritize them for consideration in the future. Our recommendations are proposed in consideration of the financial tensions we currently face.

In preparation for this report, we have been able to review a preliminary version of the proposed FY 2010 budget which has not yet been approved by the President, and discussed with the CFO some other characteristics of the proposed budget. However, the full FY 2010 budget was not available for our review before the writing of this report.

This report is divided into the following sections:

- The University Academic Strategic Plan
- The Burlington County and Sacramento Initiatives
- Allocation of Tuition Revenue
- Space Needs
- Faculty Compensation
- The Library
- Conclusions and Recommendations

Each section of the report contains analysis with suggestions and recommendations; the section at the end represents general and procedural suggestions with regard to budgeting and to improving the Faculty Senate’s budget review.

The University Academic Strategic Plan

In the midst of a difficult year for financial planning, the University has, not surprisingly, made little progress in the implementation of its Strategic Plan. The preliminary version of the FY 2010 budget that we saw contained one million dollars of new money for the Strategic Plan, as against \$4 million last year. In addition, last year’s budget had a total of \$12 million for Strategic-Plan related activities, including recurring expenses.

¹ “The [Senate Budget, Planning, and Development] Committee shall be responsible for presenting an analysis of the budget via the Steering Committee to the Senate for its review and recommendations. The Senate’s analysis, review and recommendations will then be forwarded in writing to the President for transmission to the Board of Trustees before its consideration of the budget.”

From the preliminary version of the new budget that we saw, we could not tell if the additional \$8 million from FY 2009 recurred in FY 2010.

There are initiatives from last year's strategic planning implementation that are being continued, however it is difficult to determine whether these additional funding to improve levels of full-time faculty participating in the summer term, and to provide research coops throughout the University are included in the current budget (is this what you mean?).

There are a number of areas whose support has not been completed:

- The undergraduate research and the educational technology task forces have not yet given their reports, and we hope that they will be able to make recommendations that add to the atmosphere of teaching and learning at the University. We recommend the funding of these and other initiatives from the Strategic Plan.
- In addition, a new structure for hiring and promoting teaching faculty has been put into place and implemented throughout the University. Last year, we recommended that future budgeting support the new grade levels created with suitable state-of-the market pay levels. Our recommendation was supported by a Faculty Senate resolution and agreed to by then-Acting Provost Mark Greenberg. Dr. Greenberg indicated then that a separate pool of money would be used for this purpose. We do not know if this plan was included in the FY 2010 budget but we urge its implementation.

To plug a variety of gaps in the current services academic budget, increasingly DeL revenues are being used for a wider variety of expenses. Initially, these revenues were to be earmarked for curricular innovation, but the restrictions in the budget have meant that the Colleges were using this money for a variety of purposes, including faculty hiring and what would otherwise have been strategic initiatives. We regret that this is happening, as it compromises curricular innovation which is essential to keeping the University at the cutting edge of the educational enterprise, and it camouflages difficulties in academic planning and development. It makes coordinated planning and budgetary transparency even more difficult throughout the University.

At the same time, the Provost has launched several initiatives to smooth online operations:

- the launching of an Online Learning Council chaired by Associate Provost Jan Biros to coordinate online learning in the University and to ensure that quality support services are available for online students, and that the instruction they receive meets Drexel's academic standards. We have recommended that this group, which consists of College online advisors be expanded to include faculty input as well.
- the formulation of rules about appropriate uses for DeL funds. These include the stipulations that some of the funds should be used for advisors and to hire faculty to keep class size down. However, it is not clear what the nature of these rules is or how they are being implemented. We would recommend the issuing of reports that detail how the DeL money is being used as part of each College's budgetary request.
- the establishment of a working group of Deans and DeL leadership

We hope these initiatives will lead to better understanding across the academic community of the role of the online learning component of the academic enterprise.

We would like to urge a return to the strategic planning process next year, with solid commitments in the budget to its initiatives. In previous years, each College budget had included a table classifying budget requests according to whether they were operating expenses, capital expenses, or strategic initiatives. This year, this attachment was not used. We would hope to see the introduction of such an element into future budgetary planning.

Last year, we recommended the strategic planning process be continued and extended beyond the current Academic Strategic Plan, and this year we see even more urgency to strongly support the strategic planning

process. Even more academic units are themselves already extending their strategic planning beyond the current cycle, and the existence of such planning provides more opportunity for communication and development involving faculty input. The Provost has declared strong support for the Strategic Plan and we hope that he will be able to strengthen its role in oncoming budgets.

