

***Minutes of the March Session
of the Faculty Senate
Missouri State University***

The Faculty Senate held the first meeting of its March session on Thursday, March 9, 2006, in the Traywick Parliamentary Room, PSU 313. Chair Art Spisak called the session to order at 3:32 p.m. Dr. Eric Shade served as parliamentarian.

Substitutes: Margaret Buckner for Gary Brinker, S&A; David Ashley for Jim Hutter, PEC; and Michael Hudson for Gary Ward, SMAT.

Absences: Carmen Boyd, Instructor representative, BMS; Connie Claybough, LAB; Mark Given, REL; Norm Griffith, Staff Senate representative; Chuck Harvey, GSC representative; John Hoftyzer, Budget & Priorities Committee chair, ECO; Frank Kauffman, SWK; Kandiah Manivannan, Faculty Concerns Chair, P&A; Dale Moore, Staff Senate representative; Peggy Pearl, ECFD; Wenping Qiu; FRS; Barbara Turpin, CGEIP chair; and Rod Williams, MIL.

Guests: Sam Dyer, COM; Sarah McCallister, HPE; Kim Bell, Records & Registration; Tyler Barnes, SGA; Lois Shufeldt, MKT; Beat Kernen, PLS; Jim Giglio, HST; Deborah Larson, MJF; Sheila Gordon, T&D; Pauline Nugent, MCL; Skip Phelps, Provost's Office; Tammy Jahnke, Provost's Office; Frank Einhellig, Provost's Office; Kishor Shah, MTH; Paul Langston, Institutional Research; John Strong, Provost's Office; Madeleine Kernen, MCL.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February Senate session were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Frank Einhellig gave an update on meetings held with the University of Missouri-Rolla on the proposed new civil and electrical engineering programs to be offered jointly with Missouri State. A "Proposal for Off-Site Delivery" has been completed.
2. A question-and-answer article on the JQH Arena by Chair Spisak and a letter dated February 27 from President Nietzel to the JQH Arena Planning Committee were both made available on the sign-in table.
3. John Strong, co-chair of the Public Affairs Conference, announced the conference would be held on campus this year on April 19-21. The conference will have 5 plenary addresses and 24 panels. Ken Rutherford is also serving as a co-chair of the conference. Dr. Strong encouraged faculty to attend the meetings and asked them to also encourage their students to attend. More in-depth information was distributed by e-mail to Senate members prior to the Senate meeting. Sheila Gordon from Theatre & Dance noted a tremendous gender inequity in the speakers for the conference this year, and Dr. Strong agreed it was a problem that needed to be addressed (some of their potential presenters were lost—speakers receive no honorarium, just travel expenses).

GUEST SPEAKER - FOOTBALL COACH TERRY ALLEN

Ken Rutherford introduced Terry Allen, Missouri State's new football coach. Coach Allen spoke concerning his background and what he hopes to accomplish at Missouri State. He hopes to turn the program around in the next five years. Following his presentation, he answered questions from Senate members.

REPORT FROM SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE CONCERNING NOMINEES FOR 2006/07 CHAIRPERSON-ELECT AND SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY

Art Spisak reported that the Senate Nominating Committee's two nominees for 2006/07 Chairperson-elect are Tom Kane (PSY) and Elizabeth Rozell (MGT). The Nominating Committee's two nominees for Secretary of the Faculty are Rebecca Swearingen (STE) and Michael Hendrix (BMS). Nominations from the floor were accepted, and Senator Gallaway nominated Edward DeLong for Secretary of the Faculty (nomination seconded by Senator Woodall). The candidate forum will be held at the beginning of the April 11 Senate meeting, with elections to be held immediately after.

ELECTION OF FACULTY-STUDENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES

Senators were instructed to vote by secret ballot for three faculty members from a slate of twelve nominees for the Faculty-Student Judicial Commission. Faculty members elected for two-year terms to the Commission were Larry George, Modern & Classical Languages; Judith John, English; and Gary Brinker, Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology.

APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAM IN EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES MANAGEMENT, B.S.

Senator Callahan moved and Senator Woodall seconded for approval of the new program in Emerging Technology Management. On behalf of the Budget & Priorities Committee, Senator Kent said no major issues were found concerning the program and that the Budget & Priorities Committee was bringing it forward for Faculty Senate approval. After discussion, the motion was approved by voice vote. It will go forward as **Senate Action 18-05/06**.

