

**Faculty Senate Meeting
October 10, 2013**

Gwyneth Williams, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

Members Present: John Aleshunas, Ginny Altrogge, Jef Awada, Glen Bauer, Carla Colletti, Don Conway-Long, Paula Hanssen, Chris Sagovac, Marty Smith, Roy Tamashiro

Announcements

The Senate will meet next Thursday, October 17th.

There will be an Academic Assembly on October 15, 2013 in the Winnie Moore Auditorium that has been scheduled by the Provost and deans. All were encouraged to attend.

Gwyneth asked the Senate if we should continue to hold the Faculty Assembly in EAB 102. Everyone agreed that the new venue was a good location to hold the November 12th Faculty Assembly. We will request a wireless mic for those speaking and will have snacks available after the assembly.

When Gwyneth met with Provost Schuster, she told him that both the fall and spring faculty institutes would come out of the entertainment budget line and that we had received a 25 percent cut in that line. He informed her that she should contact the folks in charge of the budget and have the line moved under professional development. Gwyneth contacted Curt Vehlewald and Greg Gunderson and the entire line was moved under professional development and \$3,200 (the 25% cut) was added back to the total.

All faculty have received an email from Joe Stimpfl regarding FY 15 Budget Requests. The budget request form was attached to the email. Every faculty member has been told s/he can submit something and that the administration is sincerely interested in good, innovative ideas.

Gina Jensen sent out an email with a Call for Proposals for faculty to submit to the Faculty Subcommittee for the Centennial Celebration.

Insurance enrollment will be held November 1 – 15, 2013.

It was reported that alumni weekend was discussed at the Administrative Council meeting last week. The Council talked about what worked and did not work, and what can be improved for next year.

Fall Institute Report – Martha Smith

Fall institute is happening this weekend, Friday, October 11th and Saturday, October 12th, at Pere Marquette Lodge in Grafton, Illinois. Martha sent out a reminder to the Faculty Assembly.

Board of Trustees Meeting Oct. 3, 2013

Gwyneth reported on the Board meeting. An executive session of the Board was held first, then the Administrative Council was admitted to the meeting. President Stroble gave an enrollment report. There was a report on a survey of college presidents listing their top concerns. The meeting then broke into small groups to discuss the various concerns addressed in the survey.

The night before the Board of Trustees meeting, Gwyneth and John Aleshunas attended the Board dinner at the Jewel Box. The University Chamber singers performed for the group.

Salary and Fringe Benefits

The SFB Committee met with Provost Schuster two days ago and Gwyneth met with the SFB Committee afterwards. The statement was made that this meeting was very positive with a good discussion between the SFB committee and the Provost. They discussed the possibility of an across the board raise in January (mentioned in last spring's salary agreement), which is dependent upon Fall II enrollments. Also discussed was whether next year's package could raise salaries in non-market competitive disciplines that did not receive raises under the Mercer adjustments.

SFB asked Provost Schuster if Mercer should be redone given the amount of time that has passed. He stated that perhaps it should be redone.

Was there discussion about finishing Mercer? Yes, that was discussed.

The SFB committee will be sending out a survey to the Faculty Assembly, and the results will be shared at the November 12th Faculty Assembly meeting.

Report on CREDO Retreat

CREDO is a consulting group on board to help with strategic planning. They work specifically with educational institutions and are all long-time academics.

There was a two day retreat for the Administrative Council and the deans, which Gwyneth and Martha Smith attended. At the retreat there was discussion of the attributes of thriving institutions and then participants broke into groups to come up with ideas for new initiatives for Webster.

CREDO had many positive things to say about Webster University and stated that if the university does nothing, we will stay as we are and will muddle along. If we really want to thrive, we will need to pick 3 or 4 things that we do well and really focus on them. The statement was made that Webster is an extremely complex institution.

Webster is part of a pilot program that CREDO is doing. We are one of 15 schools involved in the pilot program. Data is being collected from us as well as 14 other schools. At some point in the next two years, CREDO may have people from all 15 schools meet and share their strategic plans.

