

Secretary of the Faculty Candidate Statement**Elizabeth L. Walker, Associate Professor, Department of Animal Science**

I am honored to again be nominated to serve as the Secretary of the Faculty. I have served with great pride as current Secretary of the Faculty, Chair of CGEIP and have been privileged to see how leaders in the Senate work closely with committees. Cordiality, even when we differ in opinion is crucial to be a successful governing body. Missouri State University faculty leaders have impressed me with their professionalism. To be considered for a position of leadership among the faculty at Missouri State, is a huge honor and I can intend to conduct myself with the type of respect, thoughtfulness, and professionalism I have witnessed.

The learning curve was steep, but I feel like I have learned a great deal and am ready to continue my role as Secretary of the Faculty. I have gained great experience and knowledge thus far and will serve as a diligent member of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Executive Committee. My goal is to bridge the gap between Faculty Senate and my own College as well those interested in one day serving their fellow faculty. I am still in awe of the whole Senate governing process and I look forward to serving again. I continue to want to be part of something bigger than myself and help others as best I can. I feel like I have made strides in accomplishing this goal and I look forward to the job ahead. Meeting and working with the amazing staff, faculty and our Provost and President at MSU has been a great honor.

Chair-Elect Candidate Statement**Cameron Wickham, Professor, Department of Mathematics**

I would like to thank the nominating committee for considering me for Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate. I am honored to accept and will do my best to effectively represent the faculty in this leadership role.

As I finish my 28th year here at MSU, I have become well acquainted with the culture here on campus. I have been here for many accomplishments as well as conflicts. I have been a senator on the Faculty Senate, I've served as a member of several standing and ad-hoc Senate committees, and I've served as a member of my college personnel committee. I have seen that transparency is a key component in many issues—open exchange of ideas is usually a driving force behind accomplishments while a lack of transparency often promotes conflict. It is my position that such transparency is the foundation for open inquiry, the foundation of the academy. This is a primary role for the Faculty Senate chair—to facilitate such inquiry among faculty and with the other primary constituents of the University: students, staff, administration.

As the years have passed, I have grown to appreciate the importance of shared governance for the good of the university. I trace this to my experience on the ad-hoc Senate Family Leave Committee. Working with the faculty members on that committee and interacting with others in the university community showed me how a commitment to open dialog can lead to benefits for all.

If elected I will endeavor to maintain open and transparent communication, both here in the senate and within the larger university community. We may not agree on everything, but I will always listen to you. This is essential for continuing to offer the excellent educational opportunities and experiences for our students, and also for our role in the larger community.

Faculty Senate Committee on Rules
Response to Charge One through Seven
March 1, 2019

Rules Committee members: Terrel Gallaway (chair), John Heywood, Seth Hoelscher, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Walker (*ex officio*)

Charge #1

Rules Committee Charge pertaining to Senate Actions

The term "Faculty Senate Action" is used in the Constitution (ART III, line 37) but is defined in the Bylaws (ART I SEC 7, lines 583-585). This makes it possible to change the Constitution by changing the Bylaws, thereby bypassing the more stringent requirements for making substantive changes to the Constitution as described in ART X of the Constitution. Investigate the history of this language and consider a change to the Constitution and Bylaws that would remedy the problem.

Findings and conclusions:

1. The current language appears to be completely consistent with the original language that was adopted by the faculty in 1987. Over the years, the original term "Actions" has been replaced, successively, by "actions" and then "Faculty Senate Actions", but these changes were made in parallel in both documents. It appears that the most recent change was made to clarify the distinction between legislative products that are governed by ART III of the Constitution (now called Faculty Senate Actions) and a new category of legislative products (Internal Actions) that are not governed by ART III of the Constitution because they do not alter University policies or procedures.
2. Thus, the potential loophole for amending the Constitution that is identified in this charge was present from the very beginning. It is not a side effect of any subsequent amendments to either document and therefore does not dictate the nullification of any previous amendments.
3. A simple way to close the loophole is to insert into ART III of the Constitution a duplicate copy of the definition of "Faculty Senate Action" that currently appears in ART I SEC 7 of the Bylaws. Because "Faculty Senate Action" (originally "Action") has always been taken to have the same referent in both documents, and the definition that appears in the Bylaws has never been altered, we believe this change to the Constitution would be non-substantive and could therefore be approved by the simpler mechanism normally employed for amending the Bylaws, as described in ART X of the Constitution.

Summary of Proposed Changes to the Constitution of the Faculty:

1. Add to ART III of the Constitution the definition of "Faculty Senate Action" that appears on lines 583-585 of the Bylaws.

PROPOSED INTERNAL ACTION TO MAKE A NON-SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION**Original Language***[comments bracketed and italicized]*

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

ART III POWERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

[lines 29-38:]

The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish policy in the areas of authority assigned to the faculty in the *Bylaws of the Board of Governors* and for such other areas or problems as may be assigned to it by the president of the university or the Board of Governors. Shared governance, as delegated by the Board in the *Faculty Handbook*, recognizes the essential interdependence of governing boards, administration, faculty, staff, and students. This shared governance is indispensable to the development of educated persons. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish specific functional bodies to carry out powers granted to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate and its established bodies shall have the power to initiate action in such curricular and non-curricular matters as it deems fit, or in such matters as are brought to its attention by one or more members of the faculty. Every Faculty Senate Action is subject to challenge by the faculty and subject to final approval by the president and, when necessary, by the Board of Governors.

Proposed Changes**Additions in bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, *[comments bracketed and italicized]*

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

ART III POWERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish policy in the areas of authority assigned to the faculty in the *Bylaws of the Board of Governors* and for such other areas or problems as may be assigned to it by the president of the university or the Board of Governors. Shared governance, as delegated by the Board in the *Faculty Handbook*, recognizes the essential interdependence of governing boards, administration, faculty, staff, and students. This shared governance is indispensable to the development of educated persons. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish specific functional bodies to carry out powers granted to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate and its established bodies shall have the power to initiate action in such curricular and non-curricular matters as it deems fit, or in such matters as are brought to its attention by one or more members of the faculty. **Faculty Senate Actions, as perfected and passed by the Faculty Senate, represent the collective reasoning of the faculty through its governance process as to policies and procedures to be followed by the University.** Every Faculty Senate Action is subject to challenge by the faculty and subject to final approval by the president and, when necessary, by the Board of Governors.

Charge #2**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to the Changes in General Education**

Consider whether changes to the General Education curriculum should require more than a majority vote of the Senate.

Rules Committee recommendations and considerations

The Committee does believe that there should be a high bar when it comes to modifying General Education. However, a supermajority requirement for approving modifications to the General Education curriculum is something that would have been most effective if it had been in effect immediately after the new General Education program was put into place.

Additionally, there are ongoing issues that relate to GCEIP and General Education. These include an ongoing examination of both CGEIP's structure and the General Education assessment process. Similarly, understanding whether the long-run effects of Missouri's Core 42 Program need to be considered is beyond the scope of this committee.

