Faculty Senate Minutes Minutes of September 5, 2008

PROXY

John Hall

FACULTY ASSOCIATION OFFICERS		
Louella Moore—Chair		Р
—Vice-Chair of the Senate		
Beverly Boals Gilbert- President Elect		Р
Lillie Fears —Secretary Faculty Association		Р
—Secretary of the Senate		
AGRICULTURE (1)		
Bill Humphrey	Spring 10	Р
BUSINESS (3)		
Johnny Van Horn	Spring 10	Р
Richard Segall	Spring 10	P
Ahmad Syamil Spring 10 P		
COMMUNICATIONS (2)		
Pradeep Mishra	Spring 10	Р
Jack Zibluk	Spring 10	Р
EDUCATION (5)	O : 00	•
Andy Mooneyham	Spring 09	A
Daniel Cline	Spring 09	A
Tom Fiala	Spring 09	P
Mark McJunkin	Spring 10	Р
Amy Claxton	Spring 09	
ENGINEERING (1) Shivan Haran	Spring 00	Р
	Spring 09	P
FINE ARTS (3) Brent Foland	Spring 10	Р
Ron Horton	Spring 10 Spring 09	P
Bill Rowe	Spring 09	P
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (6)		
Robert Baum	Spring 10	Р
Win Bridges	Spring 10	A
Richard Burns	Spring 09	P
Peggy Robinson-Wrig		P
Alex Sydorenko	Spring 09	P
Richard Wang	Spring 09	P
LIBRARY (1)	-1 3	
Myron Flugstad	Spring 09	Р
MILITARY SCIENCE		
Jeffrey Helms	Spring 09	Р
NURSING AND HEAL	LTH PROFESSIONS (4)	
Donna Caldwell	Spring 10	Р
Richard Freer	Spring 10	Р
Mike McDaniel	Spring 09	Р
Judith Pfriemer	Spring 09	Р
SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (4)		
Richard Grippo	Spring 09	Р
Hung-chi Su	Spring 10	A
J. Mike Hall	Spring 10	Р
Open	0- (1)	
UNIVERSITY COLLE		P
Vicki Stripling	Spring 10	Р

Chairman Moore called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

I. MINUTES:

Minutes from presented for April 4, 2008 and April 18, 2008 but approval was deferred until next meeting so last year's senators could review them.

II. OLD BUSINESS None

III. NEW BUSINESS

Election of secretary of senate: Louella Moore nominated Amy Claxton. Elected by the senate

Election of vice chair: Louella Moore nominated Shivan Haran. Elected by the senate

Committees

Louella reported on the faculty senate committees for 2008-09. She stated that she has filled the Committee on Committees with the following senators: Bill Rowe, Bill Humphrey, Myron Flugstad, Jack Zibluk, Beverly Boals Gilbert, Louella Moore. There first charge will be to appoint members of the senate to the remaining committees. Loueella passed around a list of the committees and asked senators to list their 1st, 2nd and 3rd preference to serve.

Summer Update

Louella reported that she received and email on May 8th regarding a policy change regarding undergraduate enrollment policy. The policy had been that this years admission class would have a GPA of 2.5 and ACT composite of 17 contingent upon review of the admission data from fall 2007 and the application pool. The email proposed a change of 2.35 on the GPA and 18 for the ACT composite. Louella responded that since the senate was unavailable due to summer she could not speak for them and reminded admissions that she had communicated to all that any business should be forth coming in April so the senate could respond. An interim policy has been published with the change to 2.35 GPA and ACT composite of 18.

Louella also reported that there ere some reorganization and salary adjustment requests this summer. Dr. Potts was trying to be true to the 2% raises and called for a meeting with both the faculty and staff executive committee. At that meeting, one non academic department requested a change in the 2% policy, to give some individuals a higher raise and some less. Dr. Potts denied their request. Another department requested a reorganization and reassignment of duties that would increase responsibility to some key individuals and while eliminating some positions. They further requested dividing up part of the salary from the eliminated position to those who were assuming greater responsibilities. The overall adjustment would actually be a decrease in the salary budget for the department. Dr. Potts approved the changes. There were a few issues from facilities management where long standing employees were being paid less than new higher but without a merit policy there was not a mean to address this and the raises were denied by Dr. Potts.

