

## Faculty Senate Minutes

Thursday, March 1, 2018 at the Alumni House, 1:30 PM

### I. Attendance

K. Corley, A. Geraghty-Rathert, G. Glasgow, T. Green, S. Jensen, J. Palmer, T. Reilly, G. Renz, E. Rhiney, Risik, Liz, B. Rodney, C. Sagovac, H. Singaravelu, J. Stulce, L. Teeter, P. Witkowski.

### II. Approval of Minutes

Upon motion by G. Renz, seconded by A. Geraghty-Rathert, the Senate unanimously approved the minutes, as amended, of the February 1, 2018 Senate meeting.

Upon motion by G. Renz, seconded by J. Stulce, the Senate unanimously approved the minutes of the February 15, 2018 Senate meeting.

### III. Old Business

1. G. Renz reported that Salary and Fringe Benefits met with Provost Schuster and Chief Financial Officer Ana Karaman on February 20, 2018. Nothing was agreed upon and they will meet again in March. G. Renz asked the Senate to send any thoughts about the Salary and Fringe Benefit committee's discussions with the administration to him or D. Psihountas.
2. Senators discussed whether faculty members should be asked to complete the pay for performance annual report if there will be no raise or it is unlikely there will be a raise. G. Renz said his understanding is that the pay for performance evaluation was approved with the agreement that the performance pay evaluations could not be used for faculty reviews by the administration, only for determining pay raises. (*Note: See the Performance Pay Policy for Status-Track and Stated Faculty, Webster Groves Campus, Paragraph 10 for this restriction.*)
3. G. Renz reported that the Finance Advisory Committee is still trying to get the number of full time faculty hired for international campuses, as well as their locations and dates of hire. The Provost told D. O'Bannon that the administration is trying to get the correct information, but it is difficult. (*Note: The Provost had also said at the Faculty Assembly on February 13, 2018 that he would provide this information.*)

### IV. New Business

4. The Senate had a telephone conference call with Dr. David Robinson, former AAUP President about the forthcoming 2018 Spring Institute at which he and Dr. Kathryn Kuhn will speak on shared governance and faculty involvement in organizational change. Dr. Elizabeth Paddock may possibly attend.

Robinson said he and Katherine Kuhn have national-level AAUP experience as well as being officers at the state level. Dr. Kuhn is presently Vice President of the Missouri AAUP and is also on the National AAUP Council.

Dr. Robinson offered some ideas for his presentation at the Spring Institute on shared governance. Dr. Robinson he could speak about applications more relevant to Webster University besides shared governance, such as tenure and part-time faculty issues, and the faculty/Board relationship. He said other universities and colleges have experienced some of the issues Webster University is experiencing. Dr. Robinson said he could also talk about how an AAUP could supplement other faculty groups at Webster, such as the Faculty Senate. Dr. Robinson said he would be available before and after the institute for conversations.

C. Sagovac asked if the discussions at the Spring Institute will help Webster develop a strategy for addressing its problems. Dr. Robinson explained that it depends on our actual situation and how much disagreement there is. Webster is not the only institution going through this and the faculty needs to work together, even if they disagree.

T. Reilly asked what it would entail to start an AAUP chapter at Webster. Dr. Robinson said that because there are already six AAUP member on campus, all they need to do is elect three officers and the chapter will be recognized by the AAUP. Contingent faculty may be members of the Webster AAUP chapter as well, according to Dr. Robinson.

