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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

December 7, 2010, 3:30 p.m.

HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, J. Conant, R. Dunbar, R. Guell, C. Hoffman, J. Kuhlman, V. Sheets

Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

Guests: Aviation: T. Allen, R. Baker, H. Minniear

J. Gatrell (CGPS), R. Lotspeich (AAC), Y. Peterson (NHHS-Applied Health), R. Peters (CAAC), B. Sims (COT), L. Sperry (FAC), B. Williams (NHHS)

I. Administrative Report

President D. Bradley:

a. The Board of Trustees will meet December 17.

b. Health care costs and premiums are expected to increase 7.5%.

c. We need to be careful about new degree programs because of financial constraints. We need to look at programs that are cost effective and self-sustaining with existing criteria.

I will not be able to continue progress on salaries without some form of performance document. So I encourage you to complete your work on it.

d. A copy of the NCA report is available.

Provost Maynard:

a. NCA report is very positive and consistent with their exit report. As we knew the only real

issue is the assessment plan. They recommended a full 10 year accreditation.

R. Guell: On that subject, you are required by law to make the Assurance portion public but are not required to make the Advancement section public. Will you make the Advancement portion public?

President: Keeping in my spirit of things, there are no secrets. Both documents will be made

public.

II. Chair Report

S. Lamb - Regarding the Faculty Performance Evaluation progress:

It continues to be all consuming. I know that the president wanted a simple evaluation process, but there is no such thing as a simple evaluation process; it just does not exist. I know the president’s goal, and I respect his goal of modifying the policy so faculty can live with it. Looking back at previous precedents in relation to the evaluation process, the continuous scale that used to allocate monies was most divisive. I know it is this president’s desire to make it a three stage instrument, and FEBC felt it was a positive move and supported it. We continue weekly to take input from faculty – going through each statement. If a suggestion adds something to the document, it is put in. We have been selective about what is incorporated into the document, wanting it to be a sound document.

President: I believe the real reason to keep it simple is that my experience is that these things fail after a few years. if for no other reason ; they fail under their own weight. The bureaucratic and the level of time involved both by the individual/administration becomes very over-whelming. This is my primary reason for keeping it simple. Also, I believe the more complicated it becomes, the more room there is for acrimony.

S. Lamb: It is the case that the Arts & Science Council voted 6 to 5 against it. It is also the case that the entire English department with the exception of one (1) abstention voted against it. I still believe that support is there at the Faculty Senate. It will be a secret ballot and divided into two portions. I am hopeful that both portions will pass. But debate will be had.

III. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a. K. Bolinger: Administrative assistants/staff asked when they will have job descriptions for their newly created positions. [Reclassification of staff into broader categories]. I got the sense that they did not have a new job description - not title per sue.

Provost: There is nothing in that process that is being done currently. The only thing I am aware of are concerns related to some employee classifications/appeals.

President: There has been some reclassification in the pay raise process through Human Resources, but as far as I know, that process is over.

Provost: I’ll look into it.

b. C. Hoffman: I have heard that next year's Special-Purpose faculty will teach 5-5. Is that correct?

Provost: Yes - Or equivalent. Some are involved in advisement. We are hoping to increase benefits for special purpose faculty (retirement, education, and health).

C. Hoffman: So will their base salary go up to 30k? ($1,000 per credit hr.)

President: No. We need to make a distinction between Special Purpose faculty and Adjunct faculty.

Provost: You probably have a handful of people who made $27,000 – so there will be no one making $27,000 next January. President – simple answer is that no one [full time] will make less than $30,000.

S. Lamb: It has been the assumption, and still is in many domains, that 15 hr is viable at the University. It is broadly accepted in most arenas that that would translate to a 9 hr teaching load, a 3 hr viable research load, and a 3 hr service load. I know that we are under a financial crunch, and we have had discussions (arguments) that we would move to a more robust teaching environment load. I think to have research expectations as well as a 12 hr. teaching load and a service component is not attractive to new faculty. I doubt that you will retain many of those people that you have spent a great deal of effort recruiting if they retain a 12 hour teaching load. I know every time I speak to new faculty orientation that that is the single most question in their minds. This is especially true when speaking of new faculty from particular Colleges.

Provost: The pressure to increase productivity is not any less this fall than it was last fall. We still maintain less than a 17-1 student- faculty ratio. We need to increase this.

S. Lamb: Still, I plead that deans allow the chairs the opportunity to satisfy existing demand completely and do it in a way that is conductive to retaining a research agenda. Class sequencing can improve, and class sizes can adjust. We must retain a 9 hour teaching load for those who have an active viable research agenda.

President: The worst thing we can do is just increase the course load per faculty member. I still plead that the faculty help with pruning of course offerings so we are not offering sections that do not help us (some majors as well). That is the key to keeping sections to minimize any unnecessary courses. Ultimately, we have got to increase our student-faculty ratio. We can and must be more creative.

c. J. Conant: What happened in the last two weeks regarding faculty positions (searches)? And, I present a plea that if there is going to be a conversion, that it happens as soon as possible so departments can begin a search process (probably too late for me). Has a stop been put in place on hiring?

Provost: Regarding search process (40 new faculty positions), the president and I needed to look at where this institution will be going in the next 3-4 years (looking at the big picture). We need to get student-faculty ratios up before considering hiring new faculty; we believe we “put too many eggs in the basket this year.” We thought about 20 or so searches this year…then adding more until we get up to 410 total lines. We also need to consider special purpose faculty before offering them a two-year contract. We need to look for highly qualified, top-notch people who can make a significant contribution to this institution.

