



1-26-2017

Faculty Senate Minutes Jan. 26, 2017

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min

Recommended Citation

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes Jan. 26, 2017" (2017). *Minutes & Agendas*. 102.
http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min/102

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes & Agendas by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

Volume X, Number 7
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
January 26, 2017

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Tom Schuman. Roll was called by Secretary Barbara Hale. Those whose names are grayed out below were absent.

William Bragg, Lance Haynes, Audra Merfeld-Langston, Mark Mullin, (Ron Frank for) David Westenberg, Craig Claybaugh, Fui-Hoon Nah, Daniel Forciniti, Ali Rownaghi, Richard Dawes, Jeffrey Winiarz, Klaus Woelk, (Bill Schonberg for) Joel Burken, Mark Fitch, Fikret Ercal, (Ali Hurson for) Chaman Sabharwal, Michael Davis, Levent Acar, Kurt Kosbar, James Drewniak, Maciej Zawodniok, Trent Brown, K. D. Dolan, Steven Corns, Abhijit Gosavi, Ralph Flori, Wan Yang, Kathleen Sheppard, David Van Aken, Wayne Huebner, Martin Bohner, Akim Adekpedjou, S.N. Balakrishnan, Umit Koylu, Gearoid MacSithigh, Ashok Midha, Otis Register, Shoaib Usman, Paul Worsey, Barbara Hale, Ulrich Jentschura, Amber Henslee

II. Approval of November 17, 2016 Minutes

The November 17, 2016 minutes were **approved** as submitted

III. Approval of December 14, 2016 Minutes

The December 14, 2016 minutes were **approved** as submitted

IV. Campus Reports and Responses

A. President's Report

Senate President Tom Schuman began his report by calling for a moment of silence in memory of Professor Tim Philpot.

Dr. Schuman reported that he, Sahra Sedigh Sarvestani and Mark Fitch will attend the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) on January 27. He gave an overview of the interim report of the Higher Education System Review Task Force, which recommended updating academic program approval process to meet State of Missouri workforce needs.

Professor Schuman reported that IFC is adding the Standard of Faculty Conduct to the proposed changes to Collected Rules and Regulations (CRRs). The proposal seeks to return sections to the Standard of Faculty Conduct that were removed during President Wolfe's term, leaving some holes in the policy. This lack of rule and process in the

current CRRs forces the filing of faculty grievances. The Rules, Procedure, and Agenda Committee referred the proposed changes to the Academic Freedom and Standards Committee and to the Personnel Committee. Neither committee expressed concern with the proposed changes, although it was pointed out that the use of the terms “respondent” and “complainant” appear confusing. The Personnel Committee suggested that the consequences of refusing a sanction should be described. Dr. Schuman asked for the sense of the Senate regarding these proposed changes.

A **motion** was made and seconded to approve the proposed changes to the Standard of Faculty Conduct in the Collected Rules and Regulations. *The motion passed.*

Dr. Schuman then gave an update on the Post-Tenure Review proposal (CRR 310.015). UMKC, UMSL and UMC have approved the changes. The legislature is still actively following our progress in this area. The UM System legislature relations group has warned against inaction. Further, IFC has dropped the white paper’s consideration due to objections at MIZZOU. In order to provide direction for the IFC representatives for the next meeting, Dr. Schuman requested a motion to get a sense of the Senate.

A **motion** was made and seconded to support the proposed changes to the Post-Tenure Review CRR 310.015. *The motion passed.*

Professor Schuman reminded the body that President-Designate Choi will visit the S&T campus on Monday, February 6. The Faculty Senate officers will have a breakfast meeting with him, there will be meetings with deans, chairs, faculty and staff. Faculty are encouraged to attend and be heard!

Next, Dr. Schuman discussed CRR 370.010 regarding Faculty Grievances. The CRR allows two committee structures for faculty grievances:

Model A, which calls for two (or four) Grievance Resolution Panel (GRP) faculty members (plus 2 alternates) chosen by Faculty Senate.

Model B, in which the GRP consists of two panels as described in Model A above.

There has been an increased number of faculty grievances submitted in this academic year, requiring a substantial increase in the amount of time needed for consideration of the details, and making it difficult for a small committee to manage.

Motion: Mark Fitch moved for Faculty Senate to begin a Model B structure for the Grievance Resolution Panel. The motion was seconded. *The motion passed.*

Dr. Schuman then yielded the floor to Mariesa Crow, who presented a report from the Faculty Ad-hoc Committee for Administrative Engagement. The committee was elected by Faculty Senate on November 10 in response to a request from President-Designate Choi for a discussion about campus climate with the FS President and a group of faculty representatives. The members elected are a subset of the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Committee (FRRC).