5. G. Renz said that a Dispute Resolution Committee is being formed and 7 faculty members were needed for the committee. (*See the Appendix.*) Senators Muthoni Musangali, Anne Geraghty-Rathert, Gary Glasgow, Scott Jensen, Ted Green, Lara Teeter, and Liz Risik volunteered to be on the dispute resolution committee. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by G. Renz, seconded by P. Witkowski, to appoint these Senators to the Dispute Resolution Committee.
6. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by P. Witkowski, seconded by A. Geraghty-Rather, to admit David Hilditch to the Faculty Assembly as a contingent faculty member for a two-year term ending May 2020.
7. J. Stulce said she believes there needs should be a University Calendar that includes information pertinent to the faculty, i.e. performance review deadlines, cyclical dates for faculty deadlines, and CRF deadlines. G. Renz said he will ask Nancy Hellerud if something like this exists or if it can be created.
8. J. Stulce said the College of Arts & Sciences would like to give money designated for faculty Professional Development to students for projects supervised by a faculty member. G. Renz said the Salary and Fringe Benefits committee had negotiated the money to be used for faculty professional development, not student grants. Accordingly, he and others on the Salary and Fringe Benefits committee opposed

using the funds for students. G. Renz said the Salary and Fringe Benefit committee had proposed to the administration that unused professional development funds could be rolled over to the next year instead of being lost. The administration is considering the proposal.

9. The Senate agreed that G. Renz will write the minutes for the February 13, 2018 Faculty Assembly without trying to report every question and answer or statement made at the assembly.
10. G. Renz said the IT Faculty Committee needs faculty input regarding problems they are experiencing with the hardware or software used in the classrooms, labs, or faculty members' computers.
11. B. Rodney and G. Renz reported that the IT-Faculty committee is discussing alternative platforms for video conferencing used to teach WebNet courses. There are discussions with Cisco and World Wide Technologies regarding modifying the contract to provide the WebEx video platform. The faculty members on the IT-Faculty committee want to provide input on the best video conferencing / teaching platform before a decision is made on a new contract.
12. G. Renz will set up one or more informal faculty meetings after spring break. He may present parts of his paper on enrollment and financial trends at a meeting. The meeting(s) will not have an agenda, but G. Renz hopes people will discuss shared governance issues based on the prior 2018 Spring Faculty Institute.
13. Faculty Senate went into Closed Session at 3:27 pm.

**Meeting Adjourned: 3:50 p.m.**

## **Appendix**

### **X. Dispute Resolution Committee**

The Dispute Resolution Committee consists of 21 members of the University community with equal representation from the three constituencies: students, faculty, and staff. Each member of the Committee is appointed by their Grievance Coordinator, to serve a two-year term except that during the initial year of implementation of this Policy appointments will be made with staggered 1 and 2-year terms. Because of scheduling issues, students may be appointed for a one year term.

University leadership, division executives, deans and grievance coordinators may not be appointed to serve on the Dispute Resolution Committee. Members of the Dispute Resolution Committee will receive annual training in the dispute resolution process and the University's Policies and Procedures regarding the same.

Grievance Hearing Panels will be made up of five (5) members of the Dispute Resolution Committee.

## **XI. Grievance Hearing Panel**

The Grievance Hearing Panel is comprised of five (5) members of the Dispute Resolution Committee. If a grievance involves members of two constituencies, the Grievance Hearing Panel will have representation from both constituencies. Students may only serve on a Grievance Hearing Panel if one of the involved parties is a student or a student worker. Many members of the University have dual constituency status such as a staff member enrolled in academic coursework as a student and student employees. For purposes of this Policy the constituency in which the Grievant is affected will be recognized.

The Grievance Hearing Panel will review documentation related to the grievance, and take testimony from the Grievant, Respondent, and witnesses presented by both parties. Based on the evidence presented, the Panel will reach a recommendation with respect to the issue(s) presented. The Grievance Hearing Panel's written recommendations, based on a simple majority vote, will be forwarded to the appropriate Grievance Coordinator, who will transmit the recommendations to the appropriate division executive(s) and/or dean(s) of the University. The division executive(s) and/or dean(s) will then make a final decision and notify the Grievance Coordinator, who will notify the Grievant and Respondent of the decision in writing.

**Appeals.** Decisions of the Grievance Hearing Panel and the division executive and/or dean may be appealed to the Provost as described in the Procedures that follow. The decision of the Provost is final at the institutional level.