REPORT FROM RULES COMMITTEE

Norma McClellan, chair of the Rules Committee, reported on two of the Committee's charges to investigate and make recommendations on granting status of Faculty Senate Delegate (i.e., non-voting) to (1) the University Provost and/or any Associate and/or Assistant Provosts and (2) to one representative from the Deans. The Rules Committee recommended that "the current open door policy of the Faculty Senate remain intact, and that no specific delegate seat be designated for administrators. Administrators from all ranks are always welcome to Faculty Senate Meetings without the obligation or responsibility being placed on one particular designated delegate to attend."

The Rules Committee recommended additional wording to line 145: "The Past-Chair, unless appointed to an administrative position or leaves the University, must serve one year as the Chair of Judicial Review and is not eligible for any elected positions in the Senate." Lois Shufeldt, the current Judicial Review Committee chair, did not like the word "must," and after discussion, the word was changed to "will" by friendly amendment.

The Rules Committee proposed adding a description of the Honorary Doctorate Committee to the Committees section of the *Bylaws* (line 595), and a change to the index page to add “Honorary Degrees” to the list of committees. Senator DeLong said the Honorary Doctorate wording being added to the *Bylaws* is current practice except for the fact that the Committee would now be allowed to confer two honorary degrees annually instead of one if it wishes to do so. Senator Wyrick moved to amend (b) Membership to add that the members of the committee should have a doctorate degree. After discussion, his motion died for lack of a second. Senator Buckner moved for and Senator Wyrick seconded an amendment to delete wording under (b) Membership (referring to student), “selected from either the Honors College or the Graduate College.” By show of hands, the amendment failed 16-17.

Senator Satzinger moved and Senator Kaufman seconded an amendment to change the word “state” to “public” (Item 7), and by a show of hands, the amendment passed 23-10. The amendments to the *Bylaws* presented by the Rules Committee at today’s meeting will be voted on in the April Senate session.

REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Jim Giglio, chair of the *ad hoc* Committee on Search Committee Procedures, thanked committee members Gloria Galanes, Linda Garrison-Kane, Tamera Jahnke, Robert Jones, and Tom Plymate for their work on the committee. The charge to the Committee was to make recommendations in three areas: “The formation and responsibilities of Faculty Search Committees, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action practices in the context of faculty searches, and the delineation of accountability in the Search process.”

A Senate Action was distributed to Senate members concerning the above report. As it was not distributed with the agenda before the meeting, a 2/3 vote of the Senate membership was required for it to be presented (vote approved presentation by a show of hands). Senator Myers moved for approval of the Senate Action (seconded by Senator Wyrick). Each “resolved” paragraph was discussed and voted upon separately. The first paragraph read, “Resolved, that the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines incorporate the recommendations made in Section 1 of the attached report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Search Committee Procedures.” After discussion, the first paragraph was approved by voice vote.

Moving to discussion of the second paragraph, “Resolved, that the Office of Equity and Diversity be responsible for the items listed in Section 2 of the report,” Dr. Giglio remarked that the authority of the EEO had been a little bit restricted and everything pushed down to the Dean’s Office. After much discussion, Senator Harsha moved to amend Section 2, d) to read, “Each department shall have a search process evaluation procedure to be followed at the conclusion of a search.” His motion was seconded by Senator Zimmerman. After more discussion, Senator Satzinger moved the previous question (seconded by Senator Reed), and by voice vote, his motion passed. By voice vote, the motion to amend was approved. The motion to approve the second “resolved” paragraph, as amended, was approved by voice vote.

After discussion, the third paragraph, “Resolved, that the Office of the Provost initiate annual performance reviews of all academic administrators involved in searches, as described in Section 3 of the report,” was also approved by voice vote. The Senate Action will go forward as **Senate Action 19-05/06**.

Senator Reed moved for approval of the resolution distributed with the March Senate agenda entitled “Resolution in Support of the University Initiative for an Inclusive Community” (seconded by Senator Maunder). Senator Buckner asked for a definition of the word “inclusive,” saying she wasn’t sure what the word meant. Senator Kaufman felt the term was too vague. Dr. Giglio offered to change “inclusive” to “diversity” throughout the resolution by friendly amendment, but Senator Bourhis pointed out the wording wouldn’t fit in all instances. Senator Bourhis moved to refer the resolution back to Committee so different wording could be added (seconded by Senator Kane). By voice vote, the motion was approved.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. It will be continued on Tuesday, March 14, at 3:30 p.m. in Karls 101.