Accordingly, the Committee believes the university would be better served by having another committee, with greater expertise, look into the issue of how best to ensure the integrity and stability of the General Education curriculum. Conceivably, this could be an additional charge for the ad hoc committee already looking into issues related to CGEIP.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

Relevant Parts of the *Constitution and Bylaws*:

1631 **ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE**

1632 **PROGRAMS**

1633

1634 SEC 1 Establishment of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

1635

1636 As an integral part of the Faculty Senate structure, a Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

1637 shall be established.

1638

1639 **SEC 2 Purpose of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1640

1641 This Council shall act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, undergraduate
1642 courses and programs offered collaboratively by academic departments in two or more colleges, undergraduate
1643 degrees offered by two or more colleges, and the general requirements for undergraduate certificates. This
1644 Council shall also act on applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

1645

1646 **SEC 3 Powers of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1647

1648 This council is empowered to recommend the approval of curricular proposals or reject and return proposals to
1649 the originator, and to approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree
1650 program.

1651

1652 **SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1653

1654 **A** Reviews and acts upon general education course proposals to ensure compliance with established general
1655 education course criteria. A recommendation for the approval of a course proposal will be forwarded to the
1656 Secretary of the Faculty for review and disposition as described in ART VI.

1766 **SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1767

1768 The council shall recommend the approval of a curricular proposal or reject and return a proposal to the
1769 originator. A proposal may be withdrawn from consideration without motion or vote by the originating units
1770 before final disposition by the council upon specific request to the council chair. All curricular proposals
1771 recommended for approval by the council shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as
1772 described in ART VI. The Council shall also approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of
1773 General Studies degree program.

2124 **SEC 6 Responsibility of Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council,
and**

2125 **Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

2126

2127 **A** Shall receive, deliberate on, and expedite curricular proposals from academic departments or special
2128 academic programs in the university.

2129

2130 **B** Shall reject or recommend the approval of a curricular proposal. A curricular proposal shall be withdrawn
2131 from consideration before final disposition by the council, upon specific request to the council chair by the
2132 originator, without motion or vote.

2133

2134 **C** Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

2135

2136 (1) If a proposal is rejected, the CGEIP Chair shall notify the originator, the Department
Head/Director,

2137 and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from

2138 which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the CGEIP

2139 Action.

2140

2141 (2) The CGEIP Chair shall forward to the Secretary of the Faculty all proposals recommended for
2142 approval.

2143

2240 **SEC 10 Responsibility of Faculty Senate**

2241

2242 The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

2243

2244 A On all curricular matters forwarded to it by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.

2245 B On all appeals of curricular proposals forwarded to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by the college

2246 councils, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and

2247 Intercollegiate Programs. Senate actions on such appeals are separate from senate actions on the curricular

2256 E On all proposals affecting the structure of General Education. This includes but is not limited to:

2257 (1) Changes to the aims and goals of General Education

2258 (2) Changes to the learning outcomes of General Education

2259 (3) Changes to the focus areas of General Education

2260 (4) Changes to the credit hour requirements within General Education

2261 (5) Course additions to and deletions from General Education

Charge # 3**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to EPPC**

The Rules Committee never acted on charge 18 from last year, which was to revise the EPPC membership criteria as proposed by **EPPC**. We did not act on this because EPPC never responded to a request from Rules despite multiple requests to the chair of EPPC. At issue is ART III, SEC 4, paragraph A. The second sentence in this paragraph describes the qualifications for teaching, supervising, and managing within the EPP, which is not Senate business. I recommend that this sentence be struck from the bylaws.

Rules Committee's Considerations

The Faculty Senate is properly concerned with the EPPC but not the EPP. The EPP is not a Faculty Senate institution. Accordingly, EPP membership requirements are their own business and should not be included in the *Constitution and Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate.

The EPP is encouraged to promulgate their own membership criteria.

PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS

Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws*:

Article III EDUCATION PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL

SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council

A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP. Faculty/staff who teach one or

more EPP courses, advise or supervise educator preparation students, or administer educator preparation

academic departments/units* or colleges must be members of the EPP.

(*The term “unit” here refers to any group of faculty members who collectively controls the curriculum of

one or more academic programs and resides outside of the administrative structure of any single academic

department. The only educator preparation entity that fits this description is the MSED-Secondary

Oversight Committee. If additional educator preparation units are formed which fit this description, they

shall receive voting membership on the EPPC automatically without additional amendment to the Bylaws.

The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee does not fit this description because each of the BSED

Secondary programs is controlled by its respective department.)

All faculty serving on EPPC must meet all Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) accreditation standards regarding

members of the EPP. These standards include being actively involved in teacher education and having a

five-year plan on file in the respective academic department and the EPP. This five-year plan must detail

the faculty member's direct and periodic involvement with the public schools

- B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, and from

each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments are required to have at least one representative. Departments with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an *ex officio* EPPC member without voting privileges.

Rules committee recommended change to the Bylaws (Article 3 Section 4):

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [*comments bracketed and italicized*]

SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council

- A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP. ~~Faculty/staff who teach one or more EPP courses, advise or supervise educator preparation students, or administer educator preparation academic departments/units* or colleges must be members of the EPP.~~

~~(*The term "unit" here refers to any group of faculty members who collectively controls the curriculum of one or more academic programs and resides outside of the administrative structure of any single academic department. The only educator preparation entity that fits this description is the MSED Secondary Oversight Committee. If additional educator preparation units are formed which fit this description, they shall receive voting membership on the EPPC automatically without additional amendment to the Bylaws. The BSED Secondary Oversight Committee does not fit this description because each of the BSED Secondary programs is controlled by its respective department.)~~

~~All faculty serving on EPPC must meet all Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) accreditation standards regarding members of the EPP. These standards include being actively involved in teacher education and having a five-year plan on file in the respective academic department and the EPP. This five-year plan must detail the faculty member's direct and periodic involvement with the public schools.~~

- B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, **or special academic program**, and from each entity so identified in

<http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments, **or special academic programs**, are required to have at least one representative. Departments, **or special academic programs**, with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department, **special academic program**, or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an *ex officio* EPPC member without voting privileges. **The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee is not considered to be a special academic program and does not have separate representation on EPPC.**

Rules committee recommended final language for Section 4 a in its entirety and section B:

SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council

- A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP.
- B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, or special academic program, and from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments, or special academic programs, are required to have at least one representative. Departments, or special academic programs, with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department, special academic program, or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an *ex officio* EPPC member without voting privileges. The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee is not considered to be a special academic program and does not have separate representation on EPPC.

