

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 3, 2012

Call to Order: Chair Sharp called the meeting to order at 4:11 pm; Riggle Room; ADUC

Senators Absent: Ritta Abell, Ali Ahmadi, Donna Everett, Gary LaFleur, Barbara Lyons, Beverly McCormick, Yuqiu You

Visitor: Dr. Dayna Seelig

Minutes: The minutes of April 19, 2012 were approved as submitted.

Committee Reports:

Academic Issues: No Report

Evaluation: 2nd reading of Student Course Evaluation Instrument

Faculty Welfare and Concerns: PAc 29 2nd reading continued

Governance: Gen Ed Council nominations

Senate Committee on Issues: 2nd reading of PAc for Faculty Ombudsperson

Reports:

Chair's Report:

- Reported on:
 - items from the President's forums last week
 - President's comments from today's BOR meeting
 - April 26th meeting with the President and Provost
 - TEC passed a motion to require teacher candidates to pass all required PRAXIS exams prior to Clinical Practice beginning with students admitted to the University during catalog year 20120-02013.

Senator Denise Watkins informed the members that a former MSU theatre student has been nominated for best leading actor in a musical on Broadway and that his show has received 11 nominations. The show is "Once" and his name is Steve Kazee.

Scheduling Committee: Chair Sharp reported for Senator Hypes that a draft report from the Scheduling Committee will be posted on the MSU portal next week for review. You will have until May 18th to provide comments. Chair Sharp will provide the link for the report to the Senators.

Open Chair Segment:

Senator Rathbun recognized Senator Vincent Cesaro, US Army, who is taking a new assignment in the coming year at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. She thanked him for his service.

Senator Rathbun presented the following Open Chair Statement:

"I am here today to bring to you several issues, but before I start, I'd like to thank you for your hard work this year. We have made MAJOR headway on the PACs and the debate and discussion has been healthy...frustrating at times, but healthy! Thanks to you all.

One of the things I have been doing this year is working on the faculty compensation workgroup. I'd like to frame my comments around the ongoing issue of faculty compensation.

The vision at MSU is to become the "best regional university in the south." We have a strategic plan that cannot be accomplished without the help of faculty. I can bet that the current "BEST" in the south has faculty that are paid within the appropriate ranges based on discipline and time in rank. Without faculty, this institution would not be in existence.

Right now, there are 21 faculty members who are paid BELOW the minimum salary based on discipline and time in rank. These individuals are credentialed, well-educated and are probably NOT in education to make money, HOWEVER, these individuals are credentialed and well educated. They deserve to be treated

with value and respect for what they give to students and to the institution. They deserve to at least be paid the minimum salary for people in their discipline and at their rank...AT LEAST THE MINIMUM!

According to the Office of Human Resources here at Morehead State, it would cost less than \$60,000 to get these 21 people up the MINIMUM salary in terms of pay and benefits such as retirement. As I understand it, a well-paid individual has just left our institution who was making MUCH MORE than \$60,000 (hint: he is headed south...).

In the recent Presidential forum, I heard Dr. Andrews say that there is a hiring freeze and no one was to get a pay raise in the 2012-13 budget year. As a follow-up, I asked the president if he meant that "NO ONE" would be getting these moneys or positions. He stated that someone might be eligible for a raise if it was "warranted, or for issue of job reclassification or in cases of equity." I feel that the 21 faculty members who are below the minimum should qualify in terms of EQUITY. The research is done! The numbers are in! The OHR and the president know who these individuals are (I think anyone with one of the personnel rosters knows!). I am here today to advocate for those who may not be here.

As such, I would like to present a resolution as an individual member of this body. As we know, resolutions require NO ACTION by anyone (just as in the case of the resolution we passed in the case of the UPIKE situation); resolutions simply send a message. In this case, I'd like to send a message that the MSU 21(as I'll call them) should be recognized and brought to minimum salary.