Rhonda R. Ridinger
Secretary of the Faculty

***Minutes of the March Session
of the Faculty Senate
Missouri State University***

The Faculty Senate held the second meeting of its March session on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, in Karls 101. Chair Art Spisak called the session to order at 3:32 p.m. Dr. Eric Shade served as parliamentarian.

Substitutes: Reed Olsen for Terrel Gallaway, ECO; and Kishor Shah for Shouchuan Hu, MTH.

Absences: Paul Blisard, COU; Carmen Boyd, Instructor representative; Connie Claybough, LAB; Clay Franklin, CSD; Mark Given, REL; Norm Griffith, Staff Senate representative; Charles Harvey, GSC representative; Susan Hinck, NUR; John Hoftzyer, Budget & Priorities Committee chair; Kevin Hughes, A&D; Jim Hutter, PEC chair; Frank Kauffman, SWK; Kandiah Manivannan, Faculty Concerns Committee chair; Marvel Maunder, ACS; Norma McClellan, Rules Committee chair; Dale Moore, Staff Senate representative; Peggy Pearl, ECFD; Wenping Qiu, FRS; Ralph Rice, PAS; Rebecca Swearingen, STE; Barbara Turpin, CGEIP chair; Scott Wallentine, PTE; Gary Ward, SMAT; and Rod Williams, MIL.

Guests: Jim Giglio, HST; Nathan Hoff, Records & Registration; Tyler Barnes, SGA; and Paul Langston, Institutional Research.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Dr. Giglio began by explaining that the word “inclusive” in the Committee’s resolution has a broader meaning than “diversity” but it has also created unnecessary ambiguity, so the Committee has changed “inclusive” references in the resolution to “diversity.” A revised copy of the resolution was distributed to Senate members. Senator Kaufman moved for approval of the revised resolution (seconded by Senator Watson), and by voice vote, the motion was approved. It will go forward as **Senate Resolution 10-05/06**.

Discussion then centered on Item 4 of the Committee’s report. The Committee replaced wording in Item 4 of the report with the following sentence: “Because of additional costs associated with proactive training and more extensive recruitment, especially in the hiring of diverse candidates, the committee recommends allocating additional funds at the University level” and presented a Senate action asking that “additional funds be allocated at the University level to cover the costs of proactive training and more extensive recruitment.” However, since the 2/3 vote of the entire membership required to consider the Senate action failed (not enough Senators in attendance at the meeting), Dr. Giglio decided to send it forward as a Senate resolution instead. Senator Baggett moved and Senator Kaufman seconded for approval of the resolution, and, after discussion, it was approved by voice vote. It will go forward as **Senate Resolution 11-05/06**.

RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT 2005-06 STATE OF MISSOURI STATE LEADERSHIP REPORT

Senator Jolley moved the above resolution to accept the 2005-06 State of Missouri State Leadership report (seconded by Senator Wyrick). Chair Spisak informed Senate members that Senator Kane

would present the report to both Administrative Council and to Academic Council. Senator Kane told Senate members that it helps to be able to say that the Faculty Senate endorses the report. There was much discussion about whether a 35 percent response rate is considered a good response rate. Senator Brinker said surveys were in his area of expertise and that a 35 percent response rate is considered very good. He felt the Senate could say it was “reasonably representative.” A friendly amendment was offered by Senator Miller (and accepted by Senator Jolley) to change the wording of the resolution to read: “Resolved, that the 2005-06 Administrator Assessment Report, Part I, be adopted by the Faculty Senate regarding departmental conditions at MSU.”

Discussion followed concerning the reasons why the response rate was not as high this year as in previous years. Senator Kane said in 2001, the #1 reason given for not responding to the survey was that it did not make a difference; the second highest reason was confidentiality. After more discussion, Senator Satzinger moved the previous question (seconded by Senator Zimmerman). By voice vote, the motion passed. The main motion, as amended, also passed by voice vote. It will go forward as **Senate Resolution 12-05/06**.

REPORT FROM ACADEMIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS CURRICULUM

Since the Subcommittee Chair was not in attendance at today’s meeting, Senator Kane, chair of the Academic Relations Committee, asked that the report be tabled until the April Senate meeting.

