

**Minutes of the Faculty Concerns Committee
November 24, 2009**

The Faculty Concerns Committee held its monthly meeting for November on November 24, 2009, in Plaster Student Union, Room 315. Judith Martin, chair, opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Minutes were kept by Ruth Barnes, secretary. Refreshments were served.

In attendance: Ruth Barnes (TD), Patricia Cahoj (PT), Roberto Canales (CHHS), Jef Cornelius-White (CLSE), Michael Craig (), Thomas Dickson (MJF), Elizabeth Dudash (COM), Keith Ernce (HPER), John Harms (), David Hays (MUS), Caroline Helton (Nursing), Reza Herati (CHM), Michael Hudson (SMAT), Rajinda Jutla (GGP), Tom Kane (PSY), Judith Martin (MCL), Gabriel Ondetti (PLS), James Philpot (FGB), Emmett Redd (PAMS), Michael Roling (AGR), Sharmistha Self (ECO – Faisal Rabby, sub), Yili Shi (ENG), Rathel Smith (COBA), Tracy Stout (LIB), Joan Test (CEFS), Duat Vu (AD), Randall Wallace (RFT), Ye Wang (CSD), Cameron Wickham (MTH), Rebecca Woodard (Senate Chair-elect)

Absences: Brooks Blevins, Daniel Crafts (HRA), Vicki Dunlop (Laboratory School), Thomas Kachel (FID), Kim Kyoungtae (BIO), Melody Lapreze (MGT), Duane Moses (CIS), Steven Olson (ACT), Allen Schaefer (MKT), Elizabeth Sobel (Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology), John Strong (attending conference), Yang Wang (attending conference), Johnny Washington (PHI)

Departments without representative: Computer Science, Defense & Strategical Studies, Military Science, Social Work

Approval of minutes: October 2009 minutes corrected and approved.

Administrator assessment survey – update from Dr. Jef Cornelius-White

- Administrator Assessment survey is on Inqsit. The survey will be posted December 1st, with participation for two weeks. Committee members are asked to encourage their colleagues to respond. Low response rate in the past has meant that data was thrown out.
- Tom Kane: Department Conditions Assessment survey is also ready to go. The survey will be done next semester. It will compare departments to the university and to each other, relative to last year. The Provost has generated a letter in support of the initiative; Senate will send information to the faculty.

GEP 101 Senate action

1. Update

The GEP 101 Action went before Senate. Senate is referring it back, with a charge for Faculty Concerns Committee to make it more specific.

Discussion followed, including clarification of the Senate's reasons for referring the action back to FCC.

- Senate deems FCC the best body to determine fair salary.
- A second issue: which committee is in charge of designing course. \$2000 figure came from IDS and Provost. In 1996, decision was to pay \$1000/credit hour – was doubled last year. Tom Kane met with Jim Moyer, Chair of First-Year Programs Advisory Committee. \$2000, although good for staff, is too low for the most qualified faculty the university would like to teach the course.
- Factors: 1) rank; 2) those who go to administration and then go back to faculty. If this system violates all these factors, it needs to be reconsidered.

Further discussion about \$2000 remuneration:

- Other programs on campus have other fixed costs, such as program directors
- Per course has been at same rate for decades. Can we consider other salary issues than this one? For example, OTC pays per course instructors more than MSU.
- Mention of Work Load Document generated two years ago.
- Negotiation with Provost & IDS Director would be constructive.
- The curricular proposal from CGEIP has \$2000 all the way up the line.

- Administration wrote and Senate approved without much scrutiny. Origin of salary figure is not clear. First Year Programs had recommended \$2700. Will people will teach a class that is not in their best interest, with respect to policy that is in the Provost's office.
- Cost will not remained for the life of the course

2. Question period with Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Margaret Weaver

- A. Question for Margaret Weaver: What is the charge from Senate? Answer: Senate didn't specify the charge, since this originated in FCC. Concerns voiced:
- Issue of having separate policy for faculty and staff – some recognition of that should be in the action. Decisions of FCC will impact staff, even if staff is not represented
 - Senate wasn't clear about what this issue is. Is it the flat amount? Or, that this seems to be in conflict with 2%?
 - Senate encourages creation of a subcommittee.
 - Assumption from Provost that faculty had agreed on \$2000.
- B. Discussion followed, including:
- C. Work load policy for faculty and staff
- Remuneration, including flat fee policy
 - Comparison with like institutions
 - Analysis of the proposal by Faculty Senate
 - Need for Department Heads' approval
- D. Request to discuss with staff. Staff will be invited to next FCC meeting.
- E. FCC representatives asked to conduct informal, unofficial poll of own departments faculty, asking if they would teach this course for \$2000.

Old Business

No old business

New Business

No new business

Motion to adjourn by Keith Ernce; seconded by Emmett Redd. **Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.**

Next Faculty Concerns Committee meeting: January 26, 2010