

MINUTES/FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 19, 2012

The Senate met on Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at the Alumni House

Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

Members Present: John Aleshunas, Jef Awada, Glen Bauer, Maxine Bauermeister, Carla Colletti, Don Conway-Long, Susan Heady, Scott Jensen, Andrea Rothbart, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Stephanie Schroeder, Marty Smith, Eileen Solomon, Roy Tamashiro, Keith Welsh, Gwyneth Williams

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the December 1st Faculty Senate meeting minutes. All were in favor; motion carried.

Announcements

A thank you card from Cynthia was shared with the group for the flowers that she received after her back surgery.

Committee Appointments

The Senators were asked to be thinking about a replacement on the IRB Committee to replace Susan Seymour for the Spring 2012 semester as she is now the Acting Academic Director of the Thailand campus and will not be available. It is hoped that someone from the School of Communications can be appointed as a replacement.

Electronic Elections

Ralph gave a report on the electronic elections in response to questions that were asked at the December Senate meeting about voting electronically – 1) only valid ballots are allowed to be submitted. For example, if the ballot says to vote for two people and you vote for three, it will not allow you to submit the ballot. 2) An audit trail can be followed. If there is a question about a ballot, that person's seven digit number can be entered and that ballot printed. Ballots can be printed manually to recount, if the need arises. Ralph asked the Senate to endorse electronic voting as he would like to take it to the February faculty assembly meeting. Electronic voting would take place ONLY for senate and committee elections. It was stated that when discussing electronic voting for any other ballot items during the Faculty Assembly meeting to announce that this involves a change from the current University Handbook language.

Cedar Creek Conference Center

Ralph, Glen Bauer, John Orr, and Marty Smith visited Cedar Creek Conference Center near Washington, Missouri, for a tour to see if the facility could be used for a future Fall Faculty Institute as an alternative to Pere Marquette. Ralph reported that the facility is very nice, but is not large enough to accommodate the number of faculty that attend the institute. The lodging prices are also more than what we are charged at Pere Marquette. It was determined that Cedar Creek is not suitable for our needs at this time.

Spring Institute

Glen Bauer sent around a list for Senators to volunteer for the Spring Institute Committee. Glen stated that the committee will need to decide on a topic that is of interest to faculty as professional educators that would be useful. Glen read the ideas that were given on the Fall Institute Evaluation form. Other ideas that were discussed included: publishing, teaching topics that deal with student population and how they learn/interact, faculty sharing what they did with a research grant, poster sessions allowing faculty to highlight what they are good at. It was suggested to select a topic for learning rather than addressing any

university issues or policies, since such topics have not been particularly successful at past Spring Institutes. The committee also has to keep in mind that we have a 2.5 hour time slot to fill and to select a topic that would fit into that time frame. It was mentioned that it is always exciting to see an outcome from an institute such as the spring teaching festival. The question was asked if having the institute is still viable. It is felt that the institutes are still important, but have changed in format from when they first began. The institute used to be an opportunity to wrestle with serious issues that faculty felt were important. Faculty believe the social aspect of the institute is important because the university has grown so large that faculty from the same school or college rarely see each other, much less have time to stop and talk. The Spring Institute Committee will meet on Thursday, January 26th, at 1:30 p.m. to further discuss topics, etc. and will have selected a final topic by the February 2nd Senate meeting.

Faculty Assembly

The Senators were asked to bring topics for the February faculty assembly to the next Senate meeting. Topics brought up today: 1) an overview of GCP courses for the fall and whether or not we are meeting our goals. 2) Update from the Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee.

Committee Update: What constitutes a faculty member?

Ralph asked if Julian Schuster would be willing to meet with the subcommittee to discuss their concerns of granting faculty status to newly hired administrators. Dr. Schuster indicated that he would be willing to meet with the subcommittee. The statement was made that most individuals who set their career path on the road to being an administrator are clearly interested in being an administrator. Why would they want to obtain faculty status? It was stated that if there is not a good grounding for the motivation of someone wanting to become faculty after being an administrator, then why grant them faculty status? It was stated that in many cases, people will not accept a job without faculty status and sometimes in order to get quality people, faculty status must be included. Regardless of the reason, this type of appointment contravenes the current University Handbook language.

Procedures for Obtaining Leaves and Sabbaticals

Keith Welsh shared a draft of a proposed amendment to the University Handbook language regarding Procedures for Obtaining Leaves and Sabbaticals. The Senators that are replacing those out on leave were brought up to speed on this topic: the main goal of the proposed amendment is to state that once you are granted status and you are eligible for leave and do not take that leave to fulfill a University need, your "clock" would stay on the original timeframe meaning you would not lose that time. This would prevent individuals from banking time and then taking a year or more off with full pay. Discussion took place regarding the proposed amendment language.

Question was called and seconded to stop the discussion of the proposed amendment language.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed language as amended for the University Handbook. All were in favor (16); no oppositions, no abstentions. Motion carried.

Motions from November Faculty Assembly Meeting

Glen Bauer read the two motions that were passed at the November Faculty Assembly meeting:

Motion 1: The Faculty Assembly requests that the administration provide the Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee with the following faculty data (sex, years of service, rank, School/College, and base salary) for use in salary and fringe benefit negotiations. Such data will be kept confidential and will not be distributed or discussed outside the committee unless it is presented in aggregate form (i.e., group data in excess of 5 individuals). A vote was taken and the results are as follows: 84 in favor; 1 opposed; 3 abstained. Motion carried.

The Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee will be contacted to find out if they have received the requested data.

Motion 2: The Faculty Assembly requests that the administration and senate create a joint equity committee to oversee a salary equity analysis. The committee will be able to access any relevant data and if necessary employ an outside consultant. The analysis will be completed by the end of the academic year (2011-2012) and will be implemented immediately. A vote was taken and the results are as follows: 61 in favor; 7 opposed; 12 abstained. Motion carried.

The above motion suggests that the Faculty Senate has the responsibility to form a joint equity committee to oversee a salary equity analysis. This will be completed at the February 2nd Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.