

MINUTES/FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 5, 2012

The Senate met on Thursday, April 5, 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, Andrea Rothbart, Stephanie Schroeder, Marty Smith, Eileen Solomon, Roy Tamashiro, Gwyneth Williams, Keith Welsh

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the March 22nd Faculty Senate meeting minutes. All were in favor; motion carried.

Announcements

Ralph reminded everyone of the date for the next Faculty Senate meeting – April 26th.

Ralph stated that electronic school/college elections are currently taking place. Faculty have until midnight Friday, April 6th to vote. It was suggested that a reminder to vote be sent out to faculty with the school/college link that was sent in the original e-mail.

Ralph asked that suggestions be e-mailed to Cynthia on where to hold the Senate Luncheon in May which will include current and newly elected senators.

University Handbook Language

Regarding the University Handbook language for Academic Administrators, a motion was made and seconded to add the following sentence as an amendment: (Note: the President, Provost, and the five deans of schools/colleges retain membership and voting rights in the Faculty Assembly.) With the exception of one abstention, all were in favor; motion carried. **(Editors Note: The above Note in reference to University Handbook Language is incorrect).**

The question was asked if all current academic administrators are a part of the Faculty Assembly. The answer is no. Some individuals will be excluded from the Faculty Assembly because they do not have faculty status. Should something be added to grandfather people in? It is felt that everyone should be treated the same. The CRF Committee is approached constantly about this issue and they would like to have a more orderly process.

The question was asked if another Faculty Assembly meeting should be held before the end of the semester to address issues that have not yet been resolved. May 1st was the date suggested for an additional assembly, if it is called for.

SFB Committee Report

The SFB Committee was present to share a Discussion and Conclusion Document for Academic Year 2012-2013. This document shows what the SFB Committee recommended and the administration response. The Faculty Senate asked the SFB to add a Conclusion line to the document for each topic to show the final outcome. The committee members were thanked for putting together this document to provide clarity and make the process clearer.

The next topic discussed by SFB was Full-Time Faculty Professional Development funds. Most faculty that may need additional funds do not ask for them because they are told that there is a cap on funds. Since it is not an entitlement, there is no cap. Any remaining funds should be available to be awarded at the end of the year. In some schools, the dean allows for reallocation for faculty that may have overspent and need additional funds. It would be ideal to roll over any remaining funds into the next year, but this method is not favored by

the administration. With the Messing Award dates being pushed back, it is hard to determine if faculty will overspend during the current academic year instead of after the current academic year has ended.

The third topic discussed was Full-Time Faculty Overload Guidelines. There has been some confusion on the number of credit hours for overload. When this issue was voted on, there was some wording that stated under certain circumstances, overload could be approved by the appropriate dean. For independent study courses, the cap is 6 credit hours, unless approved by the appropriate dean.

Safe Harbor 401(k) Top-Heavy Plan – SFB shared a document that details exactly what a Safe Harbor plan involves. With the Safe Harbor Plan, as you increase the percentage of match, you destabilize any kind of equitable retirement funds. The IRS has set guidelines to follow. 6 percent is the limit for matching contribution funds. It is felt that Safe Harbor is status quo as it is offering what faculty already have.

The SFB Committee was thanked for including start up costs for new faculty as this allows new faculty the chance to continue their professional development right at the start. SFB felt that their presentation would not make as much sense at the faculty assembly unless there was a brief presentation first by Greg Gunderson and Dan Hitchell.

Old Business

The Adjunct Faculty Committee (Art Silverblatt, Michael Hulsizer, David Hilditch) was in attendance to give an update on the changes that have been made to the Handbook document since the last meeting. The document examines the structure of non-full-time faculty options in the University Handbook. Explicit language has been added to address hiring, voting rights, and benefits. There are currently two committees for adjunct benefits. Betsy Schmutz is chair of one and she has been asked to share her findings so that they can be added into the aforementioned document.

The Adjunct Faculty Committee has divided instructor appointments into Main Campus (Webster Groves) and Extended Campuses (Domestic Only) to provide clarification on voting rights in the Faculty Assembly. The statement was made that if they are full-time, they should be added to the Faculty Assembly with the potential for having administrative add ons. For the extended campuses, there may be a small number of faculty acquiring status. It was said that a formula needs to be established for how many may be added and the criteria required. This has not yet been completed. It was suggested that this section, on voting rights, be revisited in the future because without a formula it is ambiguous.

The discussion then moved to the instructor position and it was stated that instructor is not a rank; it is a status within the University. The traditional thinking is that it implies a rank due to non-status track language that was carried over originally. The statement was made that adjunct signature lines have shown the title of adjunct full professor or adjunct associate professor. This was added by the last taskforce because Neil George wanted some way to differentiate the adjunct faculty. It was further explained that years of service is how an adjunct's rank is determined. If an individual has been in a position for a year, then after that year, it is determined if that position becomes status and would need to be advertised. In similar cases, department reviews are used to determine this type of position. For the most part, instructors will be temporary for three years up to five years and then the position is converted or a new person is hired. The newly hired individual would negotiate years of service towards the new position. It is hoped that the years of service would encourage a number of instructors. This is done at the beginning of each hire and without considerable risk to the University. It would fill a need within departments and is a good way to bolster our faculty ranks. There is nothing in the language that prohibits them from serving on committees within that five year period.

At Extended Campuses, if faculty are full-time and eligible, they should be entitled to professional development funds.

Michael Hulsizer stated that the goal is to send this document to the other committee that he is serving on to vet all the benefits and then return to the Faculty Senate with a final document for approval.

Proposal for Integrative Program Advisory Committee

In the spring of 2011, the Faculty Senate, at the recommendation of the General Studies Committee, suspended the General Studies Committee and the GNST curriculum. Due to this action, the First Year Seminar and the Self-designed Interdisciplinary Major (or SIM program) were left without a support structure. A motion was made and seconded to appoint an Integrative Programs Advisory Committee to provide support for the First Year and Keystone Seminars, and SIM. All were in favor; motion carried.

The Integrative Programs Advisory Committee will approve proposals for the three programs, oversee the assessment of each program, and support and advise the directors of each program. The committee will also solicit applications for the directors of the First Year and Keystone Seminars and make recommendations for seminar directors to the Global Citizenship Project Committee.

Miscellaneous

A brief discussion took place regarding the documentation that is being requested by Human Resources to verify marriage and dependents. It was felt that the internal communication was not handled properly and there is concern about whom the information is being sent to.

Someone asked what is happening with the equity study. It was stated that the equity committee membership was sent to Julian Schuster and a response has not been received. It was suggested that Ralph discuss this with Julian the next time that they meet.

The meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.