J. Conant – It would have been nice if this information came out in October 1 rather than December. There would have been no problem then.

d. R. Dunbar:  You mentioned extended benefits for Special Purpose faculty – explain?

Provost:  We are serious about treating special purpose faculty creating a meaningful role for them beyond just teaching for this institution. We are looking into extending retirement benefits and education benefits.

R. Dunbar:  In putting together data for student – faculty ratio – do we separate out librarians as faculty, since they have no students assigned to them?

Provost and President:  Yes, we separate those out in the data.

e. J. Kuhlman: Related to required statement at the end of position announcements: I was not impressed with this document. Although the statement says so, we do not have a professional baseball team. This needs to be changed. Also, the statement does not state that we have two other universities in this town. The statement is not professionally done. Can that section be changed (just the bottom portion of it)?

Provost: I will have to check with the source.

f. C. Hoffman: I have been told that Emeriti Directory hard copy has arrived in Emeriti mailboxes, but have found that it is not available on campus except by special request. E. Kinley says he will be integrating the Emeriti directory into the online faculty/staff campus directory. The online student directory, however, is available only after Portal login.

President: I have asked Dean Tillery to ask the students to give us guidance if they would like to have their directory moved outside their area. We will see what the students want to do regarding this.

g.. R. Guell: I encourage the president to read the Institutional Research (IR) Strategic Plan as there are reports that they suggest that they will no longer produce.

IV. **APPROVAL of the Executive Committee Minutes of November 30, 2010**. **TABLED**

until next Executive Committee meeting on December 14, 2010 R. Guell/C. Hoffman 9-0-0.

V. AAC item: Establishing a Financial Affairs Committee

R. Lotspeich presented rationale for proposed committee. Discussion/review:

Dr. Lamb: The presentation of ongoing advisory responsibilities for this proposed committee was very well done. I also believe that faculty shared-governance would be greatly aided by a committee that had these ongoing advisory responsibilities. Faculty could contribute to this domain, and I urge you all to make a serious attempt to do so. However, we should not, create an additional committee.

**MOTION TO ESTABLISH A SUBCOMMITTEE (**a Drafting Committee**) OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A PROPOSAL FOR THE STRUCTURING OF A FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** K. Bolinger/R. Guell 9-0-0.

This committee, formed by the Executive Committee officers, would help draft this proposal. Furthermore, this committee will not necessarily be formed from members of the Executive Committee.

VI. CAAC Items:

* Move Safety Management from College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services to the College of Technology

B. Williams, B. Sims, Y. Peterson, and R. Peters presented rationale for the proposal.

Concerns raised about resource issues related to faculty and equipment.

**MOVED TO APPROVE** THE MOVE OF SAFETY MANGEMENT, WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION: 9-0-0

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, in its role in the review process for the transfer of the Safety programs from the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services, agrees that the academic nature of the Safety programs are more clearly and closely aligned with the College of Technology than they are with those in the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services, recognizes the wisdom of this move, and approves the transfer. We will recommend approval to the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee also recommends that the Provost consider  transferring one additional faculty line plus 1 more faculty share of the S&E budget to the College of Technology to ensure that personnel available to the College of Technology be adequate to offer the programs in Safety.  While the Executive Committee appreciates the effort and wisdom that has gone into the proposed move, it is hopeful that the resource transfer will be adequate to support this worthwhile proposal.

**MOVE TO APPROVE THE ABOVE-STATED RECOMMENDATIONS Unanimous**

* MS in Aviation

T. Allen presented rationale for the proposal and distributed handout entitled *Master of Science Aviation Studies –Rationale for Proposal*

Concerns expressed related to revenue sources and a faculty ratio of 10-1

**MOVED TO APPROVE** MS in Aviation R. Guell/J. Kuhlman 9-0-0

VII. FAC Item – Attendance Policy

L. Sperry presented – Review/discussion of the following policy:

Attendance Policy

Senators on leave who will not be attending the Senate meetings for a semester are expected

to notify the Senate Chair so that temporary alternates can be appointed. Other senators who

miss two meetings in a semester will be reminded by the Senate Chair of their obligation to attend.

If the senator misses an additional meeting during the remainder of the academic year, the senator

will lose his/her seat, an alternate will be appointed if one is available, and the college the senator

had represented will be notified of the change of status.

**MOVED TO APPROVE** the above- stated Attendance Policy (with minor corrections):

K. Bolinger/J. Conant 9-0-0.

VIII. Revised Version of Faculty Performance Evaluation

**MOVED TO APPROVED** Today’s Executive Committee Revision

S. Lamb/A. Anderson 8-1-0.

S. Lamb will make one final clean copy and one in red and black showing all that is new. This document will be presented to the Faculty Senate on December 16, 2010.

IX. Constitutional Issue revisited (Canceling a Senate meeting).

**MOTION TO DELETE** the following motion (number 8) from those items to pre presented at the Faculty Senate.

**Motion number 8:**

In 245.3.4.4 Replace “The University Faculty Senate shall meet at least once in each calendar month throughout the academic year.” with “The University Faculty Senate shall meet at least once in each calendar month throughout the academic year except when the Chairperson shall deem that there are no action items pending before the Senate or when the Chairperson shall decide to move the first meeting to the first week in September.” S. Lamb/R. Dunbar 9-0-0.

Opening voting would begin on January 10.

**MOTION TO RECONSIDER** Constitutional Amendment decision related to Executive Committee Grievance procedure and **TABLE** it for discussion at Executive Committee on January 4, 2010.

S. Lamb/R. Dunbar 8-1-0

Meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.