RESOLUTION ON MONITORING COSTS OF NEW SPORTS ARENA

Senator Bourhis moved to accept the above resolution on monitoring costs of the new sports arena (seconded by Senator Harsha). Senator Reed moved to table the resolution (seconded by Senator Baggett), but by a show of hands, the motion failed. Senator Bourhis said since the decision to build the arena had already been made, the Senate needs to be realistic about what can be accomplished. The resolution says there are concerns and that the Senate wants to make sure the University proceeds cautiously. Senator Wyrick said when Hammons Hall for the Performing Arts was built there were two sets of books and that this resolution could lead to just monitoring a false set of books. Senator Wyrick added he had also been told that the Budget and Priorities Committee was not interested in doing the monitoring. Senator Kent, also a member of the Budget and Priorities Committee, said no one on the Budget and Priorities Committee felt they had the expertise to do the monitoring. He suggested they might have to regenerate or have a special subcommittee whose members have that expertise.

Senator Woodard, also a member of the Planning Committee for the JQH Arena, said the committee was hoping to hire an architect by May 1 and that open forums will be held at a later date where faculty will have an opportunity for input. She said the goal is for the arena to be self-supporting and to be funded through gifts. Senator Satzinger felt the biggest issue was the exclusiveness of the arena, with it being too much of a country club and excluding faculty and students. He moved to amend the resolution by deleting lines 7 through the end and substitute with the following: “Resolved, that President Nietzel and the JQH Arena Committee make every effort to incorporate input from the University Community before committing to a specific design specification” (seconded by Senator Reed).

Senator Bourhis felt the Senate should be doing both. He asked that the Senate vote down the amendment and instead have it stand on its own. Senator Woodard added she would gladly take

suggestions to the Committee. It was noted that Senator Pearl is also a member of the Committee, and she could also take input from Senate members. After more discussion, Senator Zimmerman moved the previous question (seconded by Senator Herr), and by voice vote the motion passed. By a show of hands, the amendment failed.

A friendly amendment was offered by Senator Watson (accepted by Senator Bourhis) to add a phrase after "Faculty Senate" on line 27 "through the formation of a subcommittee with appropriate expertise." After more discussion, Senator Zimmerman moved the previous question (seconded by Senator Herr), and his motion was approved by voice vote. By a show of hands, the resolution, as amended, was approved. It will go forward as **Senate Resolution 13-05/06**.

RESOLUTION AGAINST CONSTRUCTING A NEW SPORTS ARENA

Senator Wyrick moved for approval of his resolution against the construction of a new sports arena (seconded by Senator Woodall). Senator Wyrick stated that it was impossible to know how much money will be donated, and once bonds are issued, servicing becomes the #1 priority. He felt the Senate should stand up for principle. According to Senator Wyrick, the Intercollegiate Athletics Priorities Committee report indicated the University should lease, not own, facilities in the future. He said with interest and service costs, the arena would cost around \$80 million.

Senator Rutherford informed Senate members that the Intercollegiate Athletics Priorities Committee report never recommended leasing over owning, that there were no plans to build a parking garage, and that the donation for the arena is from a trust and not from an individual. Senator Bourhis said he agreed with everything Senator Wyrick was saying, but he felt it would be more productive for the Senate to invite administration to give them more information. He further felt that passing the above resolution would do damage to faculty. Senator Wyrick asked whether the Senate chair (and possibly President Nietzel) would be willing to come forward in a month and give the Senate an updated report. Chair Spisak replied he would be happy to do so.

Senator DeLong moved to postpone voting on the resolution until after the report at the April Senate meeting (seconded by Senator Baggett). SGA delegate Barnett said most of the questions were answered in the Planning Committee charge distributed to Senate members earlier. Senator Bourhis indicated he would vote against the motion to postpone and further asked that the Senate chair or President Nietzel report to the Senate to provide more information. Senator Zimmerman moved the previous question on the motion to postpone (seconded by Senator Herr), and by voice vote, his motion passed. By a show of hands, the motion to postpone failed. Senator Zimmerman moved the previous question on the main motion (seconded by Senator Coombs), and Senator Wyrick's above resolution failed by voice vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Satzinger asked to move another resolution but could not proceed due to a lack of quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting will be on Tuesday, April 11, at 3:30 p.m. in Hill Hall 1.

Rhonda R. Ridinger
Secretary of the Faculty

Senate Action 18-05/06

Adopted by Senate on March 9, 2006

Right of Challenge Expires April 8, 2006

Emerging Technologies Management, B.S.

A complete copy of the above curricular proposal can be viewed in the Faculty Senate office.

Right of Challenge Expires April 8, 2006

*Senate Action from Senate Ad Hoc Committee
on Search Committee Procedures*

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines incorporate the recommendations made in Section 1 of the attached report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Search Committee Procedures;

RESOLVED, that the Office of Equity and Diversity be responsible for the items listed in Section 2 of the report; and

RESOLVED, that the Office of the Provost initiate annual performance reviews of all academic administrators involved in searches, as described in Section 3 of the report.

