The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 3:22 p.m. in union 237A with President Davie Davis presiding.

ROLL CALL:

In addition to FS President Davis, the following 16 Senators were present: Bordere, Bradley, Ewing, Kangas, Kidwaro, Love, Norwood, Peltz, Sarkar, Smith, Swanson, Wenger, Yates, Marsh, Peterson, and Palmer for Callahan. Also present were University President Aaron Podolefsky and Provost George Wilson.

MINUTES:

With the following changes and corrections, a motion was made to approve the minutes of meeting 8 of the 2008-2009 Faculty Senate held on January 14, 2009. Motion passed unanimously.

Changes made to January 14th, 2009 meeting minutes:

- 2nd page, midway down:

  Steve Popejoy couldn’t be here today to discuss the Compensation Task Force as the agenda reflects.

  but Mary Kelly was in attendance to explain what the climate study has been through this year. She made a small presentation.

- 4th page, bottom:

  Senator Yates-Callahan called for a vote by ballot.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

President Podolefsky had the following announcements:

- The week before last, we got a call saying that the Governor was going to make an announcement. The Governor announced that the arrangement is going to be that the universities would have the same base budget as last year in exchange for not raising tuition.
• The Governor is in support of the newly named “Caring for Missourians.” Previously named, “Preparing to Care initiative.” This will bring about 1.2 million dollars in base budget increase to the nursing program. The amount given to us was based on how many nurses they said UCM could train. (If it is passed)
• Another discussion was regarding the A plus program. This program gives full assistance to a community college student for 2 years. There was talk about giving assistance for 2 years to a community college and then 2 years at a public college. President Podolefsky stated that it would not be fair to tell students that they can get their last two years free if they go to community college for the first two years.
• There was discussion about Mohela and positive talk regarding Higher Education.

Senator Yates asked about the 3% increase that he read about which would be given to state employees. President Podolefsky stated that we are not considered state employees.

President Podolefsky stated that up until the State of the State address, we really didn’t know where we were headed. He also announced that he will be in Washington on Friday February 6th and he is looking for federal funds.

FS VP Jerry Kangas had the following announcements:

• The COC has been battling committees that don’t meet. We decided to call three committee chairs of the Summer Sessions, Extended Campus, and Distance Education Committees together to go over the charges and try to combine these three into one working group.
Senator Bradley asked, “If they are not meeting, why do we need to go over the charges?” Kangas stated that it has to be looked into to make sure nothing falls off and that everything is taken care of that needs to be taken care of by these committees.

SPRC representative Som Sarkar had the following announcement:

The SPRC is working on the KPI. There is a short list now. The data will be collected in a way so it will be all broken down. There has not been any discussion on the budget in the SPRC as of now.

Provost Wilson stated that an update for the budget has been done. The salary increase and mandatory things have been accounted for and the other specifics will come as most of the departments will get their information regarding the budget together.

FS President Davis had the following announcements:

• The FS is supposed to be gathering data regarding faculty ratings. Since we are supposed to be providing feedback on this, maybe we should set a deadline.
Provost Wilson stated that we will continue to do the 5 questions from the SB 389 questionnaire. The question is, do we want to combine these questions along with more questions? It can be left alone and used as is if people are happy with the way it is.

Senator Norwood asked if combining questions along with the SB 389 required questions would create an issue of accessing the information since it is not supposed to be public information?

Wilson replied that we have been told that we can separate the parts in segments so whatever questions are supposed to be confidential will be.

- Regarding enrollment validation, she got feedback of people asking why it needed to be changed at all.

Provost Wilson stated that what we will begin doing in the fall, is asking students to log into a computer to confirm their financial aid and self validate themselves for their classes. It also gives students an opportunity to change and update information such as addresses.

FS President Davis stated that the FSEC could get these two issues dealt with soon.

FS VP Kangas stated that the COC is looking to moving some or all committees to three year terms. This would provide continuity and also help reduce the load of trying to find people to fill vacancies all the time.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Steve Popejoy was in attendance to make a presentation on the Compensation Task Force. He stated that the Support Staff Council and the Professional Staff Council, Faculty reps, HR reps, and a rep from the Bargaining unit met to look at the idea of putting together a committee to look at the information they have and make recommendations. The committee began meeting last year and have had meetings all through August.

Popejoy skimmed over the document and pointed out a few things. (Please see report attached to approved minutes.)

Senator Yates made a suggestion that the wording be changed throughout the document as it can get confusing talking about market and merit pay.

Motion 2008-2009-10 regarding amending the By-Laws to have the SPRC representative be a voting member of the FSEC. It was thought that it would be a good idea to formally make the SPRC rep a voting member of the FSEC. It will be crucial in the times to come.

Senator Yates then called the question, seconded by Kangas.
Motion to end debate passed unanimously.

A vote was then taken on the motion with results as follows:

| PASSED | For: 13 | Against: 3 | Abstain: 2008-2008-10 |

Motion 2008-2009-11 from the FS Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee regarding equitable dependant benefits coverage was presented by Phong Nguyen. (See motion and appendix A and B attached to the approved minutes)

Yates stated that he wanted to draw attention to the resolve part of the motion. It says “move toward.” It doesn’t say anything about we have to do this.

