

Faculty Senate Minutes
2 April 2014

Senators Present: Lea Ann Alexander, Ajay Aggarwal, Steven Becraft, James Duke, Carolyn Eoff, Dan Fitzroy, Janice O'Donnell, Greg Gibson, John Greene, Megan Hickerson, Jana Jones, Barbara Landrum (for Patricia Loy), Travis Langley, Richard Miller, Lonnie McDonald, Holly Morado, Malcolm Rigsby, Ingo Schranz, Brett Serviss, Suzanne Tartamella, Patrick Wempe, Penny Whelchel, Peggy Woodall, Fred Worth

Senators Absent: Emily Gerhold, Patricia Loy, Richard Schmid, R. C. Smith

Others Present: David Evans, Jacob Mills, Jim Shuff, Maralyn Sommer

1. Call to Order: President Fred Worth 3:15.
2. Discussion with Interim Provost/VPAA, Dr. Maralyn Sommer
 - a. Dr. Sommer noted that she had no specific items for discussion and was open to questions; she did note that so far, 227 students have applied for graduation at the three o'clock ceremony and 214 have applied for graduation at the six o'clock ceremony; she expects those numbers to fluctuate somewhat.
 - b. A senator asked Dr. Sommer whether the \$45,000 set aside for equity/merit raises can be rolled over to next year; Dr. Sommer indicated that it can, although it would set those faculty members eligible for a raise this year "a year behind"; she indicated that there will be no raise of any kind (COLA, etc.) for next year and encouraged moving forward with the equity/merit proposal this year.
 - c. Dr. Sommer said she did not want to rush the equity/merit process, but reiterated her support for moving forward with the process this year; she noted that she knows which faculty members most likely require equity adjustments, but that this is "not her decision"—deans and chairs will make those decisions; she wants to "do what's right though"; while it is too late to add these funds to the April paycheck, they could be added to the May paycheck; she emphasized that what we do this semester will not set a precedent and noted that approximately \$53,000 has been budgeted for equity/merit raises for next year.
 - d. Dr. Sommer noted that salaries have been an issue in several recent faculty searches (criminal justice, HPR)—top candidates have turned Henderson down and 3-4 positions remain unfilled; Dr. Sommer noted her astonishment that newly minted PhDs were unwilling to work for the salaries offered.
 - e. Dr. Sommer suggested that addressing issues of equity and compression should begin with new hires' salaries; when it comes to the low salaries of existing faculty members, she noted "it is what it is."
 - f. A senator questioned Dr. Sommer about the possibility of the faculty's looking at the school's overall budget with a goal of having some input about those "non-faculty" parts of the budget.
 - i. Dr. Sommer noted that the Faculty Senate should operate via recommendation rather than reaction and provide proposals that are "reasonable." For example, a 12% salary increase is *not* reasonable. She posed the question: instead of the faculty's offering constant criticism, why not offer solutions? Dr. Sommer noted that it is hard for the administration to work when they are always on the defense.
 - ii. A senator responded by noting the president's letter regarding transparency and the Faculty Senate's suggestion/request for a representative on the executive council; this suggestion was refused by President Jones.
 - iii. Dr. Sommer responded that this request would be difficult to accommodate due to the sensitive nature of the issues [i.e. personnel] discussed by this body; they cannot afford rumors and the president is adamant about confidentiality.