Charge #4**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to Staff Representation on the Faculty Senate**

The bylaws state that the staff will provide two delegates to the Faculty Senate, one representing the "classified staff" and one representing the "professional staff". However, in recent years the staff senate has provided a single delegate. I am not sure the distinction between "classified" and "professional" staff even exists anymore. This should be investigated and the bylaws should be updated as needed. NOTE from T. Dicke: I spoke with Chair of Staff Senate those classifications are no longer used. His recommendation was to just leave it at two delegates.

Rules Committee's Considerations

First, it is important to note that Senate meetings are open meetings; all staff members are welcome to attend. Second, the delegates from students, graduate students and staff serve, in large part, as liaisons between Faculty Senate and their own representative bodies. That is, a staff delegate represents, in a sense, the Staff Senate, not a particular classification of staff. Accordingly, only one delegate is necessary. It is up to each of the representative bodies to ensure that all of their constituents are fairly represented and adequately informed. Moreover, the new language makes the representation consistent with a single delegate each from the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Senate.

PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS

Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws (Art I, Sec 2)*:

138 There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting
 139 members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the
 140 Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments,
 141 one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and
 142 representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full
 143 or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one
 144 delegate from the Student Government Association and one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; one delegate from
 145 the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff.

Rules committee recommended change to the *Bylaws (Art I, Sec 2)*:

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [*comments bracketed and italicized*]

138 There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting
 139 members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the
 140 Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments,
 141 one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and
 142 representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full
 143 or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one
 144 delegate from the Student Government Association, ~~and~~ one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; **and**
 one delegate
 145 from ~~the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff~~ **the Staff Senate.**

Recommended Final Language (*Art I, Sec 2*)

There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments, one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one delegate from the Student Government Association, one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate, and one delegate from the Staff Senate.

Charge #5**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to the Committee on Judicial Review**

The bylaws provide no guidelines for handling reports from the Committee on Judicial Review. In the past, decisions rendered by the Judicial Review have been treated as the “final word,” but this may be in violation of Robert’s Rules, and certainly violates the spirit of shared governance. As a standing committee on the Faculty Senate, Judicial Review should submit its reports to the Senate and its recommendations should not become Senate Actions (or Internal Actions) until there has been an affirmative vote in the Senate. Rules should then research the issue and propose language that will clarify the bylaws.

Rules Committee Considerations.

The Rules Committee agreed with the chief concern expressed within the *Charge pertaining to Committee on Judicial Review (JRC)*. That is, historically, the JRC had been charged to interpret the Senate’s Constitution and Bylaws and deliver its report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate. According to the current *Bylaws*, reports of the JRC could be reviewed by the Chair, who could immediately charge the Rules Committee to act according to the JRC decision without informing the Senate body.

In the interest of transparency and shared governance, the Rules Committee concluded that the charge submitted to the JRC, conclusions reached by the JRC, and subsequent charges from the Chair of the Faculty Senate to the Rules Committee should be communicated to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner. At that point, the Faculty Senate would have opportunity to consider the actions of the JRC and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

The Rules Committee’s language specifies that the Chair of the Faculty Senate should “ensure the report of” JRC relevant information. This language provides the Senate Chair an option of either directly reporting to the Faculty Senate or inviting the JRC to deliver a report.

PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS

Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws* (Art I, Section 9B (6) and Art I Sec 5 (10)):

843 (6) Committee on Judicial Review

845 (a) Purpose

847 (aa) Shall adjudicate in questions of interpretation of the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty.

849 (bb) Shall consider questions originating from any faculty member when presented through the
Chair of the Faculty Senate.

852 (cc) Shall serve as a panel of election judges in the annual primary and annual general elections
for Faculty Senate membership.

855 (b) Membership

857 Shall be composed of the three next most immediate past chairs of the Faculty Senate who do not hold full time administrative positions. The most immediate past chair of the Faculty Senate who is serving on this committee shall serve as chair of the committee.

Section 5-A-(10) Duties of the Officers and Past Chair of the Faculty Senate [lines 421-3]

A. The Chair of the Faculty Senate

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee to determine if any decisions may require a revision to the bylaws of the Faculty and, if so, shall issue a charge to the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules.

Rules committee recommended change to the Bylaws 5-A-10 (mostly added language):

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [comments bracketed and italicized]

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee ~~to determine if any decisions may require a revision to the bylaws of the Faculty and, if so, shall issue a charge to the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules.~~ **(JRC) and ensure the report of the following to the Faculty Senate within two meetings following a decision: 1) the initial charge considered by the JRC; 2) the determination reached by the JRC; 3) any resulting charge(s) from the Faculty Senate Chair to the Rules Committee emanating from a JRC decision. In addition, the Senate Chair should remind the Faculty Senators of their right to propose action relevant to the determination reached by the JRC.**

Rules committee recommended final language *Art I Sec 5 (10)*

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee (JRC) and ensure the report of the following to the Faculty Senate within two meetings following a decision: 1) the initial charge considered by the JRC; 2) the determination reached by the JRC; 3) any resulting charge(s) from the Faculty Senate Chair to the Rules Committee emanating from a JRC decision. In addition, the Senate Chair should remind the Faculty Senators of their right to propose action relevant to the determination reached by the JRC.

Charge #6**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to CGEIP**

Unlike Graduate Council and EPPC, CGEIP is not empowered to propose modifications to those portions of the Bylaws (ART IV) that guide its operation. CGEIP has expressed the desire to re-structure so as to better leverage both faculty interest and experience. Rules should work with CGEIP to update the text of ART IV, and should consider adding a provision allowing CGEIP to directly propose future modifications.

Rules Committee recommendations and considerations

The committee consulted with CGEIP leadership and concluded that the necessary changes are so substantive and involved that an *ad hoc* committee appointed to look into the issue would better serve the university. The recommendations of that committee could then help inform a charge to Rules next year. We also believed it was be a good idea to notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate immediately, rather than wait for our final report, so that he could form an ad hoc committee if he agreed it was appropriate to do so.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

Charge #7

Rules Committee Charge pertaining to a glossary for the Bylaws

Consider generating a **glossary** of terms used in the Bylaws.

Rules Committee recommendations and considerations

The Committee believes a glossary would be helpful. However, instead of appending the glossary to the Constitution and Bylaws, the Committee felt it would be more appropriate to maintain the glossary as a separate document. To ensure that the Glossary is helpful to future committees, an electronic copy of it should be placed in the Rule's Committee's Electronic archives, in the Faculty Senate Office, and on The Faculty Senate's website.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

Charge #8**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to a Senior Instructors**

Consider the desirability of adding Senior Instructor to the rank representatives and propose language to define the eligibility and election process.

Rationale: Under our current system Instructors and Senior Instructors share a Representative. There are currently about 90 Instructors and 60 Sr. Instructors. Although the concerns and conditions of both groups overlap, there are also significant differences. At least on the surface, the numbers seems to indicate this could be a useful change.