On a similar note, in terms of 4-5 years of NO MERIT increases for anyone on faculty, I feel the time has come to ask ourselves a few questions. 1. What are the priorities of the institution? 2. How long are we willing to give our best if our institution does not give us its best? 3. What are we willing to do to make our voices heard? and 4. What will it take in order for us to speak up for ourselves and our fellows?

Will you: continue to give to the MSU Foundation in the fall canvas?, continue to volunteer for jobs knowing that you will receive no pay or recognition for the work?, continue to forgo your scholarly pursuits or teaching excellence for additional time giving service to the university?, work 10 or 11 months even though you are on a 9 month contract?

I am not suggesting anything. I am asking that you consider the questions quietly and thoughtfully and seek out your own answers.

Oh by the way, I want to remind everyone that there is an Employee Appreciation Picnic next week. It's a free lunch for us all, or is it?"

Senator Rathbun provided the Senators with a copy of A Resolution concerning Faculty Salaries. Senator Berglee moved to accept the resolution. Senator Rogers seconded the motion. There was discussion and questions about the resolution. When discussion was completed, Senator Wymer moved to close debate and vote on the resolution as revised in the Senate. The Resolution concerning Faculty Salaries was passed by the Senate as follows:

A Resolution concerning Faculty Salaries

Whereas, approximately 21 current faculty members at Morehead State University are being compensated in a pay range that is below the national minimum salary in relation to discipline and rank, and

Whereas, a Faculty Compensation Workgroup was formed to study this issue, and

Whereas, it is a known fact that personnel outside of Academic Affairs have received equity adjustments to their base salary

Be it resolved that all faculty who are currently being compensated in a pay range that is below the national minimum salary in relation to rank and discipline be immediately brought to at least the minimum salary in relation to discipline and rank.

Further, may it be resolved that this action is not to be considered, in any way, a 'first step' toward implementation of the Faculty Compensation Model proposed by the Faculty Compensation Workgroup.

Regent's Report:

- Todd Thacker was elected as Staff Regent
- Attended Audit Meeting; University is losing money with regard to how the "E" and "U" grade is being used; Encouraged faculty to carefully review the description for these grades and use them correctly in order to help the budget situation and student with regard to their financial aid.
- Heard an extensive report on the University budget
- Heard a report from Phil Gniot on salaries
- Explained why he feels that the Faculty/Staff Compensation Plan presented by Phil Gniot is flawed because of how "market mean" salary is defined

Senate Actions:

Governance: The Governance committee presented a slate of nominees to fill upcoming vacancies on the General Education Council (GEC). Senator Rogers identified the candidates and their positions for the Senators. Senator Rogers was prepared to conduct a ballot vote if necessary; however, after asking the Senators if anyone would not be in favor of a voice vote, and no one was, Senator Rathbun moved to accept the slate of nominees by voice vote. Senator Macintosh seconded the motion. Senate approved the slate of nominees for GEC as follows, for the 2012-15 term:

- S&T representative: Carol Wymer
- At-large: Cyndi Gibbs
- At-large: Kelly Collinsworth

Faculty Welfare and Concerns: Senator Rathbun presented PAC 29 for continuation of the 2nd reading. She stated that FWC accepted all friendly amendments from the last meeting except for the one, and it was reworded. At this time, FWC was not able to "tackle the issue of how workloads are calculated", because it is so complicated. FWC is recommending the "issue of workload formulas is tackled first thing in the fall" by Academic Issues. A Senator suggested that the Provost request copies from each department showing what they use to calculate workload and an Ad-hoc committee review them over the summer to determine the inconsistencies.