Mike McDaniel expressed concern about the change of policy for admissions that did not go to any shared governance group.

Dick Freer stated shouldn't admissions be a concern faculty. The heart of the issue of what it takes to get in and what it take to get out of a University should be set by faculty.

Bill Humphrey stated that the admission policy had a time line set to increase both the GPA and the ACT score and now they have changed the time line.

Shared Governance item for Expedited Review

Mike McDaniel made a presentation on the proposed change to the shared governance process of combining the AGOC and the IGOC. Mike reported that the Shared Governance Writing group consisting of Mitch Holifield, Dan Howard, Julie Isaacson, Glen Jones, Lucinda McDaniel, Louella Moore, and himself have worked to try to take care of some problems that exist in the handbook. This summer the writing group took on the task of rewriting Section 1 which has shared governance. The Shared Governance process was noted to have too much duplication and too cumbersome to navigate. In the desire to have a fluid transparent system they proposed a change that was present to faculty at the Fall Faculty Conference in August as well as having been posted in the ASU Daily Digest. Mike reported that was is present was (1) the proposal to create the Shared Governance Oversight Committee that would combine the AGOC and the IGOC and (2) suggested changes to the Faculty Handbook that would be needed to make the proposal/policy flow.

Mike further stated that he and members of the writing committee, specifically, Julie Isaacson, have been meeting with various constituencies groups on campus and a few issues have been brought up. Mike stated that the oversight committee does not need to have a final vote on issues. They are not the final, authority but rather the manager of the process. Another issue was the "twelve month mentality to a nine month reality" that is dealt with during the summer months.

Mike also stated that it is not clear in the proposal what is takes to flip the switch to make a review expedient (30 days); extended (whole semester) or full (half semester). He stated the writing group will come to agreement on verbiage to define the terms. Mike also asked that since contingency groups are not listed in the handbook do they need to be?

Louella stated the difficulty now is that items do not go to AGOC or IGOC now so the proposal would be a tracking system. She stated "in my opinion the new policy will strengthen the policy and that faculty and the faculty senate will have a stronger position in shared governance."

Dr. Dan Howard: Dr. Potts and I are 100% committed to shared governance.

Dr. Richard Wang: "There are items that faculty need to have primacy over. These items are not a shared governance item but one of primacy. I do not see where faculty senate, this representative body, or faculty have primacy over any issue."

Julie Isaacson: A concerned faculty member or even the faculty senate as a group can say what happened concerns you and may be a breach of the shared governance process. "All that needs to be said is "'I don't think the process was followed' and the oversight committee would be compelled to investigate the matter"

Dr. Wang: "Since we are a representative government everything should go through the faculty senate, not an individual. Ten years ago there were items that are primacy with faculty and can not be shared governance."

Dr. McDaniel: stated the writing committee will meet and rewrite the mentioned items and post the revision as soon as possible. We will be meeting on Monday to rewrite. We need to have a vote on September 19th

Dr. Humphrey: Ten years ago, the primacy issues were what caused the split into AGOC and IGOC. The balance on any shared governance committee depends on the participation of faculty to the meetings. If all faculty attend we have controls if they do not we lose control.

Dr. Wang: "Primacy means we would not share some issues with anyone"

Dr. John Hall: reported he had attended an informal meeting at the Edge last week with the executive committee, Julie Isaacson, Mike McDaniel, and other concerned faculty. "I am concerned the SCOG is voting on the issue at the end of the process. They should just tally the votes from the lower committees and forward them to the chancellor. They do not need to the control to stop an item"

Julie Isaacson and Mike McDaniel: both stated that that will be clear in the rewrite and are in agreement to just tally and forward.

Dr. Hall asked if a better name might not be steering committee

Julie Isaacson responded that the committee still needs oversight properties especially in review of complaints that shared governance was not followed.

Dr. Freer: stated there need clarification of what are constituency groups. If they are not defined they do not exist and will not be brought into the process. In the proposal is there a way for large constituency groups such as faculty and staff senate, to have a second look at a proposal after a reworking.

Julie Isaacson; the flow sheet shows the proposal does return and further stated she did not see the votes as weighted votes but rather a uniform way to be transport and to be sure everyone got a voice. It is the chancellors decision in the end.