- iv. The senator noted that this is only one example of a request that has been denied; a discussion followed regarding the constitution of the cabinet and faculty representation on that body; Dr. Sommer responded that the faculty is already represented on the cabinet by the various deans.
- 3. A motion was made to suspend the rules and thus allow Dr. David Evans to address the Senate; the motion passed unanimously.
 - a. Dr. Evans explained his role as co-chair of the Quality of Life Subcommittee (Priority Three of the Strategic Plan) and shared the “desired outcomes” developed by his subcommittee; senators were encouraged to read the document (see addendum) and share ideas with him and his co-chair, Ms. Kathy Taylor. Other members of the committee include Dr. Laura Storm, Dr. Patty Miley, Mr. Bobby Jones, Ms. Elaine Kneebone, and Dr. Drew Smith.
 - b. The plan is to finalize the document by the end of the term and have full implementation by 2020; Dr. Evans mentioned the president’s commitment to shared governance and the placement of shared governance in this particular strategic priority.
 - i. A senator questioned the label “analysis required” for faculty salaries—why analysis and not action?
 - ii. Dr. Evans responded that they are looking for a numerical goal as well as looking at peer institutions; staff salaries are more difficult to deal with.
 - iii. The senator noted that the budget includes non-faculty who continue to receive raises; the only way to achieve true equity requires redistribution of funds, for no new money will be coming in.
 - iv. Dr. Evans noted that this is the fifth strategic plan in ten years—the goal is to “get this one right.”
 - v. The senator suggested a Faculty Senate subcommittee that would look at the budget; another senator agreed.
- 4. A motion was made to reinstate the rules; it passed unanimously.
- 5. Approval of March 2014 Minutes by Acclamation
- 6. President’s Report
 - a. Report of Meeting with President, Dr. Glen Jones (20 March 2014)
 - i. The \$45,000 merit/equity adjustments money will be rolled over to next year if the money is not allocated this year.
 - ii. We are going to look at committee structures and organizations. Some committees may be unnecessary, some may need a change in their charge.
 - b. Report of Meeting with Interim Provost/VPAA, Dr. Maralyn Sommer (21 March 2014)
 - i. The \$45,000 merit/equity adjustments money will be rolled over to next year if it is not allocated this year.
 - ii. Dr. Worth expressed his concern about expecting faculty to make the case for their own raise.
 - iii. Dr. Sommer: “I am open to any ideas on the equity issue but would like to try [to] make adjustments yet this academic year. We can continue to look at the committee recommendations next fall. We just need to make sure the chairs and deans are involved in the process.”
 - c. Report of meeting with Mr. Bobby Jones (19 March 2014)
 - i. Discussed senate resolution on non-course related fees. Mr. Jones will find out what other schools do on this issue. President Worth noted that Mr. Jones was not enthusiastic about this proposal.

1. A senator pointed out that the services currently supported by the fees should continue to be offered to faculty and/or staff even if faculty and/or staff do not pay the fees.
 2. Several other senators attempted to clarify for the senator what the proposal was intended to do.
- ii. Discussed some recent vandalism in the parking lot behind the international house and the possibility of having cameras installed. He was unaware of the incidents and will investigate.
 1. A senator noted that the vandalism consisted of windows' being shot out and mentioned that his/her own car had been vandalized. The senator also stated that the HSUPD was called regarding the incident and thus the Senator was surprised that Mr. Jones did not know about the issue.
 - iii. Discussed the possibility of switching to Division III in athletics and asked if we would save money. The suggestion would be dependent on the entire conference switching since otherwise increased travel might eat up any other savings. Mr. Jones said he would try to make an estimate of savings/loss if such a change were instituted.
 1. A Senator noted that this proposal would make the football team entirely walk-on and save a significant amount of money.

7. Reports of Committees

a. Executive Committee

i. Equity/Merit Proposal (see attached)