Rules Committee's Considerations

The Committee agrees that Instructors and Senior Instructors should have their own representative. First, it was instructors and senior instructors themselves who initially raised this issue. We give much weight to their concerns that they could be better represented separately. Moreover, the distinction between these two groups is a meaningful one with each group having different concerns, perspectives, and time horizons. Finally, it should be noted that the promotion to senior instructor has never lived up to what was originally promised and intended. Ideally, separate representation in the Faculty Senate could serve as an initial step in rectifying that problem.

However, creating a separate representative for Senior Instructors would require a substantive change to the Constitution as well as a change in the Bylaws. Appropriately, changing the Constitution is a more difficult task and involves a vote of the entire ranked faculty. It is the Committee's belief that such an undertaking would work better if the faculty had more information about Instructors' and Senior Instructors' concerns as well as more to time consider this issue. Accordingly, the Committee believes this issue should be addressed in the next academic year. The new Chair of the Faculty Senate, if they so decide, can give the Committee on Rules a new charge at that time.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

Requests to the Faculty Senate from the Ad Hoc Committee

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on CGEIP requests that Faculty Senate recommend to the Rules Committee the following two items:

1. The Committee recommends the following wording for the Faculty Senate's charge to CGEIP:

The purpose of CGEIP is to act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, to regularly review the assessments of current general education courses, as well as to act upon courses and programs offered by academic units in two or more colleges (i.e., intercollegiate programs not routed to Educator Preparation Provider Council or Graduate Council).

2. The Committee recommends the membership of CGEIP be changed as follows:
 - CGEIP membership will be formed with one representative from each department that offers a course in the General Education program.
 - This representative will be elected by the department.
 - A department is not required to elect a representative, rather this is an option available for the departments that offer a course in the General Education program.
 - The Library will also have the option to elect a representative to CGEIP as a voting member.

[Nota Bene: The Committee was intent that every college should be represented on CGEIP. Every college will be represented if every department that has a course in the General Education program sends a representative, *except for the Library*. This point of the recommendation addresses this concern.]
 - A member's term will be three years, but there will be no limit to the number of terms a member can serve.
 - Non-voting Ex Officio members will include:
 - Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
 - Provost's Designate
 - Director of the Center for Assessment and Institutional Support
 - Academic Outreach
 - A representative from SGA
 - Leadership of CGEIP will be elected from and by the members of CGEIP, and will include the following offices:
 - Chair—the Chair should receive a one-course reassignment per semester
 - Chair-Elect
 - Secretary

Report on the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on CGEIP

Preliminary Remarks

The Faculty Senate formed the Ad Hoc Committee on CGEIP, with the following charge:

The ad hoc committee to evaluate the purpose and operation of CGEIP is charged to investigate and recommend to Faculty Senate what it sees as the proper role of CGEIP in the curricular process and to investigate and recommend ways to make the work of CGEIP more efficient and effective in carrying out its duties

The Ad Hoc Committee consisted of the following members:

- Rich Biagioni, Chemistry
- LeAnn Brazeal, Communication
- Tom Dicke, History, Chair of Faculty Senate, (*ex officio*)
- Keri Franklin, Office of Assessment / English
- Sarah Lancaster, Environmental Plan Sciences and Natural Resources
- Josh Smith, Biomedical Sciences, Provost Fellow for General Education Transition (*ex officio*)
- John Strong, Religious Studies (Chair)

The Ad Hoc Committee held five meetings:

1. February 6, 2019
2. February 20, 2019
3. March 6, 2019
4. March 22, 2019
5. March 27, 2019

Summary of the Discussions of the Committee Leading to the Two Requests

The Committee's initial meeting established the main issues concerning the role and operations of CGEIP.

1. Assessment of General Education Courses:
This was felt by the Committee to be the key issue facing CGEIP. The Committee discussed this issue extensively in second and third meetings, and decided 1) CGEIP was the proper committee to review the assessment of General Education courses, resulting in the change in the wording of the Faculty Senate charge to CGEIP; and 2) that the process that CGEIP uses to assess General Education courses should be decided upon in collaboration with the Office of Assessment. This office has provided proposals for this

process, which CGEIP is currently examining.

2. The General Goals and Student Learning Outcomes of the General Education Program: The Committee had concerns that there were too many General Goals, and that the Student Learning Outcomes may be superfluous. It was decided in the fourth meeting by the Committee that this was outside of Faculty Senate's charge to the Ad Hoc Committee, and that this discussion should be taken up by CGEIP.
3. The Membership of CGEIP: The concern of the Committee was that the membership as it is currently constituted does not effectively represent University units that are invested in the General Education program. Some colleges do not offer many General education courses, and as such, their representatives either do not attend, or are not invested in the discussions of CGEIP. On the other hand, some colleges are very invested in the General Education program, but they are effectively under represented. The result is that it is not always easy to engage the members of CGEIP in the issues facing the General Education program.

This issue was discussed in the fourth and fifth meeting of the Committee. The principle was agreed upon that the membership of CGEIP should be formed at the department level, by departments that offer General Education courses. This discussion led to the Committee's second request of the Faculty Senate, regarding the membership of CGEIP.

Summary of Issues Referred Back to CGEIP:

- CGEIP, in consultation with the Office of Assessment, will establish a process by which it will assess General Education courses.
- CGEIP should discuss the General Goals of the current General Education program, as well as the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Specifically, the concern of the Committee is that there are too many General Goals, and that the Student Learning Outcomes may not be enhancing the General Education program.
- Additional issues that CGEIP should discuss:
 - What should, *what can*, the role of CGEIP be in regard to CORE 42?
 - What is CGEIP's role in regard to Dual Credit?

Submitted on behalf of the Committee

John Strong, Chair

March 29, 2019

Faculty Senate Resolution for Internal Senate Action

Whereas, the responsibilities and work of the Council on General Education & Intercollegiate Programs have increased significantly in the past few years and;

Whereas, the situation has reached the point where it has become difficult and sometimes impossible for the committee to fully meet the demands placed upon it and;

Whereas, the ad hoc Committee on CGEIP has identified possible solutions which require changes to the purpose and membership of CGEIP;

Therefore, Be it Resolved that Faculty Senate approve this report and refer it to the Rules Committee for their review and recommendation to the Senate.

