

**A REPORT FROM THE
AD-HOC SENATE
INTERNET INCENTIVE
COMMITTEE**

Committee Members

Victor Matthews, (CHPA), co-Chair

Saibal Mitra (CNAS), co-Chair

Beth Hurst (COE)

Colette Witkowski (MCHHS)

Nancy Gordon (FCTL)

John Turner (COAL)

Michael Burton (COAG)

Terrel Gallaway (CHPA)

Christopher Hines (COB)

Stephen Foucart (VP Financial Services)

Charge:

This committee is charged to recommend to President Smart two or more options for the redistribution of salary dollars recovered from the internet-instruction incentive salary savings. The fundamental goal is a solution that is equitable to all faculty and does not constrain the ability to offer or expand on-line course offerings. There is no preconceived mandate of what factors must be considered.

The committee will, however, consider a number of variables associated with this charge, such as the vital contributions of supplemental faculty, the importance of subsidizing course development and updating, the ways in which other modes of instruction are compensated, and the policies followed by institutions similar to our own.

Revisions and Clarifications to the Charge

1. The committee asked the administration for clarification about the amount of money to be transferred: Would it grow with online enrollments or be fixed at the current level? The administration said it would be the latter. The amount of money available for distribution is fixed, but ongoing, and equal to \$335,083.
2. The committee also asked the administration for clarification about how the funds might be used: Could the money be used to redress online supplemental faculty for their reduced compensation? The answer was “no.” Increasing the base pay of online or other regular faculty is acceptable. However, only full-time faculty would benefit since per course do not reside in a “faculty line.” Some alternative arrangement would have to be made for per-course faculty.
3. Working collaboratively with Faculty Senate leadership, President Smart indicated that a *status quo* option would also be acceptable. This option would leave the online stipend at \$40 per student for a 3 credit-hour course, with no reallocation of funds.

Issues Discussed:

During the committee’s deliberations, these points were raised:

1. In 2010, the Provost’s Office reassured the Faculty Senate that the long-standing practice of the “\$55 per student compensation for online teaching was established policy.”
2. The \$55 stipend was recently reduced to \$40 during a financial emergency. This cut reduced compensation for online faculty by roughly a half-million dollars. With the proposed second cut, the collective reduction would exceed \$800,000.
3. The current budget situation is not considered an emergency.
4. Long-time online faculty viewed the online stipend as established policy and a fundamental part of their compensation. It was considered neither temporary nor an ad-hoc incentive. It was a deliberate policy from the very beginning of online classes at MSU. These payments to faculty have only been recently referred to as primarily “incentives.” Contract letters have referred to these payments as “stipends” and not “incentive payments.” Many faculty members received verbal and/or written commitments referring to this stipend when they agreed to develop

or teach online courses. Finally, since tuition for online courses is higher, the stipend is easily sustainable and reasonably interpreted as permanent.

5. The rationale for the online stipend, as originally formulated and as later articulated in a 2010 report to the Senate, included recognition of increased workload, a belief that those who were responsible for developing and teaching online should share in the "profitability" of those courses, a way of encouraging faculty to accept a few students over the recommended cap, and to promote the high expectations and quality established by the university.
6. Note that for many long-serving faculty members, online courses were neither their passion nor part of their contract. They developed courses, and entire programs, to help the university and because of the promise of the internet-instruction stipends to compensate them for their additional work.
7. Note that, from the standpoint of facilitating the creation and staffing of numerous online classes and programs, the internet-instruction stipend has served to incentivize a rapid increase in course offerings, enrollment, and revenue.
8. Note that, from the standpoint of providing much-needed additional compensation in an era of declining state support and falling real salaries for faculty, the internet-instruction stipend has been an enormous success.
9. Note that students are currently charged a premium of \$83 per credit hour for online classes (\$249 more per 3-hour class). The increased fees for students and increased compensation for faculty have been linked from the very beginning. Online classes also allow MSU to reach students outside the Springfield area, as well as students who return home during the summer. All of these factors have helped generate millions of dollars in additional revenue for the university.
10. ALL faculty members, including those who do not teach online, have benefited from these much-needed additional revenue sources for the university.
11. Note that even without a second round of cuts, the internet-instruction stipend represents less than 5% of the revenue generated by online classes.
12. Note that inflation and increased tuition automatically cause the value of the stipend to shrink in both absolute terms and as a share of online student expenditures. Inflation alone has erased about 1/3 of the original \$55 stipend's value.
13. Note that appointment letters sent to new faculty hires over the last several years include the phrase "Your teaching assignment may include courses taught in off-campus locations and use of instructional modalities such as interactive television (ITV) and/or on-line courses."
14. Note that the success of the online model (premium pricing and additional faculty compensation) could be duplicated for other types of classes, including labs, certain

labor-intensive upper division seminars, and high-impact pedagogies. This may require further study.

