2011-2012 Faculty Senate Meeting
February 2, 2012
Heth Hall, Room 014


Members Absent:

Guests: Dr. Sam Minner

I. Call to Order: 3:30pm

II. The minutes from the January 19, 2012 Senate meeting were approved.

III. Reports

   a. Senate President’s Report: Dr. Roth’s comments included:
      i. He will go to Richmond for the RU Board of Visitors meeting. He will work to keep the issue of faculty salaries in the forefront of the BOV.
      ii. He met with Emily Dodd, SGA President. She will soon come to the Senate.

   b. Provost’s Report: Dr. Minner’s comments included:
      i. He has come to believe that we need to devote more energy to the “RU experience” or the “RU brand.” He has seen there is some incongruence between reality and RU’s perception by the rest of the state.
      ii. He is concerned about college affordability. If people are interested he could bring in an economist to RU to talk about this. He suggested Richard Vedder of the American Enterprise Institute who wrote “Going Broke by Degree. Why College Costs Too Much.”
      iii. The firm that will handle the building of the new CSAT building has signed the contract and will be announced soon.
      iv. He doesn’t know anything about the new student center since it’s not an academic building.
      v. The New College Institute has a new director, William Wampler (former state senator). RU had submitted a $1.2million proposal for a number of programs but that’s on hold at the moment.
      vi. RU has finished the last interview for the Vice President for University Advancement.
vii. RU is continuing the search for the Vice Provost for Enrollment Planning and Management, as well as the new Dean of the Waldron College of Health and Human Services.
viii. Dr. Erin Webster Garrett is the new QEP Director. She is also the first person selected for the new Executive Leadership program.
ix. Dr. Minner is starting a professional development opportunity for chairs.
x. Each College has identified an experimental design and technical assistance person.
xi. Steve Helm, Dean of the Library, is leading a group to decrease textbook costs.

xii. Study Abroad and Honors task forces are continuing to work to improve these programs.

xiii. Classes dealing with First Amendment issues are in development.
xiv. “Digital Measures” is a way to organize faculty activity and will help reduce the work by faculty to produce reports. He said program is used in more than 2,000 places.
xv. We would like the new Vice President for University Advancement to have fundraising goals, along with all the Deans.
xvi. There will be a new “Wintermester” over the winter break of 2012-2013. This will involve at first only 8 online classes. Students and faculty participating are all voluntary.
xvii. On fiscal matters, Dr. Minner says that he has “a handle” on issues of salary inversion and compression.
xviii. Most of those making ETF requests this year received their requests.
xix. Dr. Boross asked if Wintermester could be other than online classes. Dr. Minner responded that such a decision was up to the faculty.
xx. Dr. Ament asked about what Dr. Minner was teaching at the moment. He responded that it was a grant-writing class that cut across disciplines.

c. Dr. Kopf reported from his work as part of the Wintermester committee. His comments included:
i. Wintermester will be treated as another summer school type of semester (e.g. like Summer I).
ii. This is a trail, with only 8 courses, all online only at first.
iii. The time frame will be from December 18, 2012 to January 15, 2013.
iv. Dr. Barris asked if a planned Study Abroad project should be stopped in this Wintermester idea continues. Dr. Kopf said that these Study Abroad plans should continue.
d. Dr. Webster Garrett reported that the final draft of the QEP was on the D2L site for the Senators. So far only 3 comments about it have been received, and they have all been considered. The final QEP document is going to Provost Minner and President Kyle.

e. Committee Reports:
i. Campus Environment—Dr. Jacobsen said that her committee was working on the faculty morale survey and discussing the COACHE survey for the fall.
ii. Curriculum—Dr. Hrezo said they were looking at the final charges from the FSEC.
iii. Faculty Issues—Dr. Gainer said that her committee is also looking at faculty salaries. They are working on intellectual property issues.
iv. Governance—Dr. Schoppelrey said they are working on the Deans’ evaluations.
v. Resource Allocation—Dr. Beach said they have a motion today, and were looking at the cost of the Core Curriculum.
IV. Old Business

a. The Motion concerning criteria to be used in evaluation of faculty was removed from the table and withdrawn by Dr. Gainer.

b. The Motion to change the reporting period and the starting date for personnel evaluation was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included:
   i. Dr. Chase said that the last Faculty Senate passed a related motion which would change the reporting date to August 22. Since that motion was passed, but had not been sent to the Board of Visitors, then it would go forward to the BOV if the motion today did not pass. The other dates at the “end” of this motion cannot be moved. This is because, as the FARs go “up the chain” their numbers increase at each level (e.g. Deans have to write letters for entire colleges of faculty). Also, appeals and grievance processes must have time to play out. All of this must be done before the last BOV meeting before graduation. Thus the current motion is to move the FAR submission deadline to May 15 of each year.
   ii. Dr. Kay K. Jordan asked if there were provisions for the transition period from the old system to this proposed one. Dr. Chase said that the first summer would be the only thing affected, and that this would get reported twice, but count only once for whatever credit it goes towards.
   iii. Dr. Webster Garrett asked how late spring evaluations would be addressed. Dr. Chase said that evaluations could be done early, and there should be a 2-week turnaround.
   iv. Dr Ament asked about those teaching Maymester, or taking research trips during that time. Dr. Chase said that one problem is that faculty are not under contract from May 15-August 15.
   v. Dr. Ferrari said that faculty could not see their evaluations until after grades were in, and thus this left inadequate time to ponder these evaluations for the FARs.
   vi. Dr. Turner expressed his hope for anything other than May 15.
   vii. Dr. Kopf said that he received no positive comments on the May 15 deadline from anyone he heard from in COBE.
   viii. Dr. Barris asked if this acceleration of the evaluations was fair to the person doing the evaluations.
   ix. The question was called. The motion failed. The old motion of August 22 will now go forward to the BOV.

c. The motion regarding allocation of faculty raises in 2011-2012 fiscal year was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included:
   i. Dr. Roybark asked if this was for raises funded only through the state. Dr. Roth said that this was for any raises.
   ii. Dr. Hrezo asked if this would take precedence over compression/inversion issues. Dr. Beach said this would take precedence over those issues.
   iii. Dr. Ayers said that he would favor giving each faculty member the same dollar amount. This would address some inequity.
   iv. Dr. Stanaland said that this motion seems to state that this up to 2% raise would be allocated like this in perpetuity, not just now.
   v. Dr. Doss asked if the state specified some type of distribution for the raises. Dr. Chase said that last time, the BOV said it had to be merit based.
vi. Dr. Ament asked who decided whether this would be merit based or otherwise. Dr. Chase said that the BOV ultimately decides raises. This was just the Faculty Senate’s recommendation.

vii. Dr. Moore offered a friendly amendment to change the wording of the first part of the sentence from “Any funding provided for faculty salary increases...” to “The next funding provided for faculty salary increases...” This amendment was accepted by the Resource Allocation Committee.

viii. Dr. Turner said that a problem he saw was that those at the lowest end of pay would vote against this.

ix. The question was called. Voice vote was inconclusive, “division” was called. The motion carried by a show of hands.

d. The motion regarding involvement of the Faculty Senate in the Continued Evolution of the QEP document was removed from the table. This motion was re-tabled by voice vote.

V. New Business

i. A motion was made and passed that the New Business motion would be considered under Old Business at the next meeting.

VI. Announcements

a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:45pm