Senator Kidwaro asked how this would affect the deductible. Phong stated that it would not affect the benefits plan but so far, it has not been toward changing the plan itself but just having it paid for differently.

President Podolefsky stated that he would have to take this to the BOG and there couldn’t be any promises made about covering the whole amount. If we ever had a budget cut, it would be hard to do. If our budget stays the same, it would possibly be easier.

Senator Kidwaro called the question, seconded by Senator Sarkar.

Motion to end debate passed unanimously.

Senator Yates called for a recorded vote. The results were as follows:

| PASSED | For: Unanimous |

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianne Gower
Faculty Senate Office Professional
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 3:25 p.m. in union 237A with President Davie Davis presiding.

ROLL CALL:

In addition to FS President Davis, the following 19 senators were present: Bonham, Bordere, Bouzouita, Bradley, Callahan, Ewing, Kangas, Love, Neal, Norwood, Peltz, Riggins, Sarkar, Smith, Swanson, Yates, Marsh, Peterson, and Heming for Wenger. Also present were Cheryl Riley, Alice Greife, Mary Ragland and Mike Grelle.

MINUTES:

With a few minor corrections, a motion was made to approve the minutes of meeting 9 of the 2008-2009 Faculty Senate held on February 4, 2009. Motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

FS VP Kangas had the following announcements:

- He met last Monday and Tuesday with the MAFS and they talked about several things including budget cuts, and the A+ program.

Senator Sarkar (SPRC rep.) had the following announcements:

- A lot of things are going on in the SPRC. They are currently looking at the KPI’s. There was then some discussion on some of the Key Performance Indicators.

FS President Davis stated that she received a letter back from President Podolefsky regarding the letter that the FS passed and sent to him. He wanted to thank the FS for their letter of support.

Cheryl Riley mentioned that the FS established a student disaster relief scholarship. She stated that if anyone would like to donate money for this cause, it can be done at foundations. The first scholarship was received by a student whose parents were affected by the earth quack in China.

FS President Davis announced that there is a special FS meeting scheduled for February 25 that will be devoted to discuss the budget.
To the FSEC, Davis stated that the President requested that they attend his forum tomorrow instead of the FSEC meeting. The meeting has been canceled and will re schedule for February 26th.

Davis then announced that Mike Grelle was asked to stop by today’s meeting to discuss a little bit about enrollment validation.

Mike Grelle stated that the reason behind doing enrollment validation was money. It will also get students to take attendance seriously. It is a very labor intensive process. They are trying to come up with an “easy button” to make this easier for everyone that has to use it.

Alice Greife passed around some copies of a document. This document was LEAP which stands for Liberal Education and America’s Promise. (See document attached to approved minutes in FS office.)

Mary Ragland was in attendance to present motion 2008-2009-13 regarding the MAPP test. It read as follows:

The Faculty Senate University Assessment Council, with the support of the General Education Review Committee, moves that the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) be pilot-tested as a potential assessment instrument for the General Education Program at the University of Central Missouri. MAPP will be evaluated again as the General Education Review Committee moves to Phase 3 (assessment of the General Education Program) of the review process wherein it will holistically consider the evaluation of the General Education Program. All policies and procedures concerning the MAPP evaluation process will remain the same as under College-Base for General Education unless the FSUAC, in its discretion, determines changes must necessarily take place in order to facilitate the move from College-Base for General Education to MAPP. This policy does not apply to students who are teacher-education majors, post-baccalaureate students, or graduate students.

The General Education Review Committee is in support of the above resolution as it recognizes the need to avoid making a three-year commitment to an evaluation instrument that has been recognized as needing to be changed. The General Education Review Committee accepts MAPP as a reasonable pilot assessment for more permanent use, as will be considered by the General Education Review Committee working in conjunction with the Faculty Senate University Assessment Council during Phase 3 (assessment of the General Education Program), according to the Faculty Senate process and timeline recommendations for the General Education Review.

Davis then called for a vote to end discussion. It passed unanimously.

Davis then called for a vote on the motion. It passed unanimously.

-PASSED-  Unanimous  2008-2009-13

Davis then presented motion 2008-2009-14 regarding a letter written by Senator Sarkar. It read as follows:
I would like to express my sincere concern for the recorded vote on motion (2008-2009_09) as indicated in the Senate meeting minutes. I was out of the country during this Senate meeting. Dr. Palmer served as an alternate on my behalf although I did not request him to do so. Before I left the country I informed you that if such a motion arose, my vote would be for the motion. Although I believe that alternates should vote from their conscience on a particular issue, some prior consultation with me electronically would have been helpful. Since the Senate minutes states in all places as Palmer for Sarkar, I want to be very clear on the record that he served as an alternate without my knowledge and voted on this issue without any consultation with me. I would have voted for the motion and voted otherwise. Therefore, Palmer for Sarkar only means that he served as an alternate but he did not express my opinion on this issue. Please put this as an addendum to the minutes so that it remains as a part of the university record. Thank you for your consideration.