- A Senator asked for a clarification of lines 51 – 55. After discussion, Senator Wymer made a friendly amendment to remove "that is proposed to him or her by the immediate supervisor" from line 54 and 55. FWC accepted the friendly amendment.
- Senator Rathbun asked the Senators to review lines 80 – 84 and suggest which version to use and/or how to revise the lines. She explained the intent of those lines. After discussion, Senator Bessette made a friendly amendment to delete lines 80 – 82, keep lines 83 – 84 but change "the description will stand as written and adjustments to the workload shall be made" to "the required adjustments to the workload will be made". FWC accepted the friendly amendment.
- Senator Davison made a friendly amendment to delete lines 127 thru 130. Senator Tuerk seconded the amendment. FWC accepted the amendment.

Senator Berglee called the question on PAC 29. Senator Macintosh seconded the motion. Motion passed. PAC 29 was approved by the Senate, as amended.

Evaluation: Senator Nabb provided background information about the development of the Student Evaluation of Course/Faculty. He stated that they tried to make it the best for all faculty on campus. They anticipate that the instrument will be improved as it is tested and collected data is analyzed. Evaluation suggests and expects that this instrument be administered along with IDEA for a period of time. The final revised instrument was sent to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation and the Institutional Research Office to be reviewed. The impression gained from these offices by the Evaluation Committee is that these offices will not review or pilot the document until approved by the Senate and Provost, and is forwarded to them as part of their work. Senator Davison also provided information

regarding the faults of the IDEA form. The Evaluation Committee is only recommending to "run a new instrument as a pilot alongside of IDEA".

- Senator Gibbs made a friendly amendment to change "throughout" to "for" in item 2. on the first page. Evaluation accepted the friendly amendment.
- Evaluation accepted a typographical error correction on the last page to change "...set of questions (items 1-9) to ...set of questions (items 1-10)".
- It was suggested that next year's Evaluation Committee work with the Administration to create a plan to pilot the instrument.

Senator Nabb moved to close debate and vote. Senator Wymer seconded the motion. Motion passed. Faculty Senate approved the Student Evaluation of Course/Faculty as revised.

Senate Committee on Issues: Senator Chatham presented a PAC for a Faculty Ombudsperson Proposal for 2nd reading. The SCI accepted the following amendments that were made at the last meeting:
The Faculty Ombudsperson shall

- Line 51 and 52 – (12) maintain and occupy a physical office with location convenient to most faculty and separate from any office(s) provided for his or her other work for the University

The Faculty Ombudsperson shall not

- Line 75 and 76 – (10) serve as an official who is authorized to receive official notice of any kind on behalf of the University

Senators discussed the neutrality of a faculty Ombudsperson. A Senator asked if there is a procedure for removing an Ombudsperson who is not satisfactory. After discussion, Senator Chatham suggested to add "or removed" after "...shall be appointed" on Line 13. SCI accepted.

A question was raised about who does the "evaluation of performance" mentioned on Line 15 and if it was annual or at the end of the three year term.

Senator Berglee called the question on the PAC for a Faculty Ombudsperson. Senator Macintosh seconded. Motion passed. Faculty Senate voted to approve the PAC for a Faculty Ombudsperson.

New Business:

A Senator asked about a rumor going around that IT was intending to remove all non-MAP computers from campus. There was concern about losing personal computers in research labs containing valuable research data. There was considerable discussion. It was suggested that someone from IT speak to the Senate regarding this issue. Recently an IT consultant group evaluated the IT systems on campus and held faculty/staff forums. Senator Wymer asked that if the recommendations from this consulting group had been formalized and are they available for review.

Chair Sharp stated that the Reconciliation Committee will be meeting over the summer for PAC 7 and possibly PAC 27. The first summer meeting is scheduled for June 21st. That meeting will probably be called to inform Senators about the progress of the PACs and have an IT representative speak about the computer removal issue.

A Senator asked if something is happening in the GEC regarding exchange courses. Senator Chatham stated that the GEC is meeting to discuss creating a policy for approval of exchange courses.

Chair Sharp will provide the Senators with a copy of the final version of the Faculty Workload – PAC 29. A Senator asked if there are FEP guidelines. Chair Sharp stated that there were no guidelines available.

Adjournment: 6:00 p.m.