The Burlington County and Sacramento Initiatives

For the last three years, our report has contained concerns about budgeting transparency:

- In 2007, we noted that the 2005 study of Drexel by Robert C. Dickeson found a lack of transparency in the budgeting process that interferes with the shared values or “buy-in” that is essential to effective fiscal planning.
- In 2008, we noted that concern about academic budget transparency has reached the consumer -- our students and their. The Delta Project (<http://www.deltacostproject.org/>), which bases its findings on IPEDS [Federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Surveys] and FISAP [Financial Institution Shared Assessment Program], has expressed concern with educational costs.

There are a number of areas in which to consider with respect to transparency. We find that some of the University’s new initiatives are hardest to pin down in this respect though these are the very areas which should be clear and available for discussion at various levels in the University. The collaboration between Drexel and Burlington County Community College has been one such program. The budget for FY 2008 for this effort has been reformulated to correct an earlier error omitting the costs of financial aid. This reduces the program surplus to be split between Drexel and BCC from \$631,689 to \$188,190. At this time, the program’s actual costs, and real and projected revenues are not available to us, but we would like to see more discussion of the academic standards and enrollment projections related to this initiative.

With respect to the much larger Sacramento initiative, we see some progress in budgetary transparency but also raise some issues with respect to the program itself. This year, according to the preliminary FY 2010 budget we have seen, the Sacramento initiative is being moved into operating expenses from the non-operating budget. We think that this represents a start on greater transparency for this program. However, examination of the budget figures for the Sacramento initiative suggests that there are aspects of the project that are not yet clear.

- The 2009 Sacramento enrollment was only 60% of the enrollment projected in the 2009 budget. This enrollment shortfall occurred in spite of a tripling of the amount spent for enrollment management compared to what was budgeted.
- Sacramento enrollment for 2010 is projected at nearly four times the actual 2009 enrollment even though enrollment management is increased by only 8% above the revised 2009 budget.
- The 2010 budget assumes that administrative expenses will be only 18% of those in the revised 2009 budget. Actual expenditures in 2009 were 55% of budget as of March. This spending pattern may indicate that 2009 administrative expenses will end the year below budget, but the 82% drop anticipated for 2010 seems high.
- The overall projected figures for the next three years are characterized by strong growth in enrollment and revenue and very modest growth in expenses. This will be accompanied by expanding the offerings from the current four programs to twelve. We wonder how such growth in enrollment can occur with such modest growth in expenses.

	2010 Budget	2011 Proposed	2012 Proposed
Total Enrollment	281	507	675
Year-to-year	396%	180%	133%

Growth			
Total Expense	6,498,015	6,768,998	7,031,328
Year-to-year			
Growth	119%	104%	104%
Total Revenue	2,846,127	5,882,380	8,266,799
Year-to-year			
Growth	675%	207%	141%

We commend the administration for making the issue more open to informed factual discussion, but feel that there are aspects of the budgeting process that need to be more clear. It is important for the University administration and the faculty to evaluate the ongoing investment of resources in this program.

Allocation of Tuition Revenue

Over the past several years we have praised the university's policy of allocating a growing proportion of Net Tuition & Fees to college programs. This year, we are again pleased to note the ongoing priority given by the university to teaching support. A review of the year to date figures for FY2009 confirms that expenditures for college programs are meeting the expectations in the budget. This shows a continued increase in the ratio compared to previous years and continues Drexel's commitment to funding the educational mission.

In our FY 2009 budget report, we noted that in FY 2007, the percent of Net Tuition and Fees going to College Programs rose to an 66%, reflecting a significant increase in the funding of the teaching mission of the university. The rate held steady across the FY 2008 and FY 2009 budgets.

The proposed tuition discount rate for FY2010 is 33%, a number consistent with the general pattern which Drexel has established. Last year the rate, after falling to about 31.1% in FY 2008, rose to nearly 34.7%. Given the current economic circumstances, the belief that we will be able to remain steady on our discount pattern is encouraging. However, the tuition rate rose 4.5 %, and there is concern whether these changes together will keep Drexel competitive in an increasingly cost-conscious higher education market.

Space Needs

This year's budget indicates some progress in the acquisition of new space, as the Wellness Center renovation nears completion and the Integrated Science Building gets underway. Also, thanks to a generous gift, Drexel has been able to acquire 3501 Market Street, and there is a plan is to move the Westphal College into that facility, with a renovation of Nesbitt Hall for other use.

However, the worldwide recession this year has meant a slowdown of the renovation plans needed to improve the University's space shortage. The CFO has indicated that there will be a year to year-and-a-half delay in the funding of the renovation of 3501 Market and the renovation of Nesbitt. Also similarly delayed are other future renovation projects, including possible work on Korman, Matheson, and Stratton and a possible new building for the Law School.