1. President-elect Brett Serviss began by thanking the committee and expressing his opinion that faculty should never have to apply for equity raises; he recommended that the process begin with the chairs and wanted to ensure that *some* equity event happen this year; the administration should understand that this be an ongoing process.
 - a. President Worth noted the difference between internal and external equity; this proposal seeks only to remedy the former.
 - b. A senator questioned why—because the committee that drafted this proposal was entirely faculty—we should change what they said.
 - c. Another senator responded that the administration was heavily involved in the process and had subsequently colored it.
 - d. The senator then expressed concern that changing the proposal would slow the process down; yet another senator responded that the Senate's modification of the proposal would not slow the process down; President Worth noted that the administration wanted faculty feedback.
 - e. A senator agreed that faculty should never have to apply for raises but questioned why chairs should; moreover, why should chairs even be the conduit through which these raises are processed? Heretofore, the chairs have had no say in salary issues.
 - f. President Worth noted that the chairs know their departments best; another senator noted, however, that the department chairs feel strongly that Dr. Sommer has largely created the compression issues but now wants the chairs to "take the heat."
 - g. Another senator reiterated the idea that chairs are aware of the qualifications and teaching loads of their faculty; yet another senator indicated that chairs would simply pass along recommendations based on inequities—their involvement would be a means to speed up the process.
 - h. A senator noted that the decision should ultimately be the dean's; in some departments compression is avoided due to extremely low starting salaries; thus, the chair may look for inequity and find none within a particular

department; the senator also noted the gross inequities even within the Ellis College and asked several questions: how much autonomy will the deans have in making these decisions—in other words, are they bound by the chairs’ decisions? If a faculty member does get a raise this year, is he or she then moved to the “bottom of the list” for the next round of equity adjustments, regardless of his or her salary?

- i. President Worth noted that Dr. Sommer is aware that this proposal will not completely solve the salary problem, but that this will be an ongoing process.
- j. A senator noted that we have no real time—if something is not done quickly, we will lose the money.
- k. A senator then asked again for clarification about whether or not the deans are bound by the chairs’ decisions; another senator noted that the chairs are concerned about the appearance of favoritism; chairs have always advocated for their faculty and thus the chairs and deans should work jointly in this process
- l. A senator reiterated the concern of a previous senator (cf. ‘j’ above); this is a time for action; we must move on the proposal that the administration wants us to move on; if not, the administration will mock the faculty yet again; we need action; even though we know that we will not be happy with the proposal, it can be tweaked next year.
- m. A senator pointed out that the chairs and deans could divvy up the money in about an hour—they know where the inequities lie.
- n. A senator asked about whether we should go with the original proposal or the revised proposal; a senator responded that we should go with the revised proposal in an effort to streamline the process.
- o. President Worth noted the addition of the Library Director to the proposal as the librarians do not report to a chair.
- p. A senator asked the question: if we are concerned only with equity and not merit, why not do things mathematically? In asking the question, the senator noted he/she had specific knowledge of cases of bias.
- q. Two senators mentioned that if faculty want to apply, they should have that opportunity; President Worth asked for amendment that would reflect those concerns; the following was proposed: “Individual faculty members have the option of submitting their own names for equity consideration directly to the provost/VPAA”; the Senate passed the amendment with 13 in favor and 10 opposed.
- r. The Senate then voted on the proposal as a whole; the proposal passed unanimously.

b. Academics Committee

i. Restricted Day Policy Revision

1. The committee brought forth a revised version (see addendum) of the proposal that was submitted at the March meeting. The acting chair explained that the modified proposal would provide more flexibility than the current policy.
 - a. A senator inquired about why these changes are necessary; he/she does not “love” the idea of change.
 - b. Another senator questioned the idea of removing the language concerning exams/quizzes for lab courses.
 - c. Another senator felt that the proposal read as anti-student.