The committee met with President-Designate Choi, President Middleton, and Chief-of-Staff David Russell via telepresence on November 22, 2016. The committee expressed the frustration of the faculty at the “lack of tangible improvement in the situation, the time already invested in remedies, and the increasing urgency of addressing the situation with respect to faculty retention.” President-Designate Choi asked for time to assess the circumstances. His visit to campus on Monday, February 6 will include an open forum with faculty.

Dr. Crow reiterated that the FRRC remains committed to improving the campus climate and is actively engaged in tasks associated with the COACHE climate survey. A status report that describes all activities of the FRRC to date was sent to all faculty on January 18.

Details of the reports are available at the following links:

[President.Report.Jan2017](#)

[Faculty Ad-hoc Committee for Administrative Engagement](#)

B. Administrative Reports

i. Chancellor’s Report

Chancellor Schrader opened her report by expressing her sorrow at the loss of Dr. Tim Philpot, sending her thoughts to Dr. Philpot’s family.

Dr. Schrader added her own reminder regarding the upcoming visit of President-Designate Choi. She thanked Tom Schuman for agreeing to convene the FS officers’ meeting and the faculty forum. Chancellor Schrader reminded the body that President-Designate Choi is being extremely generous with his time, noting that his official start date is March 1.

Dr. Schrader discussed an email that went out recently that provided links to some studies that came out of the last session of the legislature. The University of Missouri System Review Commission study and the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) Review of Mission and Programs. The Board of Curators (BOC) is just starting to dive into the Commission report and determine the priorities and what would be the response. The MDHE study is already being discussed in the legislature and preparations are underway to file bills that will codify the recommendations in the statute.

Regarding the State’s budget, Chancellor Schrader mentioned that Governor Eric Greitens has withheld \$146M from the budget, \$82M of which is hitting Higher Education. She pointed out that this is in addition to the \$200M that Governor Nixon withheld last fall. Potential permanent cuts for FY18 and beyond may exceed \$450M, making this a very interesting time. Dr. Schrader presented a chart showing the history of the FY17 withholding on appropriations and how it has affected Missouri S&T. She briefly reviewed the

reasons for the shortfall – tax policy set into place by the legislature, such as reduction of corporate taxes, and additional tax cuts that will hit next year. Public institutions of higher learning are discussing solutions and ways to cope with this reality. Every division on campus has been asked to look at efficiencies, administrative efficiencies are being considered at System-level to help remove some of the burden from the campuses, and at Missouri S&T, the vice chancellors are looking at the administrative level structure and ways to streamline to help protect the academic units as much as possible. Chancellor Schrader then asked if Walt Branson, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, could be recognized.

There being no objections, Vice Chancellor Branson was recognized to speak. He presented a couple of slides to illustrate the budget scenario for this year and next year with current estimated available funds. He stressed that these numbers will change several times throughout the course of developing the FY18 budget.

Vice Chancellor Branson explained that in FY17, we expect a net revenue loss from enrollment shifts in the amount of \$700,000 (after scholarship and aids have been distributed). With the state appropriations held back on 1-16-17 (\$4M), estimated revenue shortfall for FY17 is around \$4.7M. There is an enrollment contingency of about \$1M, so that will be used first. FY18 new tuition and fee revenue with flat enrollment and BOC approval is estimated at \$6.3M. Taking into account those items we are obligated to fund (insurance, promotion and tenure increases, etc.), the projected shortfall for FY18 is \$2.5M.

Professor Jim Drewniak commented that such a detailed presentation is difficult for the average faculty member to understand. He asked for a “drilled down” version. Vice Chancellor Branson explained that if you look at our total General Revenue Allocation (GRA) budget, we are at about \$140M. When aid and other unavoidable items and things that you can’t account for are taken out, the amount we’re working with is around \$120M.

Dr. Crow commented that our research expenditures are up, our F&A recovery amount has gone up, so if our expenditures are up to \$40M and we have an extra 2.5% indirect recovery, where does that show up in the budget? Vice Chancellor Branson reminded her that what he is presenting is the very preliminary start in looking at the budget. He stated that if we can get projections on where we will be at the end of the year, the indirect recovery can be built into the budget.

Tom Schuman asked for a sense of the Senate on their expectations for budget reports. Robert Landers said he would like to see all actuals from the beginning of last year through June 2016, continue through this year and then we can see what is being cut.

It was also suggested that the Budgetary Affairs committee provide guidance to Walt on the type of perspective and details that he brings to the Senate. Barbara Hale pointed out that a tentative agreement has been reached to form two task forces, one appointed by the Budgetary Affairs Committee and one Administrative Budget Task Force appointed by Walt Branson. Each group will be given several budget issues to review and then the two groups will combine into a joint task force.

