To:
FCSM Electorate
FCSM Department Chairs
FCSM Secretaries – Please post one copy
Member-at-Large of the University Senate: Alex Storrs, Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences

Members of the FCSM College Council

Dean: David Vanko; **Biological Sciences**: Sarah Haines, Vanessa Beauchamp; **Chemistry**: Clare Muhoro, Alan Pribula (Spring 2011), Sonali Raje (Fall 2010); **Computer and Information Sciences**: Nadim Alkharouf, Siddharth Kaza; **Mathematics**: Honi Bamberger, Leonid Stern; **Physics, Astronomy, & Geosciences**: Rajeswari Kolagani, Phuoc Ha; **At Large**: Brian Fath (Biological Sciences), James Saunders (MB3); **Students**: Kal Srour (Graduate Student), Joshua Giltinan (Undergraduate Student)

MINUTES OF THE FCSM COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

The FCSM College Council met on March 11, 2011 in 7800 York Rd, Room 418 at 1:30 pm with Honi Bamberger, Chairperson presiding.

Attendance: Clare Muhoro, James Saunders, Rajeswari Kolagani, Phuoc Ha, Brian Fath, Kal Srour, Joshua Giltinan, Honi Bamberger, Vanessa Beauchamp, David Vanko, Nadim Alkharouf, Howard Kaplon (guest), Gail Gasparich (guest)
Absent: Siddharth Kaza (notified in advance), Sarah Haines (notified in advance), Leonid Stern (notified in advance).

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Honi Bamberger, Chairperson.

2. Minutes from the February 11, 2011 were approved unanimously. Minutes from the February 25, 2011 meeting were approved with one member abstaining.

3. Council Chairperson welcomed University Provost Marcia Welsh and Associate Provost Gary Levy. They proceeded to respond to prepared questions from FCSM faculty.
   3.1. Provost Welsh addressed the first issue that was brought to her attention on the agreement of faculty workload (AFWE) document and how it is currently an ambiguous document, especially with regard to the percentages assigned to teaching, scholarship and service.
      3.1.1. The provost responded by saying that these percentages are meant as guidelines only. The numbers focus on teaching as a priority.
      3.1.2. A representative from the College Council stated that the percentages have not changed but faculty felt that the expectations have. It was also added that Towson does not set AFWE percentages; they are defined by the USM.
      3.1.3. There was discussion on the number of credits a faculty member receives for teaching classes of varying sizes (e.g., a 90 student class versus a 40 student class). Currently, the number of credits received is the same. The provost mentioned that in general she does not support the idea of getting more credit for bigger classes.
      3.1.4. It was brought to the provost's attention that USM differentiates between graduate and undergraduate courses with more weight to graduate courses, but this isn't reflected at Towson. The provost suggested that the teaching load for faculty should be balanced.
      3.1.5. The provost addressed the issue of counting non-classroom instruction (advising students, mentoring graduate students, etc.) as teaching credits. She mentioned that this issue needs to be discussed and clarified.

3.2. With regards to budget and salary issues, the provost was asked about her plan for allocating the 4% budget that was held back from the departments in anticipation of budget cuts.

3.2.1. The provost responded by saying that the budget for next year will be loaded with the 4% cut. However, though the monies may come back to academic affairs, it will be re-allocated and may not be returned directly to the original source of the funds. There will be a needs assessment prior to allocation.

3.2.2. The provost also mentioned that all academic units are coming back into academic services and under the provost's control.

3.2.3. There was discussion about lab fees and their use to purchase equipment. The provost stated that replacing equipment like microscopes needs to come out of operating budgets and not from lab fees. Associate Provost Levy added that there needs to be a discussion on this with Department Chairs and College Deans. It was mentioned that we need to ensure that labs fees benefit students directly. Associate Provost Levy mentioned that the Provost's Office will provide colleges/departments with funds; however, the office will ensure that the money is not spent on non-strategic items.

3.2.4. With regards to Graduate Assistantship (GA) stipends and their comparison to other universities, the provost mentioned that the issue was under consideration. However, she also added that she supported utilizing graduate assistantships for teaching and research purposes only and not for student employment.

Dean Vanko also mentioned that the university is considering an authorization for a GA2 position that will pay a higher stipend (perhaps $12,000). Right now GAs are limited to an $8,000 stipend.

3.2.5. Salary compression was discussed; with the provost indicating that she was aware that this existed. She would like to hire statisticians to look at faculty rank and time in their discipline to determine the salaries that faculty receive.

It was also mentioned we are not likely to have furloughs in the following year.

3.3. The provost addressed the issue of Black and Gold catering and their policy that all food purchases had to come through them or a waiver needed to be obtained.

3.3.1. It was mentioned that Black and Gold changed the policy without getting university approval and faculty should be able to purchase food and be reimbursed for any amount under $50.

3.4. The provost addressed the issue of childcare and family leave

3.4.1. With regards to accepting infants to Towson's child care facility, the provost shared reasons why this will not be happening in the near future.

3.4.2. With regards to maternity/paternity leave. The provost mentioned that the AAUP drafted a proposal for paid maternity leave, which was fully supported and approved. It was also mentioned that a family care policy is being debated in the senate. The proposal is not for a semester off, but 4-6 weeks of paid leave.

3.4.3. Provost Welsh shared that a "stop the clock" policy is in effect and female faculty may take maternity leave and not be penalized in terms of their tenure and promotion.

3.5. The provost was asked to comment on the Towson seminars and who will teach them. Her hope is that 10% of the faculty will teach these seminars. She also mentioned that retired faculty would be a valuable resource to teach these courses.

3.6. The provost was asked about the goals and targets that faculty are expected to set in the annual work load agreement. She mentioned that merit committees should work with department chairs if the goals in the annual reports are too low and ask to increase them if needed. She also emphasized that untenured faculty should not be unduly burdened with too many service duties.

3.7. The provost mentioned that faculty decisions are made by faculty and faculty need to serve on university committees.

3.8. The provost was thanked for her time in addressing the council and left at 3:35 PM.

4. Announcements from the Council Chairperson

   The chairperson asked the council to consider nominations for the USM Regents awards. This will be discussed in the April meeting.

5. Vote on the FCSM Strategic Academic Plan 2010-2016
   5.1. The proposal was unanimously approved.
   5.2. The dean mentioned that it is a living document that will evolve and placed on the website for distribution after the information gathering phase.

6. Discussion on the proposal for the School of Emerging Technologies
   6.1. It was mentioned that this proposal has been around for 3 years. The school is expected to start July 1, 2011, after senate approval. The dean mentioned that the senate is following the established procedure for starting a new school.
   6.2. The plan is for the school to begin within FCSM. The dean mentioned that the school will distinguish Towson and graduate students for the work force.
   6.3. The purpose of the school, how it is going to be funded, and the proposal in general were discussed by the council.
   6.4. It was decided that the council needed more time to reflect on the proposal and seek input from the departments before voting on it electronically. Members of the council were asking to elicit feedback from their respective departments and to send in their votes via email to the chairperson by 4:00 PM Friday March 18, 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.
Respectfully Submitted,
Nadim Alkharouf, In absence of the Recording Secretary