The Status of Faculty Salaries and Benefits at Missouri State University 2019

AN ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

Committee Members

Reed Olsen, (CHPA), Chair
Antoinette Barffour (COAL)
Feibo Shao (COB)
Kennedy Ongaga (COE)
Ann Rost (CHHS)
Paula Kemp (CNAS)
Nathan Fent (COAG)
David Adams (Library)
Michel Bampoe (HR) *ex officio*
Saibal Mitra (FS) *ex officio*

Executive Summary

This report is the third report of the newly created Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. The committee offers the following brief executive summary:

- MSU faculty salaries compared to other Missouri public universities and a subset of MSU's peer universities tend to be smaller on average. Although, MSU salaries have tended to grow faster since 2004/2005 compared to other Missouri universities, when compared to our peer institutions, MSU salaries have generally grown at slower rates during that same time period (2004/2005)
- According to the Committee on Faculty Concerns Report on the Faculty Morale Survey, MSU faculty's satisfaction with benefits at MSU has worsened over time, especially since the last morale survey in 2016. Particular areas of concern are the health plan, the dental plan, Foster Recreation Center, and tuition reimbursement.
- MSU offers a wide variety of benefits that are mostly similar to benefits provided at other Missouri public universities and MSU's peer universities. There remain a significant number of differences in the details of those benefits especially with respect to health insurance and retirement benefits.
- MSU's health insurance as compared to other universities has worsened over the past year primarily because of large changes to the program, which increased premiums while simultaneously reducing benefits. One advantage of these changes was to introduce choice into the health plan for the first time.
- MSU's retirement system for new faculty, the state of Missouri defined contribution system (CURP) is underfunded as compared to MSU's peer universities.
- Feedback from faculty indicates that faculty generally would like to see an increase in MSU's tuition reimbursement benefit. Faculty would also like to see an increase in the benefit for Foster Recreation Center.

Purpose

The purpose of the Committee on Faculty Benefits is to maintain communication with personnel in the Office of Human Resources concerning current faculty benefits.

The Committee will prepare an annual report on the status of faculty benefits, to be submitted to the Faculty Senate during the Spring semester and presented no later than the April Session, that includes:

- A comparative review of benefits provided or available to faculty at MSU and benefits offered to faculty at other state and peer institutions.
- A review of data from the Faculty Concerns survey addressing satisfaction with faculty benefits.
- A summary of feedback solicited from the faculty about current and desired benefits.
- A list of Committee recommendations, if any.

Faculty Salaries

Table 1 through 5 in the appendix contains the data regarding faculty salaries at MSU compared to faculty salaries at other universities, both those within the state and those who are considered peers by MSU. For a discussion of peer institutions, see the President's web site:

<http://www.missouristate.edu/President/peergroup.htm>, which identifies members of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU) as a peer group. More than 50 universities are a member of CUMU, so the committee chose a subset of CUMU to gather data on outside Missouri.

Table 1 contains average 9 month salaries for MSU, other public institutions in Missouri, and the subset of CUMU peers in 2004/2005; Tables 2 and 3 contains the same data for 2015/2016 (our last report) and 2016/2017 which is the most recent academic year for which data is available. Finally, Tables 4 and 5 present percentage changes in faculty salaries over the entire time period and over the year from our last report.

Notice that data is presented overall and by rank for each university. The following are the main findings from this data:

- MSU tends to have lower average salaries than the four universities in the University of Missouri system and also lower than the 13 peer institutions in Tables 1 through 5. This is true both overall and for each faculty rank.
- MSU tends to have comparable or slightly higher faculty salaries than the five other regional public universities in Missouri in the tables. Note that some of the institutions in this category have higher faculty salaries and others lower salaries compared to MSU.
- Table 4 illustrates that MSU faculty salaries grew by 30.04% overall in the 12 years from 2004/2005 to 2016/2017. The lowest growth rate over that time period was for professor salaries

(29.58%) and the highest was for Assistant Professors (36.85%). Table 5 illustrates that MSU faculty salaries grew by 0.45% overall from 2015/2016 to 2016/2017.

- Compared to other institutions in Missouri, MSU tended to have higher overall increases in salaries from 04/05 to 16/17. This is especially true for the 5 regional universities in Missouri, who averaged only 20.02% increase over the time period.
- However, MSU's salary increases in Table 5 were smaller overall than was true for our peer universities.
- In contrast, Table 5 shows that while MSU's salary growth over the last year of data is lower than both the MU system and the other Missouri regional schools, the salary increases are in the same range for all three groupings. However, MSU's salary increases in this year were much smaller than were the salary increases for MSU's peer universities.

Thus, it is fair to say both that MSU tends to continue to have lower salaries compared to our peers and other Missouri universities, but that we have made some progress towards equality over the past decade. It remains problematic whether that progress will continue especially given both the results from the last recorded year in the data and because of continued budgetary problems in funding higher education in Missouri.

Although not included in the Tables in the appendix, the committee also calculated changes in real salaries over this time period (i.e., after subtracting the impact of increasing prices). Real salary changes help give us an estimate of the buying power of our actual salaries. MSU real salaries have stayed mostly flat from 2004/2005 to 2016/2017, with a small approximately 3 percent increase in real salaries. In contrast, UM system and Missouri regional universities real salaries have actually decreased over that same time period by 3 percent and 4 percent, respectively. On the other hand, real salaries for MSU's peers have increased much more than they have for MSU over the same time period, by 5 percent on average.

Satisfaction with Faculty Benefits and Salary

The Faculty Concerns Committee presented their report of the biannual Faculty Moral Survey in the March 2019 session of the faculty senate. Table 6 presents selected (relevant) results from the 2018 Faculty Morale Survey. The questions included relate either to faculty salaries or to faculty benefits.

Quoting from the 2016 report from the Faculty Concerns Committee on the morale survey:

“While faculty generally scored their MSU benefits as between “neutral” and “somewhat satisfied”, the ratings in all benefit categories in 2016 were all lower than those from 2014 with the exception of vision benefits as this is a new for MSU employees and there is no basis for comparison.”

Hence, faculty satisfaction with benefits generally are lukewarm and worsening over time. Notice that this trend of worsening satisfaction with benefits increased even further in the 2018 report, with faculty satisfaction for every type of faculty benefit being lower in the 2018 survey.

Finally, notice in Table 6 that there exists a fair amount of dissatisfaction by faculty regarding salaries. Unfortunately, the Faculty Concerns Committee deleted some of the questions related to salaries that had been present in earlier years of the survey. That makes it more difficult to examine faculty attitudes towards salaries. However, Table 6 illustrates that faculty generally think that faculty salaries are below those of peer institutions (which is correct according to Tables 1 through 5). Likewise, faculty do not believe that future salary prospect are positive. In fact, the Faculty Concerns Committee in its 2018 report notes that: “perhaps the most prominent result of the survey is evidence of faculty discouragement with regard to compensation.”

Benefits Review

The remaining tables in the appendix present data regarding the charge to the committee to review the benefits “provided or available to faculty at MSU and benefits offered to faculty at other state and peer institutions.” Table 7 summarizes the types of benefits available at MSU and the comparison universities. Table 7 illustrates that MSU has most of the types of benefits provided at other universities in the study with the exception of family leave. MSU provides the bare minimum of family leave required the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), which requires up to 12 weeks of unpaid family leave. However, nine of the other universities listed (including the entire MU system) do include more generous family leave policies than MSU.