15. Note that if \$335,000 of reallocated funds is used for across-the-board pay raises, there is absolutely no way to guarantee it would actually increase salaries in the long run. There is no benchmark, typical pay increase, or explicit salary policy by which to compare. Given that pay raises have not kept pace with inflation for the past 10 years, it is certainly possible that the transfer would simply help pay for the “raises” that market pressure, faculty concerns, and ethical leadership would have demanded anyway.
16. Note also that online faculty are supportive of policies to ensure high-quality online courses and programs. However, cutting online compensation may actually reduce quality. Quality assurance should instead be handled directly through course review and evaluation policies.
17. Consider the possible impact of a stipend reduction on faculty decisions to continue to teach online or continue to maintain current class sizes for online courses. Longtime online faculty report that, in many cases, online class sizes have grown substantially.
18. Consider that another reduction in the online stipend will have an inordinate impact on per-course instructors. Additionally, since they do not occupy a faculty line, the only way that they can be redressed is by raising their per-course pay—a consideration for the College Deans. Both of these factors are at odds with the committee’s charge to consider the “vital contributions of supplemental faculty.”
19. Consider how distribution of the reallocated funds could be used to increase the base pay of those full-time faculty members who have the lowest CUPA average salary.
20. Consider the possibility of using a portion of reallocated funds to (a) raise the amount of the start-up funding to develop an online course, (b) provide a payment to faculty who take additional training on teaching online courses (Blackboard Blackbelt program or Digital Professor Academy programs), (c) expanding start-up funding to include, replacement or substitute courses for online classes that had previously been taught by another faculty member, and/or (d) provide a payment to faculty who participate in “refresher” training after teaching online for several years.
21. Consider whether reallocated funds should be distributed exclusively to faculty members who teach online, whether it should be distributed across the board to all full-time faculty regardless of whether they teach online, or whether a formula should be developed to distribute the money based on a division of the funds and the number of online courses taught by faculty members.

Committee Recommendations:

The members of the committee, after considering several options, unanimously agreed that the *status quo* is the best of all possible options. The online stipend should not be reduced. Accordingly, no funds would need to be redistributed.

Rationale:

Important factors informing this recommendation include:

1. The Faculty Senate had previously been reassured that the longstanding practice of paying the online stipend was “established policy.”
2. It is important to honor the explicit and implicit promises Missouri State University made to online faculty.
3. Online supplemental faculty would be disproportionately harmed by the stipend reduction and would be excluded from various redistribution schemes.
4. The incentives created by online stipends have a demonstrated record of helping Missouri State University increase revenue.

In addition, the committee offers these final observations:

1. The online stipend was part of a well-thought-out strategy for developing online courses and programs at MSU. It has and continues to serve the university well. Though the policy has been revisited multiple times, stability would be welcome. The stipend should continue to be recognized as established policy.
2. If financial emergencies or evidence that the policy is counterproductive should arise, changes to the internet stipend should be made collaboratively in the spirit of shared governance. Considerable thought should be given to encouraging innovation, rewarding excellence, facilitating ongoing training and course refinement, and promoting academic integrity in online instruction.
3. As with all courses, issues beyond compensation remain. These include facilitating the creation of new courses beneficial to students, technological and pedagogical support for faculty, and encouraging ongoing improvements to existing courses. Such matters are beyond the charge of this committee but may be worth exploring in the future.

4. Across campus, there are many situations where extra compensation for additional work may be warranted. These include graduate education and heavy advising loads. Correcting all such problems is beyond the scope of this committee. Moreover, a beggar-thy-neighbor approach, such as stripping compensation from online faculty, is counterproductive to helping the faculty as a whole. It may prove better to emulate, rather than dismantle, the online stipend.