After little discussion, FS President Davis called for a vote on the motion.

-PASSED- Unanimous 2008-2009-14

Davis then presented that last motion for the day. Motion 2008-2009-12 regarding the Distance Education Committee charge review. The committee suggested that the words “as requested” be removed from section I. Function.

Davis called for a vote on the motion. It passed unanimously.

-PASSED- Unanimous 2008-2009-12

With nothing further, the FS meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianne Gower
Faculty Senate Office Professional
The Special Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 3:22 p.m. in Union 117 with President Davie Davis presiding.

ROLL CALL:

There was no roll call completed at this meeting.

MINUTES:

The minutes of February 18, 2009 will be approved at the next FS meeting on March 25, 2009.

NEW BUSINESS:

Today, the group along with some other faculty members, met to discuss a couple of recommendations that were presented a few days before. It was as follows:

Based on a strong conviction that academic affairs constitutes the primary function of the university, Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

1.) Decision regarding budget reallocations should be made in the SPRC rather than handed down through the various administrative levels in the form of across-the-board budget cuts. The task of the SPRC is to carefully analyze the cost effectiveness of units across the university in light of the Key Performance Indicators, which have been thoroughly vetted by the governance bodies and establish to safeguard the quality of programs and services. In order for the SPRC to perform its function, units need to provide input to that body regarding their unique needs and resources. All decisions made by the SPRC should reflect the KPIs and primacy of the academic mission.

2.) Cuts to academic programs are damaging to the mission and reputation of the university and take years to repair. Before such actions are considered, all possible sources of revenue should be examined, such as carry forward funds and savings from reduction or elimination of non-essential and/or non-revenue-generating programs and services. The health insurance refunds should be used to cover the anticipated increase in benefits costs.

3.) Elimination of positions, including non-tenure track positions, should be an option of last resort. Cutting positions harms individuals and programs, lowers morale, and adds to the negative economic climate beyond the university.
4.) In the interest of preserving the quality and integrity of the academic mission, as well as preventing the loss of positions, faculty are willing to forgo a salary increase, thus elimination this item from the contingency funds built into the FY 2010 budget.

There was some discussion and some comments from the gallery. This resulted in some changes to the recommendations. They are now as follows:

Based on a strong conviction that academic affairs constitutes the primary function of the university, Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

1) Academic affairs is not only the heart of the university enterprise but also the major generator of revenue. Budget cuts to the academic area decrease the quality of the educational experience at UCM, cause damage to academic programs that takes years to repair, and pose a threat to the university’s reputation, all of which ultimately reduce UCM’s capacity to generate funds.

2) Decisions regarding budget reallocations should be made in the SPRC rather than handed down through the various administrative levels in the form of across-the-board budget cuts. The task of the SPRC is to carefully analyze the cost effectiveness of units across the university in light of the Key Performance Indicators, which have been thoroughly vetted by the governance bodies and established to safeguard the quality of programs and services. In order for the SPRC to perform its function, units need to provide input to that body regarding their unique needs and resources. All decisions made by the SPRC should reflect the KPIs and the primacy of the academic mission.

3) The Faculty Senate demands that administrative expenses at UCM be brought into line with those at this university’s sister institutions. According to a recent report from an ad hoc subcommittee of the FS Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee, based on information from The Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System, UCM’s administrative costs are quite high relative to other institutions in Missouri. For instance, UCM’s executive/administrative and managerial FTE staff is 181% that of Southeast Missouri State University, although UCM’s student body is nearly the same size as SEMSU’s. UCM’s administrative bloat has been problematic for some time, and the current budget stringency renders the situation no longer tolerable.

4) After the process of trimming administrative budgets has begun, all other possible sources of revenue should be examined, such as savings from reduction or elimination of non-essential and/or non-revenue-generating programs and services. The health insurance refunds should be used to cover the anticipated increase in benefits costs.
5) In order for faculty to conduct research, scholarship, and creative activity of a quality consistent with the expectations described in the tenure and promotion guidelines, funds for faculty travel and professional development should be maintained or increased.

6) The budget process should be made transparent, so that reallocations and adjustments at every level are clearly visible to the university community.

7) Elimination of positions, including those held by non-tenure-track faculty, should be an option of last resort. Cutting positions harms individuals and programs, lowers morale, and adds to the negative economic climate beyond the university.

8) The principle of faculty tenure should be held inviolate at all times.

9) In the interest of preserving the quality and integrity of the academic mission, as well as preventing the loss of positions, faculty are willing to forego all or part of the salary increase listed in the president’s proposed 2010 budget (excepting increases for tenure and promotion), providing that 1) efforts are begun to decrease UCM’s exorbitant administrative costs, and 2) the percentage increase in administrative salaries does not exceed that of faculty salaries. The faculty’s willingness to accept an increase less than the proposed 2010 amount in no way negates the importance of salary as a significant issue in the future.

This will be voted on at the March 4, 2009 special Faculty Senate meeting.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianne Gower
Faculty Senate Office Professional