Table 8 presents the major current benefits available at MSU. The previous section illustrated an increasing dissatisfaction with benefits at MSU over previous years. That is not particularly surprising as MSU substantially changed their health benefits in the Fall of 2018. The changes included (1) a significant increase in premiums, (2) a significant decrease in benefits, and (3) for the first time a choice in the type of plans employees could choose. Such significant changes to health care benefits were not found in most of the other university health benefits.

One of the main issues that the committee sees in reviewing the data in Tables 8 through 24 regards retirement plans. It is common for universities to offer both defined contribution and defined benefit retirement plans. Notice that the other regional schools in Missouri have the same retirement choices as does MSU although the University of Missouri has a different retirement system. Missouri's retirement system does not compare favorably to retirement plans available at other institutions (outside of the regional institutions in Missouri that have the same system as MSU.)

For example, it is common for universities to offer both a defined benefit and a defined contribution plan to faculty but those two options are a choice, which is not generally true at MSU. For example, Mosers requires new employees to be on the defined contribution plan (CURP) initially and are only able to make a change after some years of service. One of the problems here is that MSU's Human Resources has not in the past informed faculty when they are eligible to shift to the defined benefit plan (MOSERS); this policy is in the process, hopefully, of changing.

Feedback from Faculty

The Committee on Faculty Benefits worked with others to create a webpage that explained the committee's purpose. The webpage also has a form that faculty can fill out if they have concerns related to faculty benefits. The form is anonymous although some faculty have added their names to their comment.

We received fewer comments from faculty this year than we had in the previous report but about the same number as in the original year of our report. Some of the comments dealt with specific problems that the faculty member had with receiving benefits. The most common theme in the faculty comments related to the tuition reimbursement benefit received by all employees. The consistent comment here is that the current level of tuition reimbursement was inadequate with a variety of recommended solutions including allowing larger reimbursements for Greenwood and the on-campus childcare facility.

Unsurprisingly, there were also comments relating to the major changes to our health benefits. For example, there were complaints about the lack of communication to faculty about the changes, especially about how quickly the changes were made. Some faculty were concerned that the changes made seemed to favor faculty with children over faculty without children. There were also concerns about the dental benefits, especially as it related to the lack of coverage of orthodontic treatment.

Finally, there was increasing concern reflected in the comments regarding faculty use of Foster Recreation Center. Notice that this is consistent with the Faculty Morale Survey results presented in Table 6, where the satisfaction with the recreational services and facilities dropped from a mean of 3.68 two years ago to only 1.49 in the current survey. Satisfaction with recreation facilities and services was by far the lowest satisfaction on any benefit in the survey.

Committee Recommendations

Based upon the data gathered by the committee and presented in this report, the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee presents the following Resolutions and Senate Actions for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas, the Faculty Morale Survey continues to indicate poor faculty morale related to all of the measures of salary and,

Whereas, MSU salaries continue to significantly lag behind salaries at our peer universities and

Whereas, MSU salaries continue significantly lag behind salaries at the University of Missouri campuses and

Whereas, MSU salaries have just barely kept pace with increases in inflation since 2004/2005, therefore

Be it Resolved that the MSU administration must focus on adequate compensation for MSU faculty that both increases salaries relative to inflation in each year and also increases MSU faculty salaries comparable to our peers with the ultimate goal of bringing MSU salaries in line with our peer institutions.

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas, employees of Missouri State University are currently entitled to assign 15-credit hours of tuition waiver per year to their dependents and;

Whereas, employees of Missouri State University are not currently allowed to apply all of their tuition waiver to dependents attending Greenwood School, nor to dependents enrolled at the Child Development Center. therefore

Be it Resolved that Missouri State University allow all employee credit waivers to be applied to all educational settings at the university, including college tuition, Greenwood School, and the Child Development Center.

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas, employees of Missouri State University are currently entitled to assign 15-credit hours of tuition waiver per year to their dependents and

Whereas, in time of decreased revenue and growth, the additional faculty benefit of tuition waivers for dependents would be an incentive for new employees and

Whereas, in a time of limited salary incentives, faculty benefit of tuition waivers for dependents would serve as an incentive for continued employment at Missouri State University therefore

Be it Resolved that Missouri State University consider review and revision of the current tuition waiver plan to include a “step approach,” with added hours of tuition waiver above and beyond the basic 15-credit hours per year, based upon faculty years of service and employment at Missouri State University.

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas, faculty have expressed significant levels of dissatisfaction with recreation facilities and services in the bi-annual faculty morale survey and

Whereas, faculty have also expressed dissatisfaction to the Committee on Benefits via the committee’s system faculty feedback, therefore

Be it Resolved that Missouri State University expand faculty access to the Foster Recreation Center by either reducing the price to faculty of membership or by making membership a free benefit to faculty.

Report from the ad hoc Committee on Summer Compensation for Faculty

Distributed to Faculty Senate: April 2019

Committee Members:

Cindy MacGregor, Committee Chair, Past Chair of Faculty Senate

W.D. Blackman, COAL

Tim Flannery, CHPA

Steve Foucart, CFO

Julie Masterson, Dean, Graduate College

Arbindra Rimal, CoAg

Timson, Benjamin, CHHS

Huang, Shyang, CNAS

Guests: Frank Einhellig and Shawn Wahl (invited to final two meetings)

Charge from Tom Dicke, Chair of Faculty Senate 2018-2019

The Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Compensation for Faculty is charged to investigate and recommend equitable and flexible methods of compensating faculty for summer teaching, particularly for high or low enrolling courses.

Overview of the Issues

There are several issues related to our current system of funding faculty to teach during the summer session. ***College cost center allocations*** for summer faculty compensation constrict the resources available for summer courses. Deans can address this constraint by using money from their overall budget; this is problematic because resources redirected into the summer shift fiscal constraints into the regular academic period. *How can cost centers have more money for summer faculty compensation while assuring that such investment from the university will generate additional revenue above the cost of compensating faculty?*

Furthermore, the current system ***complicates compliance with the Faculty Handbook***. The *Faculty Handbook* prescribes faculty are paid at least 2.5% of their base salary per credit hour taught, provided minimum enrollments are met. No other exceptions to the 2.5% are allowed by the *Faculty Handbook*. Some faculty have reported they are given an arbitrary maximum they are to be paid for summer, without a clear calculation of justification. In some places, the compensation for faculty is based just upon the 2.5% plus fringe in order to create a minimum enrollment for the course to “breakeven” without assurance that the university is making money on course offerings. Furthermore, there is no consistent way in which the compensation is adjusted for faculty whose courses are below breakeven enrollment. *How can faculty be compensated for summer teaching in a manner that clearly and fairly complies with the Faculty Handbook?*

Some faculty report being ***limited to the number of courses they can teach*** during the summer. Some higher-paid faculty are told they “can’t teach during the summer because they cost too much.” Most colleges have a cap on how many summer courses each faculty member can teach. *How can faculty, who wish to do so, be able to teach more during the summer?*

Finally, the university has a focus on increasing revenue through building enrollment. Summer enrollments have been down in some recent years. The current funding and compensation system ***limits the number of courses offered*** during the summer to what cost centers can afford. Students cannot enroll in courses unless those courses are available. *How can more courses be offered in the summer while assuring that these offerings are generating revenue for the university?*

Committee's Process and Goals

The committee reviewed the problem, solicited additional perspective from other colleagues, and developed a proposed model they believe is worthy of piloting. These conversations resulted in a Triple Win Model. The goals of this model are to:

- (1) Direct more resources to colleges for summer faculty compensation while assuring a return on this investment for the university,
- (2) Create a clear and fair way of compensating faculty for summer instruction that includes a calculation of “minimum enrollments” and adjusts compensation for faculty who wish to teach below those minimums,
- (3) Allow faculty to teach as many summer courses as they want, regardless of high-salary or college caps on teaching, and
- (4) Facilitate the offering of more courses in the summer and, hopefully more student enrollment.