- d. Another senator questioned the “real reason” for restricted days—what purpose do they truly serve?
 - e. A senator voiced a concern about keeping the “stronger language” of the original policy.
 - f. A senator observed that the new proposal would allow faculty and students to create their “own contracts.”
 - g. President Worth asked for a friendly amendment to modify the proposal to reflect the concerns of the senators. The modified proposal reads as follows: “Restricted days’ are the two class days prior to final exams. No tests, exams, or quizzes will be given during Restricted Days with the exception of laboratory courses and physical activity courses. The university shall not sponsor any extracurricular or other organized student activities during the week of final exams”; the amendment passed unanimously.
 - h. The Senate then voted on the proposal as a whole; the proposal passed unanimously.
- c. Buildings and Grounds Committee – No Report
- d. Finance Committee
- i. A motion was made and seconded to remove from the table the letter to President Jones regarding salaries (see March, 2014 minutes for original; see addendum for modified letter).
 - 1. A senator asked about the inclusion of a statement regarding a moratorium on additional administrative positions.
 - 2. A senator noted that the letter was polite and not antagonistic
 - 3. A senator noted the need for a real statistician to ensure that statistics regarding compensation are correct; another senator voiced a concern for an “independent” party to analyze the data; yet another senator asked where previous data had come from; a senator noted that the data had come from a combination of COPLAC schools as well as institutions “similar” to Henderson.
 - 4. President Worth asked for a sense of the Senate vis-à-vis the letter; senators responded that they simply want a plan; another senator suggested that faculty look at the total budget as a means of determining faculty salaries.
 - 5. A senator expressed a desire to link faculty morale with enrollment management; another senator expressed a desire to make only slight changes to the document in the interest of time; the senator offered a friendly amendment that reflected the desire to link retention with salaries; the modified language reads as follows: “Inadequate compensation has a detrimental effect on faculty morale, on HSU’s ability to recruit and retain a highly qualified and motivated faculty, and on student retention”; the amendment passed unanimously.
 - 6. The Senate then voted on the letter as a whole; the letter passed unanimously.
- e. Operations Committee
- i. The chair reported that the new workers’ compensation standards will not be implemented until May 1; however, he stressed that reporting incidents within the first 24 hours is paramount.
 - ii. The chair brought forth a proposal (see addendum) regarding promotion; currently, only those instructors who teach full time can be considered for promotion to assistant professor; the current handbook “declares workload” but contradicts another section of the handbook; no consideration is given to other university service.

1. A senator voiced concern about the proposal; when the change allowing promotion from instructor to assistant professor after ten years was made several years ago, have we created a type of “creep” that allows unqualified people to move into the assistant professorships?
 2. Another senator asked for clarification; the senator responded that he/she was concerned about the “dilution” of the professoriate.
 3. A senator asked the chair about the sense of the committee regarding the proposal; the chair reported that most of the committee’s communication had taken place via e-mail and that the committee was divided; some discussion ensued about how thoroughly the committee had met.
 4. A senator noted that the change really was about modifying the language in the handbook; a vote was held on the proposal to strike the language “teach academic courses full time” from that section of the *Faculty Handbook*; the Senate passed the proposal with 23 in favor and 4 opposed.
 5. A friendly amendment was then offered to note that upon promotion, there would be no change to the workload; the amendment passed with 14 in favor none opposed.
- f. Procedures Committee:
- i. The chair reported that the composition of the faculty excellence committee has been updated. (see addendum)
8. Old Business
- a. None – the two items listed on the agenda (Restricted Days Policy Revision and Merit and Equity Proposal) were discussed earlier in the meeting.
9. New Business
- a. Retention: There was some discussion about keeping campus facilities such as the dining halls open later to create a more student-friendly environment.
 - b. Faculty Excellence Awards: President Worth asked about considering self-nominations for these awards; some discussion ensued, but no action was taken.
 - c. A senator provided a resolution that had been provided by a constituent about faculty salaries. The senator read the resolution regarding a Labor Day vigil to which all employees (faculty and staff) would be invited to participate as a means of establishing a sense of solidarity across campus; the senator felt that this would help with the divisiveness that sometimes exists between the faculty and staff and asked for a sense of the senate.
 - d. A senator questioned whether a copy of the resolution would have to be included in the minutes; another senator felt that the resolution would upset the administration.
 - e. The senator who proposed the resolution responded by noting that it is not the job of the Faculty Senate to please the administration, but rather to represent and advocate for the faculty.
 - f. Another senator asked why we could not wait—why not see what the new provost will do? The senator noted that we are tired of waiting; a significant discussion ensued.

10. Adjourn 5:24

Respectfully Submitted,
P. Gregory Gibson
Faculty Senate Secretary