

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**April 18, 2013**

Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

**Members Present:** Glen Bauer, Mary Bevel, Juraj Bohus, Carla Colletti, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Stephanie Schroeder, Xiaoyuan Suo, Marty Smith, Emily Thompson, Gwyneth Williams

**Approve Minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the April 4, 2013 Faculty Senate minutes. With the exception of three abstentions, all were in favor. Motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the April 9, 2013 Faculty Assembly minutes as amended. With the exception of three abstentions, all were in favor. Motion carried.

A brief discussion followed regarding guests (non faculty members) attending the Faculty Assembly meetings without an invitation from the Faculty Senate President.

A suggestion was made for future Senate minutes to include an excused list of names for those Senators not in attendance due to a conference, etc.

Ralph briefed the Senate on his knowledge of the budget process. Ralph stated, "When I became Faculty Senate President four years ago, President Stroble had first arrived and the previous budget process was still in place." Two years ago, in September 2011, Dan Hitchell sent an email to create a budget committee which included about 40 - 50 people. Ralph asked Mike Hulsizer because he was department chair of a large department to sit on the committee with him. The committee met for the first time in December, 2011 with the AVPs, VPs, Deans, WSA representative, etc. and were told that there would be a new budget process of a multi-year budget. The next committee meeting was in April or May, 2012 where the budget was unveiled to the same group of people. In September, 2012, Dan Hitchell sent an email stating that another budget meeting was being held and would be more inclusive. Neither Ralph nor Mike were able to make that second meeting. When it was stated that there was faculty representation at the budget meetings, they were invited to two meetings, but could only attend one.

The question was asked as to who actually compiles the budget and who makes the projections on which the budget is based? In the past it has been Dan Hitchell and Chris Rhyner, but both have taken other jobs and it is unknown who picked up their duties.

Question was raised about whether enrollment projections were based on any systematic look at the number of applications received?

As to the question of S&FB meetings with Provost Schuster, there was a break down in communications and they did not happen as often as they should have.

The question was asked how the negotiation process works. The S&FB Committee makes a proposal, based upon the faculty survey, to the administration and the administration then looks at the budget to determine what funds are available.

The statement was made that there seems to be a lack of respect for the role of the S&FB and the whole process. There is also a lack of respect for faculty in the shared governance of this process.

Tuesday night after the April 16<sup>th</sup> Faculty Assembly, Ralph thought it would be helpful to send Provost Schuster, Jeffrey Carter and Greg Gunderson the previous faculty agreements from the last three years.

Provost Schuster has requested to present the agreement with the S&FB at an upcoming Faculty Assembly. It was asserted that if Provost Schuster does not attend, there might not be an agreement. A Faculty Assembly has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 24, 2013 in the Emerson Library Conference Room. Ralph asked for help in getting people to attend.

### **Salary and Fringe Benefits**

At this point, two S&FB members joined the Faculty Senate for a discussion.

The agreement that S&FB shared with Faculty Senate came from their meeting with Provost Schuster the day before. The document had some small changes to the language based on Provost Schuster's preferences; not S&FB's negotiations.

The Senate went through the document point by point. The question was asked as to whether or not insurance should be listed in this document as Betsy Schmutz has said there would be no changes to insurance. S&FB has not included this in the past and will not include it this time. Items 2 – 8 were judged to be straight forward. The discussion that followed focused on point 1 about merit based performance.

Discussion took place regarding moving to a 100% merit based performance review. The question was asked what criteria performance would be based on. It was suggested that the deans will make that decision as CEOs of each school/college.

The statement made that as a department chair, it is problematic to have to decide who gets a raise and who does not based on merit without a process for performance assessment.

There are forms that were used in the past for merit performance review and it was suggested that these forms be used for this year since the deadline to complete review based on merit is so

short. Provost Schuster has stated that anyone who is satisfactorily doing their job will not see their salary shrink.

The discussion of merit based performance continued; Joe Stimpfl previously put together some focus groups that came up with several different models of merit based proposals that were shared with faculty. In these focus groups, faculty were adamantly opposed that any merit be put forth by the dean. The suggestion that the Faculty Senate should be involved in assessing criteria for merit performance as understood by the Boyer Model and service was put forward. The current language is vague and needs to be more specific.

The suggestion was made to add language to the S&FB agreement showing that continuing agreements have not changed, i.e., salaries by rank, faculty professional development funds, faculty development/research grants.

The statement was made that if faculty do not agree on the S&FB document, that there is a risk of being negatively perceived by the Board of Trustees.

Comment was made that S&FB, especially Jeffrey Carter, was unfavorably portrayed at the Faculty Assembly. It was not an accurate portrayal of the committee or Jeff.

After the discussion with S&FB was completed, the question was raised as to whether or not the Senate is going to endorse this agreement prior to the Wednesday Faculty Assembly. The statement was made that the Senate would wait and see what S&FB comes back with after their meeting with Provost Schuster on Monday.

A question was raised if a quorum is needed for a vote at Wednesday's Faculty Assembly? The answer is yes (33% of faculty).

It was suggested that we need to set up a system for the future to avoid the issues that happened this year with regard to the S&FB meetings and discussion of administration officials.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.