[The Committee on Policy Review recommends this final language go to ALC]

Proposed Guidelines for Department Head Searches

Proposed Guidelines:

Search Committee Membership

1. Department faculty shall elect a majority of the faculty members of the search committee. Other members may be appointed by the Dean to make sure all ranks and areas in the department are adequately represented on the committee, but in all cases appointed members shall comprise less than 50% of the committee membership.
2. The chair of the search committee shall be nominated by the members of the search committee, and, in no case, be an untenured faculty member. This nomination is subject to approval by the dean. Chairs of search committees shall be considered members of the committee.
3. No hiring authority (Dean or Provost) shall serve as a member of the committee or attend meetings of the committee.
4. Search committees should include as broad and representative a group as possible. Because experience and institutional memory are important factors in effective shared governance, in no case shall pre-tenure faculty form the majority of the search committee. The AAUP has addressed these issues directly:

The role of the faculty in the selection of an administrator other than a president should reflect the extent of legitimate faculty interest in the position. In the case of an academic administrator whose function is mainly advisory to a president or whose responsibilities do not include academic policy, the faculty's role in the search should be appropriate to its involvement with the office. Other academic administrators, such as the dean of a college or a person of equivalent responsibility, are by the nature of their duties more directly dependent upon faculty support. In such instances, the composition of the search committee should reflect the primacy of faculty interest, and the faculty component of the committee should be chosen by the faculty of the unit or by a representative body of the faculty ("Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators," 1981: <https://www.aaup.org/report/faculty-evaluation-administrators>).
5. Committee members from another department who are appointed by the Dean must have research/experience that is relevant to the department doing the search. These appointments from outside the department should occur only under rare circumstances (e.g., insufficient department size, need for relevant experience, or lack of diversity). Such non-departmental members of the search committee should be approved by the department faculty.

Search Committee Process

6. The search committee, and especially the chair, is responsible for assuring that the full faculty of the department is able to participate at various stages of the search process. This begins with

the vetting of the position announcement. A draft of the position announcement is initially developed by the search committee. The position announcement shall be discussed and vetted by the committee and by the department as a whole, prior to posting. AAUP guidelines state:

Prior to announcing a faculty vacancy, there should be agreement among all responsible parties on each major element of the position (e.g., rank, salary, and eligibility for tenure), how the position relates to the department's (or the equivalent unit's) likely needs for the future, the expectations concerning the professional work of the faculty member(s) being recruited, and the resources that will be provided to help the faculty member(s) meet those expectations. (AAUP and Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, "The Ethics of Recruitment and Faculty Appointments," 1993: <http://www.ccas.net/files/EthicStatement.pdf>).

7. After the date of first consideration has passed, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss all applicants, choosing those for whom a phone interview is to be recommended. This should be a large enough number of semi-finalists to ensure a diverse pool of applicants continues into the next stages of the consideration process.
8. After completion of phone interviews, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss and rank the semi-finalists, before scheduling campus visits. When feasible, the qualifications of the candidates being given strong consideration should be reviewed by all members of the department faculty, not just the members of the search committee. Individual departments may have processes uniquely appropriate to them, while maintaining the confidential nature of the applicant materials. The chair of the search committee shall assure that materials are available so faculty can participate in a comprehensive review of candidates being given serious consideration. The search committee will make recommendations for campus visits to the top candidates based on their review and the input of the broader departmental membership.
9. During the campus visits, the full faculty of the department will be included in the schedule of interview events, including at least one interview and a presentation. After the campus visits, the search committee shall meet as a group to discuss and rank the finalists, making a clear recommendation for each candidate. These recommendations, including rationale, shall include any candidates deemed by the committee to be unacceptable. Furthermore, the rationale for all acceptable candidates should include a delineation of strengths and weaknesses. In no case shall hiring authorities, committee chairs, or other committee members attempt to influence votes or solicit feedback privately. All faculty, staff, and student written feedback on candidates shall be made available to every member of the committee on the original forms in which they were submitted so as to ensure that the committee sees all responses in context. The recommendation of the committee shall be recorded and presented to the department, as shall the decision of the hiring authorities (i.e., Dean and/or Provost), particularly when they differ from the recommendation of the committee.
10. Before the offer is to be made, the search committee and hiring authorities shall meet with the faculty to discuss the rationale for wanting to offer a position to a particular candidate. Before any Department Head candidate can be offered a position, they must be deemed "acceptable" by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, who will have adequate opportunities to review the files of the finalists, including the CV and cover letter. All Department Head candidates shall, in on campus interviews, be expected to present their research/creative work as any other faculty candidate would be.

