

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
November 14, 2013**

Gwyneth Williams, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

**Members Present:** John Aleshunas, Ginny Altrogge, Jef Awada, Larry Baden, Glen Bauer, Carla Colletti, Paula Hanssen, Victoria McMullen, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Terri Reilly, Warren Rosenblum, Joe Schuster, Marty Smith, Roy Tamashiro

**Professional Development/Travel Policy**

This policy is on the Faculty Senate website and it is the Salary and Fringe Benefits agreement from 2006-2007 that collapsed travel and development together and stated what the funds could be used for. This was a negotiated agreement between the faculty and administration that still stands. If it is to be changed, it has to be renegotiated with SFB. You do not have to present at a conference to have that trip funded. Gwyneth asked Mike Hulsizer to send an email to the deans referencing this policy. The deans have been reminded where the policy can be found and what the policy is.

**Discussion of Senate meeting Oct. 31 and FA meeting Nov. 12:**

Gwyneth will send a letter to President Stroble and Provost Schuster thanking them for attending the October 31<sup>st</sup> Senate meeting.

It is felt that there are still questions remaining concerning the budget that were not addressed at Tuesday's Faculty Assembly meeting, including: what concrete provisions have been put in place in order to ensure the economic health of the University?

The relationship with the international campuses was discussed and there is still frustration over the fact that there are no clear lines on who owns the curriculum.

Some senators were pleased that the administration shared information with the faculty and listened to our concerns at the Faculty Assembly meeting.

**Letter from the Arts & Sciences Chairs**

Gwyneth shared the letter from the Arts & Sciences Chairs with the Senate that was referenced at the November 12<sup>th</sup> Faculty Assembly meeting. This letter expresses the view that departmental chairs should not become the primary evaluators of faculty in any new compensation system. The A&S chairs believe this will fundamentally alter the relationship with chairs and faculty in a negative way.

The Senate discussed the concerns of the A&S chairs in relation to the current rough draft of the compensation model. The chairs are concerned about faculty animosity toward the chair, and being placed in a position of supervisor. A statement was made that many chairs did not attend the forums that were offered in which the model was drafted. Some had requested additional sessions be held and then did not attend any. Furthermore, the letter offers no alternative.

Point five in the proposal allows for departments to have some latitude in specifying the criteria by which faculty will be evaluated under each broad category. These criteria will be developed by departments as a whole. Chairs then should have clear criteria to follow that have “buy in” from the department.

The reality of any pay system is that someone is going to have to make a decision, whether it is the department chair, peers, or the dean. Most faculty have said they prefer it be the chair.

**Visit from the Academic Deans: Drs. Benjamin Akande (SBT), Brenda Fyfe (SOE), Eric Rothenbuhler (SOC), Peter Sargent (CFA), and David Wilson (CAS).**

The Deans were welcomed and Gwyneth asked that each Senator introduce him/herself and what Senate seat s/he holds.

Gwyneth explained that President Stroble and Provost Schuster were at the Senate meeting a few weeks ago and the Senate asked various questions. One of the questions was concerning the aggressive timeline for various initiatives that faculty have been asked to undertake, such as program review and the deans’ global initiative. Provost Schuster suggested that the deans be invited to a Senate meeting so they could be asked directly about the Global Initiative (GI).

She also mentioned another topic that came up during the meeting with the President and Provost, which was a discussion of the basis for awarding new faculty lines. Provost Schuster stated that faculty lines are often mission driven and he relies on what the chairs tell the deans and what the deans forward to him. The Senate wants to discuss this with the deans, as well.

Questions about the GI:

The information presented at the academic assembly about the global initiative was not very clear. It is difficult to comprehend what the GI means to some departments whose programs cannot be changed or made more “global” than they currently are (math/computer).

Sargent: the vision element is evolving .We are searching for ideas to see what we can do.

Akande: Part of our mission, whether you are math, journalism, etc. is that we function in a very dynamic global world. We want to create competencies, creating learning opportunities to

position our students to be functional and succeed in whatever global dynamic that may be. We do not want our students to be at a disadvantage. I do not think this can wait, it is very important, very meaningful, and will enhance our vision as a university. There are so many institutions laying claim to that globality. It will give us even more advantage in what we can offer our students.