Dr. Howard: I would advocate for the committee to be an oversight as opposed to a steering committee because of the review of the review of minutes of other committees and the timely posting of their minutes.

Jack Zibluk: For those of us who are more visual is the process available in a flow chart form and just a summation

Dr. McDaniel "I'm not sure how to get it more detailed or more simplified to see. One way in and one way out" What we are seeing now, with daily publishing the proposal on the Daily Digest, regarding shared governance we have never seen before.

Dr. Grippo: In light of getting this passes or not passed quickly, my contingency has concerns about the time frames/term limits of committee terms of 6 years.

Dr. McDaniel: What we are asking you to approve is the two page proposal for the creation of the SGOC. The rest of the suggestion changes in Section 1 were done to bring all items in alignment. The terms were different for many of the committees and two three year appointments where the most frequent so all committees were changed to that. This item can be discussed further, right now it is just the two page change to create SGOC.

Dr. Howard: I would like to address the 12 month issue. As an academic institution ASU needs to function 12 months a year. The administration does not want to be perceived as heavy handed with decisions that need to be made in the summer and attempted to make any changes temporary or interim.

Dr. Freer: Legislative sessions are scheduled and if it is necessary to be called back they are paid to come back.

Dr. Alex Sydorenko: Good faith interim policy is ok but then bring the policy to the contingency groups when we are here. There is too much assumption that we get a committee together in the summer

Dr. Grippo: I would like to know what Dr. Howard has to say on this issue.

Dr. Howard: Interim policies may work if we prepare and maintain a list and then give the list to the Faculty Senate in the fall. I want there to be transparency

Dr. Richard Burns: made a motion that we vote on this issue September 19th

Louella: Are we putting forward a motion that we vote as is or that we make a list of desired changes

Dr. Burns: that we put it on the agenda. Do we need to meet next week and complete this sooner?

The conscious of the faculty is September 19th was soon enough due to bring the issue back to their faculty.

Dr. McDaniel: The writing group will have the revised version on the Daily Digest on Tuesday so you can get it to the constituency groups.

Julie Isaacson; Am I correct that committee terms is a sticking point? Is this a major issue? The time frames were adjusted for consistency but can be altered.

Dr. Grippo: A few of my constituency members are concerned with term limits.

Julie Isaacson; Then it is not a sticking point to the SGOC proposal?

Dr. Wang: I move that the senate asks the AGOC to investigate the Summer 2008 actions by the Office of Admissions to in effect, lower admission standards by failing to implement scheduled increase in the minimum GPA requirement for unconditional admission to ASU

Dr. McDaniel: Made a friendly amendment to change the Office of Admissions to the Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee.

Motion was seconded and carried by acclimation

Dr. Hall distributed a draft of a possible Faculty Senate resolution pertaining to ASU faculty salaries. "This resolution evolved through the concerns and work of some of our veteran faculty. In light of what has recently been reported in the state and local media; what was presented at the Fall Faculty Conference; and the current AAUP data specific to below average ASU faculty salaries; a number of faculty believe that a valid viable plan is needed to correct/rectify this situation in a timely manner. This draft is simply an attempt to jump start such a plan. The hope is that senators can take this draft back to their constituents and seek input and hopefully support. In turn the resolution could come back to the Senate for formal consideration."

The draft reads:

A resolution for increasing faculty salaries at ASU-J submitted to the ASU Faculty Senate by the following departments:

Whereas, nationally competitive compensation for top administrators at some state supported institutions of higher education in Arkansas have been justified as necessary to attract and retain these high quality professionals, and

Whereas, the above justification also holds true for faculty because they carry out the core mission of the university to teach, create knowledge, and provide professional service, and

Whereas, if high quality faculty are not recruited and retained, students and taxpayers suffer through poor teaching, scholarship, and professional service, and

Whereas, the AAUP 2008 Annual Report shows that ASU-J faculty earn \$5,200 below the regional average and \$10,000 below the national average for comparable institutions (i.e., Category IIA Master's public institutions), and Whereas, Chancellor Potts at the fall 2008 Faculty Conference publically noted that faculty salaries at ASU-J are currently inadequate and below regional and national averages, and that increasing faculty salaries must be a high priority, and