In simple terms, the model is intended to generate more summer courses (so students have more courses to take), more student hours of enrollment (thereby more income for the university), and more income for faculty from summer (for those who wish to teach).

Proposed Triple Win Model

More summer funding/more summer courses. More summer courses can only be offered if there is more money allocated to compensate faculty to teach. The Triple Win model includes additional allocations to the college cost center because the model protects the return on investment for university money. This assurance is possible because of a “university base revenue needed” amount included in the standard compensation formula.

Fair and consistent compensation. The Triple Win model includes a standard compensation formula that compensates faculty according to the *Faculty Handbook* by creating a minimum, or breakeven, enrollment for full compensation. The standard compensation formula includes a “university base revenue needed” amount so that typical courses generate revenue for the university. Full faculty compensation is reduced for enrollments below the minimum generated by the standard compensation formula. It should be noted that the university base revenue amount is also proportionately reduced for courses below the breakeven enrollment. The standard compensation formula is:

$$[(2.5\% \text{ of base salary}) + (2.5\% \text{ of base salary} \times \text{fringe percentage}) + \text{University Base Revenue Needed}] / \text{tuition rate per credit hour} = \text{breakeven number of students}$$

To facilitate implementation of the standard compensation formula, an Excel worksheet was created by a member of the committee. This worksheet provides precise, faculty-specific

minimum enrollments needed (for a breakeven number of students in order for the faculty salary to be fully-funded). This worksheet does not accompany this report, however, the Appendix shows the application of the standard compensation formula to some example salaries. The Excel worksheet also calculates the proportionate salary based on actual enrollment.

Unrestricted summer teaching. The model does not have caps on the number of courses a faculty member can teach during the summer. The model does not restrict high-paying faculty from teaching during the summer because their minimum enrollments are adjusted consistently.

Mission critical courses. Given that some courses are not likely to reach minimum enrollments but the offering of those courses are important to students in certain programs, the committee recommends an alternate compensation formula for such “mission critical” courses. This formula does not include the “university base revenue needed” amount in the calculations. The minimum enrollment is based just on the faculty member’s salary and fringe. These courses will not generate revenue for the university but will provide academic progress for students and allow new programs to offer summer courses during a time of initially low enrollment. A determination of “mission critical” would be at the discretion of the department head, and with approval by the dean. The department head should incorporate program faculty input in making a recommendation of “mission critical.” The mission critical formula is:

$$[(2.5\% \text{ of base salary}) + (2.5\% \text{ of base salary} \times \text{fringe percentage}) / \text{tuition rate per credit hour}] \\ = \text{breakeven number of students}$$

Extreme mission critical courses. In some rare cases, a course may be sufficiently critical to a program that it would be noted as “extreme mission critical.” In “extreme mission critical” courses the faculty member would be fully compensated, despite being paid more money than is being brought in from tuition. The determination of “extreme mission critical” would be at the discretion of the department head, with approval by the college dean and the Provost.

Profit-sharing. The full Triple Win model includes a profit-sharing layer. That layer returns profits to the faculty, departments, and colleges who used the Triple Win model for summer. The full version of the Triple Win model will be implemented after the success of the model is demonstrated through piloting and refinement. The committee worked with the Provost and Shawn Wahl (COAL dean) at the final two meetings to discuss a pilot within COAL.

Issues to Resolve

The PowerPoint presentation to Faculty Senate in March generated some questions and concerns from faculty in COAL. In addition, the committee chair sent an email on April 1st to solicit additional questions and concerns from the members of Faculty Senate who are part of COAL. The issues below are the summation of input from representatives in COAL, followed by responses from the ad hoc committee.

1. When will faculty know the “break-even” enrollment number for our summer courses?
The break-even enrollment is easy to calculate using the Excel worksheet developed by the committee. That spreadsheet was not distributed to the Faculty Senate but it would be a part of those involved in the pilot. Some examples can be seen in the Appendix.

2. When will faculty know whether the course is considered “mission critical” or not?
“Mission critical” is best answered within the department and/or college. The committee had in mind as “mission critical” those courses which are critical to students making academic progress within specific academic programs, as well as courses in new programs that might not meet enrollment minimums but need to be offered in order to grow the program. There are likely other courses and faculty-assigned administrative duties that should be considered mission critical and compensated accordingly.

3. If this is enrollment-based, what is the date at which enrollment is considered final for the purposes of salary? If it is the drop deadline (end of the first week of summer courses), what happens if the enrollment (and therefore salary) drops after the course has already started? I assume that faculty are permitted to choose not to teach a summer course if the enrollment-based salary falls too low, but what if the course has already started? *The committee was inclined to use the drop deadline (i.e., beyond which the student would not be refunded tuition) as the final enrollment number on which to base compensation. The PAF would then be submitted, using the Excel calculator to provide the compensation amount. If the college decides to use a date earlier than the drop deadline then, at the time of the PAF, if a minimum enrollment for full compensation had not been reached, the faculty salary could not go up if additional students enrolled in the course after that date. On the other hand, if students dropped, and compensation would have dropped, the salary is locked in at the PAF date. The PAF date might be a college-level decision.*

There would need to be an earlier deadline (perhaps two weeks before courses start) when a faculty member agrees to teach or not teach a course, understanding the enrollment could increase or decrease somewhat before the PAF date. This earlier deadline and faculty commitment would keep the course available to the students.