Richard Dawes, a member of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, commented that he pointed out a missing layer of detail that would be useful in anticipating the questions that will come up when people see the rapidly growing total budget.

Klaus Woelk commented that we have talked a lot about the campus climate, which he feels is related mostly to finances. He pointed out that it should be a priority of the administration and of the Faculty Senate to make it as transparent as possible.

Motion: Vice Chancellor Branson will provide July 1, 2016 actuals, including carry-forward, summarizing all revenue and all expenditures and then moving forward to show what is being cut. *The motion passed.*

Motion: Faculty Senate supports the construction of a Dual Taskforce structure as described by Barbara Hale. *The “sense of the Senate” motion passed.*

Vice Chancellor Branson continued his presentation discussing the estimated available funds for FY17 and FY18, and a tentative timeline for campus budget decisions based upon the outcome of the governor’s budget.

A **motion** was made to defer the remainder of the budget presentation until a later date. *The motion did not pass.*

Vice Chancellor Branson presented a chart illustrating actual expenditures compared to campus revenues from 2002 – 2016.

Details of the Chancellor’s Report (including the slides presented by Walt Branson) are available at the following link:

[ChancellorReport.1.26.17](#)

ii. **Provost’s Report**

Provost Marley outlined concerns related to issues that impact the Academic Affairs budget. In discussions with Faculty Senate officers earlier this week, it was noted that faculty want to know the percent of overall General Revenue Allocation budget going to departments and colleges.

Dr. Marley presented a chart illustrating the philosophy of dollars following students (by college). From 2012 through January 2017, student credit hours and enrollment in CASB is up by 11.5% over that period of time and in CEC, it's up by 17%. Over the same period of time, there was 32.9% growth in GRA funds allocated in CASB, and 38.4% in CEC. Dr. Marley pointed out that the percent growth is not uniform across departments in either college due to some strategic allocations, strategic initiative funding, and retention packages. Overall, there was about 32% growth in allocation across all academic departments and the campus. Current unallocated strategic initiative funds are not included here because there are several ongoing searches, for which the funds will be allocated next fall accordingly.

The next area of concern most often expressed is what is happening with Miscellaneous Instruction funds. The 2009-2010 budget cuts resulted in cuts that were rate sourced, which have been backfilled by one-time (cost) dollars from vacant lines ever since. Those vacant faculty line sources were transferred to the Deans in Fall 2016. Going into FY18, one of our highest priorities is to rebuild the rate source for Miscellaneous Instruction.

The same is true for start-up funding. The Provost's source for start-up funding has historically been vacated faculty positions, plus Strategic Initiative monies in recent years. The former has now been transferred to the Colleges, as recommended by the Dean's Resource Task Force. He pointed out that the Deans have authority to utilize those funds along with the responsibility for making some hard decisions.

January 24 was the Provost's internal deadline for receiving budget scenarios from his units to allow time for his review before the due date of submission to Finance and Administration. Provost Marley reminded the Senate that this is a starting point for targeting budget reductions in order to minimize the impact on our core mission.

Barbara Hale asked how much start-up money came from Strategic Initiative funds and what is this year's total Miscellaneous Instruction amount. Provost Marley said that since 2012 or 2013 we have authorized \$10.8M in start-up; we've expended \$9.8M to date (some are still on-going). He estimated that about 2/3 of that came from SI and this year, we have about \$1.5M in Miscellaneous Instruction. In response to a comment from Vice Chancellor Branson, Provost Marley clarified that those were the amounts provided by him.

Details of the report are available at the following link:
[Provost.Report.1.26.17](#)

C. Staff Council Report – NO REPORT

D. Student Council

Scottie Thomas, Student Council Vice President, reported that Student Council is still working with administration on plans to increase the size of the student fitness center. The fitness center was approved in December and has been added to the master plan. Additionally, Student Council is discussing plans for the gold course land. CEC and CASB committee chairs will continue to meet with representatives from their colleges to bring student concerns forward. A student interest survey focused on academic areas of concern for students is being developed. STUCO will continue to be active in the dining service contract process. Finally, the Student Council President election process will begin January 31 with officer elections scheduled for late March.

Details of the report are available at the following link:
[STUCO.1.26.17](#)

E. Council of Graduate Students – NO REPORT

V. Reports of Standing and Special Committees

A. Curricula

Tom Schuman presented the Curricula Committee report for Ilene Morgan, who had a class conflict. The Curricula Committee met on December 7 and January 10 to review seven degree change requests, twenty-nine course change requests and thirteen experimental course requests.

Dr. Schuman pointed out that among the new courses considered were several Explosives Engineering courses for the Explosives Engineering certificate for ATF agents. A waiver of the Experimental Course Policy was requested by the department and the dean, and was approved by Provost Marley.