At the same time, some groundwork has been laid on a very small scale for increased faculty input into space decisions. Last year, Jim Tucker and Kimberly Ingham Miller, Director of Design, Planning, Design and Construction held several ad hoc meetings to listen to the perspectives of faculty concerned with the design of classroom and other learning space. However, given the importance of the development and configuration of study space and classroom space to the success of the academic enterprise, and the expertise that faculty have in this area, more regular faculty input is needed into the design and redesign of learning spaces. We recommend the formulation of an ongoing body with strong faculty representation for input into the design and construction of learning spaces. The purview of this group would include the formulation of standards,

the coordination of plans for development and renovation and the ongoing solicitation of feedback on the success of efforts in this direction.

Vice Provost Jan Biros attended one of the meetings held by Kimberly Miller and also held a meeting about learning spaces with Eva Thury, the Chair of the Committee. As a result of this meeting, the Provost's Office solicited and obtained faculty input (through a survey to the Faculty Senate mailing list) on the renovation of 10 classrooms across campus. This process represented a much needed and appreciated improvement to the planning process for improving academic space. We hope that the process will be continued and expanded to include faculty input on renovations to classroom space in the Center City campus.

The Committee is heartened by the continuing study and assessment of the University's space needs, as well as the construction and renovation on campus that promises to ease space difficulties in some areas.

However, it feels that there is still a way to go in this respect. In last year's report, we noted that according to a formula used to assess optimum space available per student enrolled showed that Drexel has 115 square feet per student when the standard is 174 square feet per student.

We recommend that the conception, planning and construction of all academic space be conducted as a cooperative effort between academic stakeholders, especially faculty, and representatives from the Office of Student Life and Administrative Services. A number of concerns have been noted which require continued attention and support. These include:

- maintaining unit cohesiveness at the college and department levels when expansion and rearrangement of space occur. The increasingly frequent separation of faculty members' offices for space reasons works against the University's efforts to foster synergy in our teaching and research endeavors.
- ensuring that undergraduate teaching space is appropriate in quality and area to properly serve the incoming class – this is of particular concern to the College of Engineering and Arts and Sciences, where, according to latest reports, incoming class size has increased by 45 and 40 students respectively.
- properly addressing the space needs of the colleges of Nursing and Health Professions and Public Health which are housed in the Center City Hahnemann Campus. Although projections indicate the market for their programs will grow, these colleges can't expand their instructional space, research space and space designated to enhance the quality of student life because of lack of space.

If this is not a time for large-scale spending on capital projects, it is a good time to implement good planning and prioritizing for our space needs. In our report on the FY 2008 budget, we stated that we felt that academic planning for space should be better integrated into the financial planning of the University.

The structure itself of the budget makes it hard for us, and for all members of the University community, to understand the nature of space issues: what is profitable for the University; what is "state-of-the art" with respect to the planning of space; what is the cost-benefit ratio of any particular space-related project.

For example, the budget line Auxiliary Enterprises includes the Residence Halls, the Food Service, as well as Other Auxiliaries. However, many of the costs associated with the residence halls are located elsewhere, as in Interest Expenses and other miscellaneous revenue that comes to the University from arrangements with particular enterprises which gain space in exchange for funds which the University has made a policy of plowing back into the educational enterprise.

As a result of this way of representing one of the major space issues of the University, it is very difficult to grasp what is involved with a particular capital plan or improvement, and we feel we need more information

to be useful to this aspect of planning. We understand that the budget lines are unlikely to be revised in the future, but we would recommend the issuing and regular update of reports describing the consolidated budgetary allocations related to space for students and faculty.

Faculty Compensation:

The faculty of Drexel University have long sought the cooperation of the administration in obtaining a clearer picture of their standing with respect to salary and benefits, in relation to other institutions, as well as of the standing with respect to salary and benefits of Drexel's various units. Such a report is one meaningful measure of the standing of the University among its peers, and of the individual units with respect to each other.

Through the efforts of former Provost Stephen Director and his Vice Provost Judith Pitney, a Faculty Market Study of salaries was planned and developed by a compensation committee and with consultation with the Senate Committee on Budget, Planning and Development. This report was based on Drexel salary data gathered by HR as well as data from CUPA, the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. Comparative data from the AAUP were also included.

This year, with the support of the current Provost Mark Greenberg, and his Vice Provost Jan Biros, the Drexel Faculty Market Study of salaries has been released to the faculty. This study suggests that the University has been providing full-time tenure-track faculty with salaries at the median of their peer institutions, though questions remain about the benchmark schools used in the study: these schools do not match any other set of benchmarks currently used, though it does overlap with the other lists. We look forward to ongoing and aggregate data being developed comparing the status of the University with respect to full-time faculty salaries year by year. We also look forward to a complementary study of faculty benefits: planning for it began at the same time the salary Market Study was formulated, and Provost Greenberg has indicated that he expects the report to be available to us when it is completed.

