

***Minutes of the Faculty Concerns Committee Meeting on
November 25, 2008***

The Faculty Concerns Committee held its monthly meeting for November on November 25, 2008, in Plaster Student Union, Room 315. Jef Cornelius-White, chair, opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m and minutes were kept by Joan Test, secretary. Refreshments were served.

In Attendance: Ruth Barnes, Jef Cornelius-White, Daniel Crafts, Elizabeth Dudash, Keith Ernce, David Hays, Reza Herati, Rajinder Jutla, Kyoungtae Kim, Melody Lapreze, Judith Martin, Duane Moses, Ronald Netsell, Gabriel Ondetti, James Philpot, Emmett Redd, Micheal Roling, Allen Schaefer, Sharmistha Self, Yili Shi, Rathel Smith, Tracy Stout, Joan Test, Michelle Visio, Duat Vu, Randall Wallace, Yang Wang, Johnny Washington, Cameron Wickham.

Substitutes in Attendance:

Mandy Christy for Caroline Helton

Absences:

Larry Burt (History), Patricia Cahoj (Physical Therapy), Connie Claybough (Greenwood), Michael Craig (Biomedical Sciences), Thomas Dickson (Media, Journalism and Film), Thomas Kachel (Fashion and Interior Design), Frank Kauffman (Social Work), William Meadows (Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology), Stevan Olson (Accountancy), John Strong (Religious Studies), Margaret Weaver (Faculty Senate/English).

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the previous FCC meeting (October 28, 2008) were approved. Motion to accept made by Keith Ernce, seconded by Emmett Redd, motion carried.

Report from Best Practices Subcommittee (report by Judith Martin, Chair)

The committee's three concerns and recommendations were reviewed. Please see the committee's written report for details. Motion to accept the subcommittee's report and their recommendations made by Emmet Redd and seconded by Duane Moses.

Discussion of the motion: Suggestion to add to the report a recommendation that the university make the new policy of no forced distribution clear and communicate it to all faculty and administrators.

An amendment was suggested to add a global statement to part B of the report which would state: "If the policy in the best practices document is not followed, this will be grounds for an appeal. Please refer to the faculty handbook for information on the appeal process." The committee voted to accept the report with the amendment above.

Report from the Survey Subcommittee (report by Rathel Smith)

422 faculty responded to the survey. This is approximately 59% of the faculty. The subcommittee will start to analyze the survey data after Thanksgiving. FCC will discuss the findings in January, and deliver a report to the faculty senate in Spring 2009. Elizabeth Dudash will join the survey committee; she will work on the qualitative analysis of the survey.

Report from the Faculty Workload Practices Subcommittee (report by Keith Ernce, Chair)

The subcommittee presented their written report, which incorporated feedback from the previous FCC meeting.

Motion was made by Emmett Redd that the report be accepted and go forward to the faculty senate with one provision. The provision is that point number 2 under *Recommendations* be moved to become point number 5 under *Findings*, since it is really a finding of the subcommittee and not a recommendation.

Motion passed. Report will be corrected and sent forward to the faculty senate.

Discussion of Wellness and Benefits

General issue or concern is that there are two pieces of information that are part of the wellness initiative: filling out the HRA survey and the issue of smoking; these are minimal steps. What else might be done to reward people for practicing healthy lifestyles? What are the developmental sequence and plans for the wellness initiative?

It was agreed that someone from Taylor Health & Wellness or an appropriate committee or office would be invited to answer questions and to talk about these issues with the FCC. FCC will have questions to prompt the discussion, both perspectives (for and against these policies) can be expressed.

How do other places incentivize other wellness issues? Keith Ernce can bring information on other possibilities to FCC ahead of time.

Other wellness/health insurance questions raised:

There were questions on evaluations of who can get which test in which age range, etc. Why does cost go up, and then we get money off for wellness plan items? There was some concern about "opening the door," i.e. if there was an obesity policy; this becomes a potential area for discrimination. Is it possible to have something on wellness that is divorced from our health insurance. i.e. healthier menus with Sodexo?

New concerns:

1. *Inequity in lack of choice of retirement plan.* Faculty are not eligible for MOSERS, based on their hiring date. Is there some inequity related to hiring date and retirement benefits?

Discussion ensued of whether there is an inequity. Faculty informed of this when hired, so they can make a choice based on that. Institution may not have had a choice, it may be MOSERS decision. Could the university make it a choice to switch from MOSERS to TIAA-CREF? This also may be an inequity, as people in MOSERS cannot name a beneficiary other than a spouse or child. No plans were made to further pursue these questions.

2. University's move toward a centralized classroom schedule. Has there been much discussion or concern in other departments on this? We were just told had to bite the bullet and conform, even though very difficult. Some senators are thinking to try to do something about this.

Discussion: Idiosyncratic needs for particular classrooms; department has added equipment to rooms and needs to use it. Others using the rooms who don't need the particular setup, wear down the resources. Might be good to make a statement on university general classrooms, but all have specialty classrooms and those should be left alone. Classrooms that department is responsible for outfitting should be in control of department. Some have been told that there are no designated classrooms—all rooms are for everyone.

There seems to be many concerns around this issue. It would make sense for the FCC to consider it. We need to understand what Senate actions are being taken and if nothing, then a clear presentation, proposal, or recommendation for what we might do. The two issues would seem to be: Centralized scheduling & Designated classrooms.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm

Next meeting will be held on **Tuesday, January 27**, at 3:30 pm in PSU 315.