Motion: The Curriculum Committee moves for Faculty Senate to approve the DC and CC form actions.

The motion passed.

Details are available at the following link:
[CurriculaReport.FS.1.26.17](#)
[CurriculaSlides.FS.1.26.17](#)

B. Information Technology/Computing – NO REPORT

C. Academic Freedom and Standards

Professor Kurt Kosbar reported that Academic Freedom and Standards received a referral from RP&A to develop an algorithm to determine the number of students a department could realistically educate, based on the resources available to a department and the resources required to offer the degrees within their purview. The committee determined that it would be a never ending task to determine how you would measure the resources and identify the requirements for every major in every department on campus. Instead, the committee recommends an addition to CRR 300.030, section D.1.c. which discusses departmental responsibility and authority.

Motion from Academic Freedom and Standards Committee:

“Whereas, individual academic departments have the primary responsibility for maintaining and improving academic excellence

Whereas, some departments have recently seen substantial increases in enrollment without corresponding increases in funding

Whereas, inadequate resources can have a negative impact on academic standards, along with student, staff and faculty morale and productivity

Therefore, be it resolved, the S&T Faculty Senate recommends the following statement be added to section 300.030.D.1.c of the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations:

‘A department may limit enrollment to ensure it remains commensurate with the available resources.’”

Coming from a committee, no second is needed.

Senate President Tom Schuman asked if the Chancellor had an opinion on this motion. Chancellor Schrader commented that this issue is related to issues that the new joint task force will undertake. She cautioned that adopting the recommendation may tie the hands of that group. When asked her preference regarding the motion, Dr. Schrader stated that she would prefer to see a motion that puts this issue on the table to be considered by the joint task force.

Comments from the floor recognized the challenges inherent in understanding the needs and resources of all of the departments on campus, the need for checks and balances, and the relationship between enrollment and budget issues.

A **motion** was made and seconded to refer this issue to the Budgetary Affairs Committee. *The motion passed.*

D. Budgetary Affairs

Professor Barbara Hale presented the Budgetary Affairs Committee Report. Dr. Hale presented a comparison of total campus revenue, academic departmental allocations, and Salary and Wage information for Tenured/Tenure Track faculty for 2012-2017. Dr. Hale indicated that she had taken the information from the web-based financial reports.

Chancellor Schrader responded that from 2012 through last fall, there has been an increase in ranked faculty (T/TT, NTT) of 51 positions.

A question was raised about what percent of the total revenues are going into faculty salaries ~~and what percent of the total revenues~~. Vice Chancellor Branson commented that these types of questions are why we need the **joint** task forces. Referring to Dr. Hale's chart, he explained that the blue line (Total Campus Revenues) has things in it that the red line (Academic Department Allocations) does not. As an example, he said that teaching initiative monies are budgeted in the blue line, but have not yet been allocated to the departments. The distance between the two lines looks greater than it actually is because funds in the blue line will be allocated to the departments.

Dr. Hale pointed out that when you look at the financial reports and the budget, there are many details to keep in mind regarding how various money is categorized, how it is allocated and transferred between categories, and it is difficult to track without the assistance of those who have expertise in this area.

Details of the report are available at the following link:
[BAC.1.26.17](#)

E. Administrative Review Committee

Professor Ali Hurson presented the report from the Administrative Review Committee, reviewing the membership and the mission of the committee. The proposed timeline would return the results of the reviews to the Senate Officers at the end of the first week of April. Dr. Hurson explained that the surveys would be completed by tenured/tenure track faculty and non-tenure track full-time faculty at the rank of instructor or above. He also presented information on the structure of the surveys.

Dr. Schuman indicated that the questionnaires, which he received from committee chair, Nancy Stone, will be posted as part of the minutes of the meeting. Senators will be free to submit comments to the committee.

A **motion** was made and seconded to approve the process proposed by the committee for evaluating the reviewees for this academic year, subject to constructive comments received by the committee.

In response to questions regarding the number of questions per survey, Dr. Hurson explained that it will vary by questionnaire based on the job description of the person being evaluated. The surveys will be anonymous, faculty will be able to stop and save, but will be able to only submit once.

Details of the report and the questionnaires are available at the following link:

[AdministrativeReview1.26.17](#)

[Chancellor 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[Provost 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[VC Finance & Administration 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[VC Global & Strategic Partnership](#)

[VC HREI 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[VC Student Affairs 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[VC University Advancement 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

[VPD CASB 2016-2017 Questionnaire](#)

Constructive comments regarding the surveys should be directed to the Administrative Review Committee Chair, [Nancy Stone](#).

VI. Old Business

VI. New Business and Announcements

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Hale, Secretary