4. At the March presentation to Faculty Senate, a senator raised the question about the timing of courses being dropped using this model. There needs to be a determination, in advance of courses starting, as to when a faculty member commits to teaching the course (no matter the final enrollment). What will the deadlines be for a faculty member committing to teaching a course (so that summer course offerings are preserved for students)? *This would be a college-level decision for implementation of the model. There would likely be an early deadline at which a faculty member would commit to teaching, and a later deadline for generating the PAF. The earlier deadline provides assurance to students that courses remain on the schedule. The latter deadline would allow more students to register for the course, thus increasing the enrollment used to determine faculty compensation.*

5. How will negotiations about summer salary (per the *Faculty Handbook*) be conducted should a course not meet the “break-even” point? Can faculty negotiate with the DH, or are the new guidelines set in stone? *The committee discussed the need to maintain authority over the final compensation at the discretion of the administrators. The university has no systematic basis for determining faculty salaries for summer based on minimum enrollments. The breakeven enrollment numbers have been arbitrary and inconsistent across the university, and in some cases below what the enrollment would need to be in order to fund the faculty member teaching the course. Following a pilot, the model WILL need to be evaluated to see how it did not did not function. Faculty input on impacts, intended and unintended, will be essential to that evaluation.*
6. If a professor can’t make their full 2.5%/credit hour salary teaching one course but the overall enrollment through teaching another course would put the combination above the breakeven threshold, can the breakeven threshold be considered by combining the two courses? *This is not something that committee discussed but it has merit as possible policy for the model. Thus, if the faculty is teaching a total of 6 credit hours it seems logical that a total enrollment across the two 3-credit hour courses could be considered in order to provide full compensation for the faculty. In this way a combination of courses could be used, one with low enrollment and one with high enrollment, in order to fully fund the 2.5% faculty compensation.*
7. If faculty salaries are lowered for less than “break-even” enrollment, will they receive additional compensation for higher enrollments? *The original model included a profit-sharing layer for courses above the breakeven enrollment. There is strong faculty support for a profit-sharing layer being included in the model. Additional committee work is needed to address piloting, refinement, and profit-sharing.*
8. Putting this salary formula into effect and using real people's pay to do so is not really necessary: you could do all of the calculations to figure out how well the formula works (using the actual number of students who end up in each course and the salary of the professors teaching the course) without actually having to apply it to the real salaries that people receive. *This could certainly check for how the formula plays out on the compensation side. It would not mobilize more allocations to the college for summer faculty salaries or mobilize the offering of additional courses, two pieces the model is intended to generate. It would not mobilize high-paying faculty, having been denied summer teaching, to have the opportunity to do so. Nonetheless, this suggestion has merit for a future committee to consider.*
9. Some have pointed out that the equation essentially targets professors with more experience and higher salaries, since the higher the salary, the more students they will need in order to reach their regular pay level. Does this new funding formula have the potential of pricing out the full professors? *The current compensation system targets high-paying faculty by deeming them “too expensive” – sometimes they are replaced with adjunct instructors. The proposed model gives high-paying faculty the opportunity to teach but at a clear and consistent adjustment to their compensation. The “mission critical” designation could be applied to certain courses because they require low enrollments to provide quality instruction from highly-paid faculty to students.*

10. Why not establish a minimum enrollment be established for all courses, regardless of faculty salary or level of the course? This seems like it might be fairer than having a different minimum for each course taught by each faculty member. Faculty could teach at a prorated amount when their course was below this universal minimum. *Minimum enrollments are “used” in many places across the university now. What the committee found was no consistency on this matter. The proposed model includes a prorated amount for courses below a faculty-specific minimum. A future committee could simulate a university minimum enrollment model rather than a faculty-specific minimum.*
11. The piloting of the model in COAL came as a surprise to the faculty who serve on Faculty Senate and are from that college. *The conclusion at the last meeting of the committee, which included the COAL dean and the Provost, was that the model would be piloted in COAL for summer 2019. Feedback from Faculty Senate representatives from COAL indicates that the full piloting of the model in COAL needs to be delayed. A future committee should review this feedback before making final recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding piloting of the model.*

Recommendations

The ad hoc committee recommends that additional time be dedicated to work on the proposed model prior to implementation as a pilot. The current committee was formed by Tom Dicke; its existence ends with the end of his time as Chair of Faculty Senate.

The committee recommends the formation of a joint committee between Faculty Senate and university leadership. The chair of the current committee should be appointed as a joint decision between the incoming Chair of Faculty Senate (Saibal Mitra) and the Provost. The committee should focus on (a) a simulation pilot; (b) implementation policies (mission critical definition, contact deadline, PAF deadline); (c) profit-sharing layer; (d) additional input from faculty; (e) implementation and evaluation of college-level pilot; and (f) recommendations based on pilot.

Appendix re: Standard Compensation Formula

(Cost of faculty + University Base Revenue Needed)/Tuition = Breakeven Number of Students

Cost of Faculty = (2.5% of base salary) + (2.5% of base salary x fringe percentage)

University Base Revenue Needed = \$1315

Tuition:

Undergraduate tuition is \$212 per credit hour.

Internet tuition is \$295-16 (rate reduced by incentive + fringe) = \$279 per credit hour.

Graduate tuition is \$279 per credit hour.

Table 1. Breakeven Examples

Salary	Undergraduate Breakeven	Graduate Breakeven	Internet Breakeven
30,000	11	9	9
35,000	12	10	10
40,000	13	10	10
45,000	14	11	11
50,000	15	11	11
55,000	16	12	12
60,000	16	13	13
65,000	17	13	13
70,000	18	14	14
75,000	19	14	14
80,000	20	15	15
85,000	20	16	16
90,000	21	16	16

Note. The Excel worksheet would be used to generate actual breakeven enrollments needed for each faculty member based on their salary. The numbers above are offered only as examples and were generated using the Excel worksheet. All numbers of students were rounded up, no matter the decimal amount. Rounding may differ in the utilization of the model based on dean and department head discretion. **The formula is based on a “per credit hour of instruction” but the number of students needed remains the same no matter the number of credit hours taught.** Thus, a three-credit hour course would need the same number of breakeven students as a one- or four-credit hour course.

Example:

For a faculty member whose 9-month salary is \$70,000 their breakeven number of students to fully fund an undergraduate course is 18, no matter the number of credits taught.

Here is the formula for each credit hour:

Salary = \$70,000; **2.5%** of salary = \$1750

Fringe = 37.9% of \$1750 = \$663.25

Cost of Faculty per credit hour taught = \$1750 + \$663.25 = \$2413.25

Tuition: Each student is paying \$212 for one-credit hour of undergraduate instruction.

University Base Revenue Needed = \$1315

$(\$2413.25 + 1315) / 212 = 17.58$, i.e., **Breakeven Number of Students**

At a minimum enrollment of 18 students (17.58) this faculty member receives full 2.5% per undergraduate credit hour taught.

Here is the formula applied to a 3-credit hour course:

Salary = \$70,000; **7.5%** of salary = \$5250

Fringe = 37.9% of \$5250 = \$1989.75

Cost of Faculty for 3-credit hour course = \$5250 + \$1989.75 = \$7239.75

Tuition: Each student in the 3-credit hour undergraduate course is paying \$636 (\$212 x 3).

University Base Revenue Needed for undergraduate course = \$3945 (\$1315 per credit hour),

$\$7239.75 + 3945 / 636 = 17.58$, i.e., **Breakeven Number of Students** rounded to 18.