February 28, 2006 (Items 2d and 4 revised on March 9 and 14, 2006)

To: Faculty Senate

**From: Ad Hoc Committee on Search Committee Procedures
(Jim Giglio– Chair, Gloria Galanes, Linda Garrison-Kane, Tamera Jahnke, Robert Jones, Tom Plymate)**

Subject: Recommendations of the Faculty Senate Committee on Hiring Procedures

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged this committee to make recommendations in three interrelated areas: The formation and responsibilities of Faculty Search Committees, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action practices in the context of faculty searches, and the delineation of accountability in the search process. In the process of making the following recommendations the committee sought information from various institutional offices, including the Office of Equity and Diversity, the Office of General Counsel, and the President's Office. We also have been in contact with four major Midwest universities (University of Arkansas, the University of Kansas, The Ohio State University, and the University of Memphis) to determine how they handled these aforementioned issues. The committee was also mindful of last Autumn's Senate Resolution relating to faculty searches.

1) The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines include the following:

- a) Normally, the Department Head appoints a trained Faculty member to chair the search committee. That training will require attending a search briefing conducted by the Office for Equity and Diversity. Whenever possible, the committee, also appointed by the Department Head, should follow the Faculty committee composition guidelines pertaining to women and minorities as outlined in the Office for Equity and Diversity's *Academic Search Process: Guides for Hiring Faculty and Academic Administrators*. If the Department can not adequately meet the aforementioned guidelines it should fill the void from the college whenever possible.
- b) The Department Head should be responsible for drafting the recruitment ad in consultation with the Dean, the Search Committee and the Department at large. The Department Head should also confer with the Chair of the Search Committee in developing a recruitment plan. The Department Head is responsible for overseeing the implementation of that plan and ensuring that all necessary paperwork and correspondence are completed, as well as keeping the Dean informed of the progress of the search.
- c) The Department Head is also responsible to ensure that the Search Committee is apprized of the affirmative action guidelines and the do's and don'ts of the search process. The Department Head should validate that a pro-active approach exists that encourages minorities and women to apply.
- d) It is the Search Committee's responsibility to evaluate the credentials of the candidates against the expressed criteria in the job ad. Throughout this process the committee chair should remain in consultation with the Department Head who should participate in drafting questions for references regarding telephone interviews. But it is the search committee's responsibility to call references and make telephone queries with unlisted references, subject to the candidate's prior approval. Department Heads may assist in making additional off-list reference calls. Additionally, the Search Committee assumes the task of hosting candidates during the interviews. The Department Head's role is to ensure that the process moves at an expeditious pace.
- e) The Committee should provide the Department with a shortlist, along with a justification of the ranking. Following the creation of the short list, Departmental Faculty should have access to all candidate files. It is advisable, but not necessary, that the department at large concur with the search committee's recommendations. During this stage of the process the Department Head should play an active role in the discussions.

- f) Generally, at least two applicants should be brought for campus interviews.
- g) The Search Committee should request Departmental Faculty feedback relating to the campus interviews prior to a final Departmental recommendation relating to employment. That recommendation must come with the Department Head's endorsement to the dean.
- h) Due to labor market scarcity, recruitment of Faculty from protected classes is often difficult. Because of this, the committee suggests that guidelines for recruitment advertisements be a) broadly worded, b) prepared and disseminated early, and c) disseminated through outlets that are likely to attract applicants from protected classes. Also, whenever possible, all Faculty and Department Heads should look for opportunities to network and develop relationships with prospective candidates from protected classes.

2) The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the following responsibilities be included in the Office of Equity and Diversity procedures:

- a) Cost centers (Deans, Heads, and Faculty) are accountable for making good hiring decisions. Responsibilities of Deans, Heads, and Search Committee Chairs regarding hiring decisions should include:

following search procedures

conducting searches in a timely manner

knowing and following AA/EEO and other compliance laws, rules, and guidelines.

- b) Communication is important in keeping all administrative levels accountable:

Search Committee Chairs should keep Department Heads informed during the search process.

Department Heads should keep their Deans informed of the progress of the search. This should include a summary of the candidate pool and a summary of top candidates.

Deans should keep the Provost informed of the progress of each search so that the Provost can keep the President informed of the progress of faculty searches.

- c) Approvals occur at the level of hiring administrator and major administrator.