11. Because the expectation is that Department Heads are to be hired with tenure (Faculty Handbook, Section 3.8.2), the tenured members of the department shall vote on tenure for any prospective candidate, based on department criteria for faculty members in the department (not administrators), before an offer may be made. Per the *Faculty Handbook*, no job offer may be made to a candidate without an affirmative tenure vote of the tenured faculty of the department:

Tenure Upon Hire

An applicant for a position as Associate Professor or Professor may be offered tenure as a condition of initial employment only under the following circumstances: (1) the possession of academic credentials reflecting exemplary teaching and service experience, as well as excellence in research, including nationally recognized peer-reviewed publications in the applicant's academic discipline, and (2) an affirmative vote of a majority of the tenured faculty in the affected department.

12. Department faculty should be informed regarding the length of term for the contract offered the incoming DH.

Revisions Chapters 1 – Appendix B

3.8.1 Added military service to list of circumstances given consideration when stopping the tenure clock. Now reads: *Notwithstanding the above, the probationary period may be extended at the request of the faculty member for reason of medical condition, to accommodate important family care issues, or military service for a period not to exceed two additional years. Such extension will be based upon the recommendation of the Department Head/School Director, Dean, and with approval by the Provost in consultation with Human Resources.*

4.6.6.1 Last paragraph now reads: *In the case where an annual evaluation is completed only by the department head, the faculty member wishing to appeal their performance rating may request a review by the departmental personnel committee. A subsequent appeal may be made to the Dean of the College.*

8.1 4th Paragraph: The word appropriately added so paragraph now reads *...the University will respond appropriately to instances of discrimination, harassment or bullying.....*

12.4.1.1 University Hearing Committee: Thirty changed to 32 to reflect 4 faculty members from each college. The following language was added: *The Faculty Senate shall elect nominees from each college by plurality voting and two rounds of counting votes. The first count will elect the nominees with a plurality of votes to reach the minimum requirement of four faculty members per college. The second count, if needed, will elect the remaining nominees with a plurality of votes from all colleges until the annual one-third requirement of new members is obtained.*

Removing Index

Removing Gender Specific Terms: He, his, she, her will become their, they. This will be done on completion of the Handbook revisions.

Thanks to Senator Philpot for doing a close read for editorial changes.

The revised Faculty Handbook Attachment 4 is in a separate document.

CGEIP – New Business, Nov. 7, 2018 meeting**RE: Suggested change to SLOs**

Excerpt from General Education Goals and Learning Outcomes

(https://www.missouristate.edu/generaleducation/Goals_GenEd.htm)

Appendix A: Current General Goals and SLOs:

b. Physical Sciences

General Goal (11): Students will understand and actively explore fundamental principles in physical sciences and methods of developing and testing hypotheses used in the analysis of the physical universe.

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and planet earth, including its origin and physical processes.
2. Understand and use the processes by which knowledge of the physical world is generated.
3. Develop knowledge and principles of the physical world through hypothesis testing and gain the ability to draw defensible conclusions regarding the physical world.
4. Make logical connections between key concepts in the physical sciences and describe the interaction between human lives and the physical world
5. Understand the ways the environment impacts humanity and how human actions affect the environment.

Appendix B: Suggested Changes (CGEIP approved 11/7/18):

Bold represents the addition of a sixth SLO to the Physical Sciences specific learning outcomes (SLOs)

b. Physical Sciences

General Goal (11): Students will understand and actively explore fundamental principles in physical sciences and methods of developing and testing hypotheses used in the analysis of the physical universe.

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and planet earth, including its origin and physical processes.
2. Understand and use the processes by which knowledge of the physical world is generated.
3. Develop knowledge and principles of the physical world through hypothesis testing and gain the ability to draw defensible conclusions regarding the physical world.
4. Make logical connections between key concepts in the physical sciences and describe the interaction between human lives and the physical world
5. Understand the ways the environment impacts humanity and how human actions affect the environment.
- 6. Apply scientific models to make qualitative or quantitative prediction about the behavior of matter.**

Appendix C: Final General Goal (11) and SLOs for Physical Sciences:

b. Physical Sciences

General Goal (11): Students will understand and actively explore fundamental principles in physical sciences and methods of developing and testing hypotheses used in the analysis of the physical universe.

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and planet earth, including its origin and physical processes.
2. Understand and use the processes by which knowledge of the physical world is generated.
3. Develop knowledge and principles of the physical world through hypothesis testing and gain the ability to draw defensible conclusions regarding the physical world.
4. Make logical connections between key concepts in the physical sciences and describe the interaction between human lives and the physical world
5. Understand the ways the environment impacts humanity and how human actions affect the environment.
6. Apply scientific models to make qualitative or quantitative prediction about the behavior of matter.