

2011-2012 Faculty Senate Meeting
September 29, 2011
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Suzanne E. Ament, E. Kevin Ayers, Roann Barris, Maggie Bassett, Steven Beach, Candice Benjes-Small, Robert Boross, Julia Castleberry, Joseph Chase, James E. Collier, Farrell Doss, Lori Elis, Mary Ferrari, Kim Gainer, Vince Hazleton, Rhett B. Herman, Katherine R. Hilden, Lucy Hochstein, Margaret Hrezo, Cathy Hudgins, Pamela A. Jackson, Laura E. Jacobsen, Abhay Kaushik, Jerry M. Kopf, Mary LaLone, Kevin LoPresto, Michael B. Moore, Teresa O'Bannon, Richard A. Roth, Helen Roybark, Basel Saleh, Susan L. Schoppelrey, Bob Sheehy, Neil Sigmon, Michael Sinclair, Lauren Smith, Kenneth Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Lynne Taylor, Jonathan L. Tso, Erin L. Webster Garrett, Cynthia J. Thomas, Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Timothy L. Channell, Jake Fox, Blas Hernandez, Laura E. LaRue, Douglas Mitchell, Edward Carter Turner

Guests: Dr. Sam Minner, Mr. Richard Alvarez, Dr. Joe Scartelli, Ms. Lisa Ridpath.

I. Call to Order: 3:30pm

II. The minutes from the September 15, 2011 meeting of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports

- a. Faculty Senate Presidents' report: Dr. Rick Roth's comments included:
 - i. Dr. Roth discussed his attendance at the September 15-16, 2011 Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting. He communicated to the members of the BOV that faculty wanted to be left alone to do their work, and that faculty were concerned about the lack of recognition of that work as manifested by their low salaries. He reported to the BOV that 45 senior RU faculty were paid at less than the 10th percentile as compared to salaries at RU's peer institutions.
- b. Committee Reports:
 - i. Campus Environment—Dr. Laura Jacobsen said that this committee would have an issue for the Senate later in the meeting.
 - ii. Curriculum—Dr. Hrezo said that this committee started their work with assessment issues.
 - iii. Faculty Issues—Dr. Gainer said that this committee broke into sub-committees to handle the charges assigned to them.
 - iv. Governance—Dr. Schoppelrey said that this committee is currently working on prioritizing the charges given to them.
 - v. Resource Allocation—Dr. Beach reported that a representative from the quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) team will soon meet with this committee.
- c. Provost's Report: Dr. Minner and a number of his colleagues addressed the Senate. Their comments included:

- i. Dr. Scartelli gave a brief history of the [6-year plan](#) (Secretary's note: Posted on the Senate site.). He stated this grew out of his work with Mr. Alvarez in the spring of 2010 to develop a longer-term model. They created a 7-year budget model that factored in Academic Affairs priorities as the number 1 budgetary priority. This was a purely internal initiative with the guiding principles of "Where will the first dollar go?" and "Where will the first [faculty] position go?" Then the Virginia Governor and the HEOA (Higher Education Opportunity Act) got involved. That mandated that all public institutions needed to develop their own 6-year budget plans. A timeline is on page 3 of the 6-year plan that is on the Faculty Senate site. A draft of the RU 6-year plan was finished on April 13, 2011. On May 2, 2011 RU received the final instructions on the state requirements for the 6-year plan. These requirements were heavy in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics), healthcare and recruiting.
- ii. Dr. Minner stated that the objectives on page 4 of the 6-year plan do not mean that the mission of RU should change. He emphasized that this is a targeted funding opportunity and that RU is asked to submit proposals to these areas.
- iii. Mr. Alvarez pointed out that page 6 of the 6-year plan shows that RU now receives less of its funding from the state's General Fund than from other sources (i.e. non-General Fund). Page 7 shows that RU's tuition and fees are below the state average. RU is now the second lowest in the state, with only Virginia State University being lower. Page 8 shows that RU's increase in student numbers these past 2 years is really partly to get RU back to 2005 enrollment levels. He said that \$18 million of our budgets cuts in the past few years is from loss of state funding while \$6 million was from RU's lower enrollments during this time.
- iv. Ms. Ridpath stated that RU's 6-year plan was approved by the BOV at their most recent (September 2011) meeting.
- v. Dr. Doss asked about in-house funding for faculty salaries. Mr. Alvarez said that if the state raises salaries then RU must contribute 38% of that raise. RU will have to be ready for this when the budget gets better after the current biennium.
- vi. Dr. Ament asked about the New College Institute (NCI, in Martinsville). Dr. Minner said this is "really off the table at this point." RU will help the NCI but the goal is to take "zero resources" from RU's home campus. RU has expertise in teacher education, Virginia State University in horticulture and agriculture and VCU in the business aspects.
- vii. Dr. Ferrari asked if RU is expected to absorb 1,400 additional students without cost? And will we be expected to absorb those 1,400 students with or without more faculty? Mr. Alvarez replied that the expectation is that RU will get more faculty as well as more salary.
- viii. Dr. Kopf said that he found the chart on page 7 of the 6-year plan particularly troubling. He asked why we continue to stay behind the state average. He said that gap sends a message of what we think of our quality, and asked why we do not attempt to close that gap. Mr. Alvarez said that he asked the BOV those same questions. He said that RU should have tried to close that gap before things got so bad with the budgets. We can't suddenly close it now. He said the state has put out the word to not raise tuition beyond a certain unstated level.

- ix. Dr. Hazelton stated that RU is already the most efficient in the state by many studies. Every SCHEV report already shows that RU graduates the highest number of students per faculty member.
- x. Dr. Wirgau stated out that tuition and fees should be separated into different budgets areas.
- xi. Dr. Saleh asked if this 6-year plan will take funding from some programs currently at RU. Dr. Minner stated that this was possible if the whole budget doesn't get bigger.

IV. Old Business

- a. None.

V. New Business

- a. Motion: Recommendation on behalf of the Faculty Senate Campus Environment Committee concerning the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey 2011, brought by the Campus Environment Committee.
 - i. Dr. Jacobsen introduced the motion due to the deadlines that were approaching. In order to participate in the COACHE survey this year the Harvard group that ran the survey had to know by Friday September 30 if RU would participate.
 - ii. Dr. Jacobsen made a motion to suspend the rules [that would normally automatically table this motion] so that this motion could be debated and voted on at the current meeting. This motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.
 - iii. Dr. Jacobsen explained that the Campus Environment Committee voted in favor of RU participating in the COACHE survey this year. A number of our peer institutions participate (7 out of our 25 peers) as well as 6 other state schools in Virginia (CNU, JMU, ODU, UVa, VCU, VT). There are two options for reporting the data—the COACHE administrators issuing a summary report or them giving all of the raw data to one person at RU. The Campus Environment Committee voted to recommend just the summary option for this year to guarantee complete anonymity. She said that she was quoted a cost of \$20,000 for this year by someone from the COACHE group at Harvard. She pointed out that this survey would only go to tenure-stream faculty, not special purpose or other faculty.
 - iv. Dr. Hrezo said that she was unsure if the cost is whether the cost of the COACHE survey was \$12,000-\$20,000 better than the survey Senate has been using.
 - v. Dr. Doss said that his colleagues balked at the length of the survey at 25 pages of questions.
 - vi. Dr. Roybark was concerned that faculty other than tenure-stream faculty were not included.
 - vii. Dr. O'Bannon called the question, and this was seconded, and the vote to call the question passed by show of hands ("division" on voice vote). Twenty-four voted to end the discussion and 17 opposed ending the discussion.
 - viii. The motion failed by voice vote.

VI. Announcements

a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:50pm