Q: Is there a feeling among the deans that the Global Citizenship Program is not addressing those competencies across the curriculum?

A: Deans - It is felt that there are a significant number of undergraduate students that are not being touched by GCP, nor are graduate students.

Wilson – For every discipline, there is a different premise of approaching that degree that ignores or embraces globalization. We are challenging you as a faculty to look at your programs and see what can be done.

Akande – I do not want my daughter to graduate with just a degree, but as a well rounded young woman who knows about globalization. A deficiency will handicap students in their growth and development.

Senator- there is confusion about the terminology of globalization. It seems that the real meaning and focus is about global citizenship rather than studies, curriculum, travel, etc. We have a GCP program that is defined according to liberal arts goals/competencies. That group of competencies is not really a part of the concept of global citizenship. We need to segregate out the term globalization. If we understand the definition of global citizenship, we can look at how we do things throughout the curriculum.

Senator-The definition is not the only issue. Part of the issue from faculty is that they do not have time for one more thing and are very concerned about this initiative. Expectations have multiplied for assessment and accreditation, research and publication have increased, some departments are finishing program review, trying to get GCP off the ground, the GCP audits are not currently online and have to be calculated manually, and our advising load has gotten greater. Furthermore, there is no evidence that globalization will have a positive effect on enrollment. It might negatively affect enrollment.

Akande - This is an inventory of what we are doing in the curriculum. We do not do something just for the hell of it. When we talk about globalization, it is mission driven. The institution remains relevant and never has an expiration date. This initiative gives us more relevance, substance, and deeply engages us. NAFSA has become the base of moving forward and we are making sure the students can operate, function, succeed, and thrive in any environment.

Rothenbuhler - We see this as the start of a conversation, not the end of it. We are not asking for major reports by December 15<sup>th</sup>, just one page on each program. We are asking people who are experts in those programs to come up with ideas to distinguish Webster University from other universities. This will be easier for some programs than others.

Wilson - It is important to leave it up to the faculty to define for themselves how to inculcate globalism. Does every program have the potential for globalization? Yes. It is helpful to us in spreading the word as the start of a conversation. We are asking for initial thoughts on additional global features that can be added to your program. We expect to have a lot of conversations with department chairs based on those reports received by December 15<sup>th</sup>. We would love you all to be our partners in communicating this. This is an outstanding moment in our history.

Senator – We are coming off of last semester where we were involved with the Working Groups. We received some information at Fall Convocation as to what the outcomes were from those groups. Through that whole process, faculty was saying, “where are we going with this? We don’t have the syllabus, etc.” It is felt that we were operating in the dark and are now feeling this again. A lot of people have put in quite a bit of work over the last several semesters and we have heard very little from administration. Has there been research that shows this will help us to be more competitive?

Akande - In some of the Working Groups, some outcomes have already been implemented. Nicole Roach was hired out of that. The Provost page lists all of that information. The strategic planning process involves reading all of the material from the Working Groups. It is a process to use that information and was a genuine effort to have the whole community involved and have people work on that.

Fyfe – The institution needs to find ways to thread those steps into the next steps. Where does this initiative fit into the strategic plan? ACE International report is where we are building on this. We want faculty to help us define this.

The question was asked where is the road map for this? The deans responded that this is a good, interesting question. The Provost should be asked to articulate that as well as the plans on implementing this initiative.

Rothenbuhler – Given the pace of change and challenges in higher education, we have to pick the things that give us competitive advantage and provide higher education where it is needed. The deans saw this urgency and asked that this be put on the table as an initiative for this year as we go forward.

A senator said: We understand your urgency on this initiative, but that urgency is not shared by the faculty. Faculty in the SOE have NCATE next week and that leaves us three weeks after NCATE is over to do whatever else needs to be done. GCP is our plan for the undergraduates. It is understood that we need a plan for the graduates. This has already been completed in the ACE International report. That report should be used for this initiative.

A Senator stated that GCP addresses this at the undergraduate level so just address the graduate program. The strategic plan is there so let the strategic plan work.