Whereas faculty salary increases for the past year were less than half the rate of inflation, and Whereas, approximately \$3.0 million additional dollars for salaries and fringe benefits will be needed annually to eliminate the discrepancy between the current salaries of ASU-J faculty and the regional average for comparable institutions, and

Whereas, the longer current budgetary priorities continue, the greater the amount of money needed to rectify the inequitable salaries faculty are currently being paid,

The ASU Faculty Senate calls upon the ASU-J administration and the ASU Board of Trustees to develop and articulate a written plan for eliminating the discrepancy between faculty salaries and regional averages at all ranks. We request that the plan involve reducing the current discrepancy by one-third over each of the next three academic years so that parity with regional averages is reached by the 2011-2012 academic year. We further request that the revenue used to increased salaries come from sustainable (i.e., hard) sources of revenue rather than from possibly unsustainable (i.e., soft) sources of revenue. We also request that other faculty benefits such as health insurance and tuition discounts not be cut to provide the revenue for salary increases. Finally, we request that the salary increases for the purpose of reducing current discrepancies be distributed by rank rather than merit so that faculty at the ranks with the greatest discrepancies receive proportionally greater increases.

Dr. Moore: stated this item is not up for a vote as this is not a resolution. There is not a sponsor on it now. Senators need to give it to their faculty to get input. She will send an electronic copy on Monday to senators and comments can be sent to Dr. John Hall.

Mike McDaniel asked where is the \$3 million to come from?

Dr, Dan Howerton stated he believe it will be found where all money is found. ASU has always had a way to find money when they wanted ort needed to.

Bill Rowe addressed the Senate concerning the capital campaign. He stated "Faculty Senate defeated a previous attempt to coerce faculty into contributing to a capital campaign in 1987 based on the principle that any contributions were voluntary and anonymous. It appears that capital campaign directors feel that the inmate of an institution need to show potential external donors that they are willing to invest- allegedly this somehow gives confidence to external donors to donate! Faculty have watched Wyatt balloon his salary and compensation package, and those of other administrators to dizzving heights compare with: Secretary-General, United Nations \$341.094; Michael Bloomberg, NYC mayor's salary is \$195,000, but he takes just #1 for his services; US Senators earn \$162,000 per annum. An institution has to earn respect of its employees- what has the administration done in the last 20 years to earn the respect of faculty? Mascot? Pay? Shared Governance" Quality of students? Spending priorities-football, ABI versus guality education for the majority of its students? International programs? Quality of its administrative hires? There's no guaranty that funds raised and put into Development won't be used in compensation packages for administrators-look at eh budget and try to figure out where the System administrators pay comes from! The AAUP has been told that the Foundation is a private fund and is not subject to FOI. When you have administrators who make 3 to 8 times the average salary of a full professor you have individuals who cannot relate to us. They talk about loyalty but they are mere 'educational mercenaries' Administrators, from chairs on up seem to have little trouble coming up with the funds to attend conferences and stay in luxury hotels. At the same time many faculty are required to fund all their own research and travel, etc.. Someone said that being an administrator is a 24 hour a day job, well so it is for may faculty members. This past year I spent \$9500.00 of my money on research and travel to exhibitions/presentation. I taught all summer for no pay, I was PI for two SURF grants, the students received a stipend, I did not. This summer as ASU AAUP Chapter President I worked. as did others, to assist an International student from being deported. Unfortunately this is a normal summer for me and I'm on a 9 month contract."

Dr. Howard: "I have never said anything about tithing. Any gifts can be designated or earmarked but if you give money to where it can be best used you give up your rights to stipulate where the monies can be utilized"

Dr. Moore: stated she has been told of an issue where an individual applied for salary equity and it went all through the procedure before there was no money in the budget because the handbook says you can apply and if granted equity receive pay increase when the funds become available.

Dr. Robert Baum: Stated he contact Dr. Howard and Mark Hoeting this summer with concerns with computer record security. "What do we have in place to protect faculty and staff? Who is allowed to bring information home? Who has access? How are we safe guarding this information?"

Dr. Howard: "I didn't know of anything related to this issue so I deflected the questions to Mark Hoeting. Mark can answer the technical questions"

Dr. Baum stated the technical system was ok but who is looking at policy and protecting the information. When we hear of individuals loosing their lap tops with vital information I want to know who is taking my information home.

V. Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.