However, the Committee has noticed that in order to meet the University's expanding teaching requirements, there has been an increased reliance on adjunct faculty in some programs. During the recruitment of the best qualified individuals to fill these positions, compensation has become an issue of concern in both recruitment and retention. Reports from our colleagues suggest that the University may be falling considerably below local and national (for online courses) competitors in levels of compensation for adjunct faculty.

The Committee has reservations about not being able to compete for the most qualified individuals if our level of compensation is viewed as substandard in comparison to our benchmark institutions. The University should study whether our level of compensation for adjunct faculty is appropriate and we recommend that it implement a policy of competitive compensation for adjunct faculty in order to maintain the University's tradition of the academic excellence.

University Libraries

The University Libraries are somewhat unique in the academic portion of the budget in that a significant portion of their budget is devoted to the purchase of materials (serials, databases, ILL, books, microfiche and audio visual items). In FY08 the libraries spent \$3.84M on materials, which accounts for 48.7% of the budget. The cost of these materials is set by outside vendors; as described in the April 15, 2009 issue of Library Journal, increases in the cost of serials (45.9% of the materials budget) over the last number of years has significantly outpaced inflation. The library is already faced with contracted increases for AY 2009-2010

of \$85,518 for serials from Harrasowitz and Ebsco (two aggregators of independent journals), as well as Elsevier Science Direct and Wiley. Adding to the financial complications, however, contracts for the various serials and database vendors come up at different times during the year, and increases for some of these vendors have not yet been announced. As a result of these factors, the Library materials budget needs an increase equal to 5% of last year's materials budget to avoid cuts in other areas.

At the beginning of the budget cycle, all units were told to prepare a budget with no increases. This was to apply to all sections of the budget except personnel raises, as they are handled separately. In the budget process the University Libraries were assigned a flat budget (i.e., no increase from the current budget); which with the previously stated contracted increases beyond the university's control will require a significant cut in materials or services to meet.

The University Libraries are responsible for the library needs of all 19,300 students (except for the approximately 500 law students, as the law library is separately budgeted) on the three Drexel campuses. The annual library budget of \$7.89M is equivalent to \$407/student annually; the contracted increases described above require an additional \$4.41/student (approximately 1% increase). It is imperative to increase spending in order maintain current electronic collections, as unlike hard-copy books or journals, in many cases, access to both current and past issues disappears when subscriptions are cancelled. The Committee urges the full Faculty Senate to implore the University Administration to restore a true current services budget to the University Libraries to maintain both the hard-copy and on-line resources required for our students' success.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The University Academic Strategic Plan

- We feel there is great urgency for the University to return in full force to the strategic planning process next year, with solid commitments in the budget to its initiatives.
- We feel the strategic planning process should be continued and extended beyond the current Academic Strategic Plan.
- We recommend the funding of the initiatives found in the Strategic Plan.
- Funds should be designed to support the new grade levels for Teaching Faculty with suitable state-of-the market pay levels.
- We would recommend the issuing of reports that detail how the DeL money is being used as part of each College's budgetary request.
- We have recommended that the Provost's Online Learning Council be expanded to include faculty input as well.

The Burlington County and Sacramento Initiatives

- We ask that budgetary reporting continue to be revised in the interests of providing more transparency. This we think is especially important in the areas pertaining to Drexel's new initiatives, like the joint venture with Burlington County Community College and the Graduate Center in Sacramento.

Space Needs

- We recommend the formulation of an ongoing body with strong faculty representation for input into the design and construction of learning spaces. The purview of this group would include the formulation of standards, the coordination of plans for development and renovation and the ongoing solicitation of feedback on the success of efforts in this direction.

- We hope that the process of soliciting faculty input into room renovations will be continued by the Provost's office and expanded to include renovations to classroom space in the Center City campus.
- We recommend that the conception, planning and construction of all academic space be conducted as a cooperative effort between academic stakeholders, especially faculty, and representatives from the Office of Student Life and Administrative Services.
- Academic planning for space should be better integrated into the financial planning of the University. To this end, we recommend the issuing and regular update of reports describing the consolidated budgetary allocations related to space for students and faculty.

Faculty Compensation: Full-Time and Adjunct

- We look forward to a study of faculty benefits planned at the same time the Faculty Salary Market Study was formulated.
- The University should study whether our level of compensation for adjunct faculty is appropriate and we recommend that it implement a policy of competitive compensation for adjunct faculty in order to maintain the University's tradition of the academic excellence.

University Libraries

- We urge the full Faculty Senate to implore the University Administration to restore a true current services budget to the University Libraries to maintain both the hard-copy and on-line resources required for our students' success.