Senator - Because of the quick deadline, the feelings from faculty are that if our programs are not global enough, they will be cancelled.

Wilson - This is the first part of the conversation. December 15<sup>th</sup> is the first step and thoughts about each program. Do not think of it as a big, onerous task. These are things we have already been talking about.

Senator – It would be a good idea to first analyze and assess the programs that have gone wrong. We have a dysfunctional relationship with the overseas campuses. The Fine Arts program in Vienna is one example of a good program being closed.

Sargent – the only thing that has died is the degree in Vienna.

Senator: In the past, an email could be sent to any campus director and a response would be sent back. Today, you cannot even get a response to an email. The infrastructure is not there.

Wilson - These are conversations that need to occur. When we take inventory of programs, hopefully those programs will be included that are dead, dying, hospice. That is why inventory is so important.

Fyfe – A second page could be added to this initiative where faculty can list suggestions.

Senator - Has Provost Schuster or any of the deans outlined any outcomes for this whole initiative?

Deans - We are not at that stage yet. We need to gather the information first and take inventory. We want faculty to be a part of this and share ideas and this will help to formulate that syllabus. Outcomes are brought already by creating global citizens. How do we get there? That is where we need faculty participation.

Senator - It seems there are more contradictions about the assigned tasks.

Deans - The objective is to identify ways in which Webster University is accomplishing its

mission to transform students for global citizenship. We have not thought about this with the purpose of how this debate, etc. in class is going to transform the student to become more aware of the world and deal with global citizens. The objective is to inventory ways in which our students say we are providing learning experiences that address this.

Wilson – This task is about each program and has two features – what we are currently doing and what we propose to do in the future.

### **New Faculty Lines**

The Provost explained that enrollment, etc. should not be the driving force behind new faculty lines and that he relies on the deans for arguments and clarity in the process for making new faculty lines. Is this the deans understanding for how it works?

Deans -The deans have a discussion with the department chairs to get their perspective and recommendations as to what is most important. They have to decide together what has been given 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> priority. The department chairs work with the department to obtain input.

Senator - Is it your feeling as deans that you are being listened to when given mission driven arguments?

Deans - Yes

Deans - When looking at new faculty positions approved by Provost Schuster and President Stroble, there is a link to the mission and how it contributes to the overall strategy of the University.

Rothenbuhler - The logic of program review is all about enrollments. I joined the program review process late in the game. When I looked at the data it was based on, I found that there was a lot of interesting information. In School of Communications, we have put the data back in the hands of the department chairs to be on the agenda this year.

Dean - Not talking about programs that are growing or dying, but in thinking about things we need to add, the program review allows us to better allocate our resources.

Dean - When talking about numbers, in one sense the program reviews could hold some great ideas to generate more revenue. We have cases where numbers are tied to the mission of the University (Psychology major). In order to do a quality job in the mission area, we have to pay attention to the numbers.

Senator – there have been four historians since the 1960s. We need more historians, but cannot make the argument based on numbers. One of the reasons numbers are down is that we do not

have enough faculty to cover history. How can you call yourself a great university when you only have four historians? Culturally as an institution, it has seemed we can only justify positions when there is growth.

Akande – I made the same argument for 4,000 MBA students with only eight faculty and I have never gotten more faculty. For our students to get the diversity from great history professors, we need to articulate that position. This administration is open to make a case, not based solely on revenue. There are always more needs than resources and you have to figure it out and do the best that you can and put some things on next year's list. Some things are needed because they are mission driven, some are needed because the world is changing and we have to change. There are many different ways to define need.

As the deans had to leave at 2:45 p.m. due to other commitments, Gwyneth thanked them for coming.

### **Performance Pay Proposal**

Gwyneth asked the Senate to read through the document again as minor edits have been made to the text portion of the document.

There was a brief discussion about the Evaluation form and minor edits made to it as well.

The Performance Pay Model and Evaluation form along with a Qualtrics survey will be sent to the Faculty Assembly for feedback.

The question was asked if there is a chance that we take this Performance Pay Model to the Board of Trustees and they deny it? Yes, that is a possibility.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.