Provost Schuster stated that we must have growth in order to "pay our bills."

The statement was made that there seems to be a lot of consultants these days. Is this normal? Is this a trend? It was pointed out that we have always used consultants for many things over the years.

A Senator mentioned one problem is that some students are being recruited (such as single parents) that may have special needs, and there is no infrastructure in place to help them when a problem arises.

Appointments

Juraj Bohus has resigned from the Faculty Senate. The replacement should come from the School of Communications. Juraj's term expires in May, 2014.

Publications Board – A replacement is needed for Julia Griffey while she is on leave in the spring. Meg Sempreora was suggested. The Pub Board is a conduit between the Journal and those who may have complaints about some aspect of it.

Gender Equity Task Force – A replacement is needed for Debbie Stiles. Allan MacNeill was suggested.

Questions for President Stroble/Provost Schuster

President Stroble and Provost Schuster will attend the October 31st Faculty Senate meeting. Gwyneth asked the Senators for questions they would like to ask Beth and Julian when they attend. She would like to send the questions to Beth and Julian as soon as possible. Gwyneth asked that the Senators bring questions to next week's Faculty Senate meeting.

Performance Pay

Various senators reported on the town halls/meetings they had led on performance pay. A general discussion of the findings followed.

Some faculty are still not understanding that there will be no more automatic cost-of-living raises. Everything will now be based on performance.

There was much discussion of the Jacksonville model of merit pay, which allows faculty to individually weight the different factors by which they will be evaluated. The Senate agreed that teaching/advising should be the largest percentage in order to comply with the Handbook.

There was discussion about whether or not the calendar for performance pay should run January to January or academic year. The statement was made that the January to December time frame makes more sense, because evaluations will happen in the spring of each year.

It has been added to the language that appeals can be submitted to the appropriate dean. The deans will need to be included in approving all decisions about performance pay.

One senator pointed out that some professional programs engage in clinical teaching, which is different from conventional teaching. These differences will need to be taken into consideration with the performance pay model.

There is concern that there is room for potential contradiction with what CRF does. Faculty could say that their department approved their work, but CRF did not, and vice versa. It was stated that CRF looks at a five year period, where the performance pay is a one year period. Language will be added stating that performance pay is independent of any status promotion evaluations.

Some faculty are having trouble getting past the existence of the performance pay model in general. There is a real problem with faculty buy-in. One big concern is the idea that program is rigorous enough that people either have to be satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Some faculty are having a problem with the terms satisfactory and unsatisfactory. But given the fact that we have had 25 percent merit for a long time, we cannot just say we are not doing the performance pay. If someone wants to protest the performance model, they should make an appointment with Provost Schuster either individually or in groups.

Any model should respect the individuality of different departments as well as the professional programs.

The Senate was asked whether comments gathered from the various meetings indicate that faculty are satisfied with the proposed model of the department chair and dean deciding who gets performance pay. There is concern as some do not trust their department chair. The question was asked how this will change the relationship between faculty and department chairs. Currently the department chairs have a great deal of responsibility with almost no authority. We will be adding a level of authority to the department chair that could be problematic. Perhaps for those who do not want the department chair to make the decision, we could have the option of indicating who does make the decision, i.e., department chair, committee of peers, etc. The more versatility that is given to the departments, the better.

People have stated that they like the general direction that the performance pay model is taking.

Is there a way of protecting someone other than through FDL/tenure, if someone gets an unsatisfactory evaluation? This document is completely independent of CRF and no one other than the department chair, dean, and faculty member would even know about an unsatisfactory evaluation. It does not go into the faculty file.

Keith Welsh has graciously offered to help edit the language in the Performance Pay Model document.

A survey will not be generated until a final draft has been completed of the performance pay model. The survey will have room for responses.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and approved by unanimous consent to approve the September 10th Faculty Assembly minutes.

November 12th Faculty Assembly Agenda

Report from Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee

Report on Performance Pay Model

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.