Department Heads make recommendations to the Deans

Deans have final approval over hiring decisions

- d) Each department shall have a search process evaluation procedure to be followed at the conclusion of a search.

3) The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the Office of the Provost should initiate annual performance reviews of all academic administrators involved in searches. The reviews should include input from Faculty. The reviews should include audit reports that have been conducted by the Office of Equity and Diversity regarding individual searches. Along with other evaluation dimensions, these annual performance reviews should evaluate the following search responsibilities:

- a) Training - Its completion should be an initial basis for evaluation. Search Committee Chairs, Department Heads, and Deans should complete appropriate training in EEO/AA compliance issues. In addition to compliance, proactive diversity training should also be completed by all decision makers.
- b) Recruitment Plans - Did the Department follow the recruitment plan? How did the search committee and Head attempt to recruit a diverse candidate pool? In particular, were the job description, required qualifications, preferred qualifications, and advertisement written in such a way to recruit a diverse candidate pool? Also, was there broad networking, phone calling, and recruitment at professional meetings, as well as through venues that attract under-represented groups? The recruitment plan will include a statement, initialed by the dean, affirming that the dean, head and search committee have undergone appropriate training to conduct a good search. Legal defense of faculty members is noted in section 2.11.1.4 of the Faculty Handbook.
- c) Aspects of the search itself - Was the search conducted in a timely manner? Early searches are likely to attract more diverse applicants. Was the search successful (defined as making a hire from an appropriately recruited applicant pool)?* Were the lines of communication from Search Committee to the Head, the Head to the Dean, and the Dean to the Provost open regarding the progress of the search?
- 4) Because of additional costs associated with proactive training and more extensive recruitment, especially in the hiring of diverse candidates, the committee recommends allocating additional funds at the University level.**
- 5) The committee recommends adoption of the attached Faculty Senate resolution regarding development of an inclusive Faculty at Missouri State University.**

***Under some select circumstances, success may be recognizing that the pool is not good and closing the search.**

***Resolution in Support of the University Initiative
For a Diverse Community***

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has consistently embraced measures to increase diversity,

WHEREAS, attracting and retaining diverse Faculty at Missouri State University continues to be a serious challenge,

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has repeatedly affirmed the University's mission of developing educated people, particularly by providing a high quality education,

WHEREAS, a vital component of high quality higher education is the exposure of students to diverse people with diverse backgrounds, views, and approaches to life,

WHEREAS, exposure to diversity in the Faculty makes an important contribution to this aspect of the mission,

WHEREAS, the increasing diversity of the United States and the State of Missouri make it imperative that students be adequately prepared to deal with a more diverse world outside of the University,

WHEREAS, the current University Administration has taken the initiatives to develop a more diverse student body and a more diverse campus generally,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Missouri State University Faculty Senate affirms and embraces the need to attract and retain a diverse faculty,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funding for attracting, recruiting and hiring of a diverse Faculty should be a significant priority for future University budgets.

***Resolution Asking for Additional Funds Allocation to Cover
Costs of Recruitment of Diverse Candidates***

WHEREAS, additional costs are often necessary for the recruitment of diverse candidates;

RESOLVED, that additional funds be allocated at the University level to cover the costs of proactive training and more extensive recruitment.

Resolution Adopting the 2005-06 Administrator Assessment Report, Part I

RESOLVED, that the 2005-06 Administrator Assessment Report, Part I, be adopted by the Faculty Senate regarding departmental conditions at MSU.

Resolution on Sports Arena Oversight

WHEREAS, President Nietzel has announced that Missouri State University will build a new state-of-the-art sports arena estimated to cost \$60 million;

WHEREAS, President Nietzel is committed to insuring that the cost of the new sports arena will not have a negative impact on the academic mission of Missouri State University;

WHEREAS, Missouri State University had direct experience with the building of Juanita K. Hammons Hall for the Performing Arts that did have significant cost over-runs that continue to have a negative impact on the academic mission of the university;

WHEREAS, Drury University's recent experience with its capital improvement project cost over-runs demonstrates the need to be vigilant and to proceed cautiously;

WHEREAS, it is sound business practice to put into place safeguards to insure that the building of the new sports arena is completed in a timely fashion and at a budgeted cost that does not have an adverse impact on academics; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Budget and Priorities Committee of the Faculty Senate, through the formation of a subcommittee with appropriate expertise, carefully monitor the costs associated with the construction and maintenance of a new sports arena and provide a monthly report to the university community of its findings.