

**Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes  
Fall Semester, Meeting #3  
Wednesday, October 3, 2018  
Russell 100, 3:00 pm**

**As approved at the October 17, 2018 meeting**

**Attending:**

**Stan Alluisi  
Daniel Althoff  
Brandon Burnette  
Han-Sheng Chen  
Randy Clark  
Diane Dixon**

**Steven Emge  
William Fridley  
Karl Frinkle  
Brad Ludrick  
Charles Matthews  
Kathy McDonald**

**Chris Moretti  
Josh Nannestad  
Patrick Reardon  
Rhonda Richards  
Michael Scheurman  
Kate Shannon**

**Not Attending:**

**Kathy Boothe, Kay Daigle**

**Guests:**

**Carolyn Fridley, Tim Smith**

**I. Call to Order and Welcome** by Chair Althoff at 3:02 p.m.

**II. Approval of the [Minutes from September 19, 2018](#)**

Senator Fridley moved that the minutes be accepted. Second by Senator Matthews. Vote: Yes – 17; No – 0; Abstentions – 1. Motion carried.

**III. Faculty Senate Committee Reports**

**A. Budget Committee:** Did not meet and no report. There were no issues from the Senate for the budget committee.

**B. Committee on Committees (CoC):** Senator Ludrick reported that Charla Hall is appointed for one-year term for Organized Research and Program Review Committee.

[The CoC met on September 14.](#)

At the Executive Committee meeting with the President, members of Administration and the AAUP Executive Committee, Senator Ludrick asked about the Chief Information Officer (CIO) position and whom to contact for items related to the Information Technologies Organizational Structure document. There are currently several individuals representing the CIO position but no one point of contact.

**C. Executive Committee:** The Executive Committee met on September 25, 2018, with President Burrage, VP Clark, VP Westman, AVP Phillips and Alan Burton as well as AAUP Executive Committee. Items discussed included questions about CIO position, details related to budget situation, compensation and enrollment. Senator Moretti took notes and they were sent to FS for review. Senator Fridley moved that the notes taken by Moretti be accepted. Second by Senator Ludrick.

Discussion – one correction by Senator Fridley - MSEICD – Early Intervention Child Development. And also to add additional attendees. Senator Moretti will send Word document to Fridley.

Vote: Yes - 17; No – 0; Abstentions – 0. Motion carried and approved document will be submitted to the President Burrage’s office for review, before posting on the website.

Senator Ludrick noted that at the very end of the meeting on September 25, 2018, VP Clark mentioned a CUPA based system where each discipline uses a percentage as a guideline.

Next meeting of Executive Committee is October 24, 2018.

**D. Personnel Policies Committee:** Did not meet.

Senator Fridley moved that we resend the [Intellectual Property proposal](#) to VP Clark which was originally sent on April, 11, 2018, and request it be included in the APPM 7.10.3 Second by Senator Matthews.

Discussion – none.

Vote: Yes – 17; No – 0; Abstentions – 2. Motion carried.

**E. Planning Committee:**

Senator Dixon presented [four proposed motions for the FS Awards](#), a re-working of the proposals that were originally brought the FS at the September 19, 2018, meeting.

**Proposal 1: To remove the faculty at large vote. The schools will vote on the nominees from their school. (There would be only one vote).**

Presently we have a vote by the faculty at large, top nominees from each school, and then vote by school. The Planning Committee proposes to remove the faculty at large vote for all categories. There will still be an at large nomination.

Senator Dixon moved that proposal be accepted. Second by Senator Ludrick.

Discussion – Yes, this is a change to the current policy posted on the website. If approved, it will be changed on the website. It was noted that the faculty at large vote was initiated so that faculty senators would not vote just for faculty senators. We are not going back to that plan, but the vote will go to the individual school. However, there is still concern for a large spread of votes. Senator Dixon stated that the second proposal should take care of the issue of a large spread of votes. It was asked if the runoff vote would have all original except a few. For example, 15 people with 1 vote, etc. Suggestion for example is 10 people have 2 votes, select the top 3 based on the number of nominations. Dixon said that that the 2<sup>nd</sup> place vote could help with the elimination process.

Vote: Yes – 18; No – 0; Abstentions – 2. Motion carried.

**Proposal 2: If the winner doesn't have at least 3 votes, then a run-off of the top nominees takes place.**

Senator Dixon moved that proposal be accepted. Second by Senator McDonald.

Discussion – has there been any discussion to use instant run-off voting where you rank the candidates? The technical term is *instant runoff voting*. Goal is to get a majority behind one candidate. This type of voting is good, but for the purposes of the FS award vote, it might not be applicable. There still is no prevention of faculty members nominating and voting for themselves. They could also nominate themselves more than one time.

Further explanation of the instant runoff process to distinguish between very similar candidates – rank the candidates, if one wins, that is good. If there is a tie, take out the bottom votes, then on the second round of voting is based on ranks, the bottom votes goes to their second rank vote. Something similar to this was used by FS election in the past, but it may have not made it into the bylaws. The cloning system would solve the problem and would not require a revote. Ranking is built into Survey Monkey. A mathematical system would need to be established for the system to work. The cloning system would seek a greater than 50% vote. With the tie being between 6-8 people and not just 2, this is an issue. However, if forced to rank, the chances of this not working would be small. When using this system, you must get to a majority vote for it to work. Faculty, students and alumni can nominate. It was suggested that the announcement on Blackboard caused the large jump in nominations.

Could possibly set up the nomination process where a response is necessary to win. Could possibly set up a character count minimum on the nomination. The issue may be with the ease of nomination. Make this required on the form so that the responsibility is on the nominator. Possibly language should say number and quality of nomination is considered with this component there would be more responsibility on planning committee.

Senator Dixon asked to ignore the second proposal. Senator Moretti moved to postpone Proposal 2 to next FS meeting. Second by Senator Matthews.

Vote: Yes – 19; No – 0; Abstentions – 0. Motion carried.

**Proposal 3: To remove the faculty at large vote. During the school-wide vote it is determined if faculty has a nomination and vote in each category. One nominee may be selected from each school. Nominees are determined by the highest overall total number of votes in all three categories voted by the faculty of each school. The Senate then votes on nominees from schools to determine the winner.**

Senator Dixon moved that proposal be accepted. Second by Senator Matthews.

Vote: Yes – 19; No – 0; Abstentions – 0. Motion carried.

**Proposal 4: The Adjunct Professor of the Year be determined by the number of nominations rather than a vote by the faculty who probably don't know most of the nominees.**

Fourth proposal – adjunct award – there was an issue last year with the number of nominations and the final winner. The person with the most nominations – a large number – did not win.

Senator Dixon moved that Proposal 4 be accepted. Second by Senator Matthews.

Discussion: Concern that the adjunct should be treated different than the other faculty. Possibly make the adjunct instructor award for those who are ONLY adjuncts and hold no other role at SE. If FS only votes, they are not biased since adjuncts are not on FS. We could also excuse FS from winning the awards. Maybe it could be a vote based totally on nomination with name removed. Concern on time commitment and how to “scrub” the nomination for anonymity.

Senator Dixon moved to postpone Proposal 4 to next FS meeting. Second by Senator Matthews.

Vote: Yes - 18; No – 0; Abstentions – 1. Motion carried.

**F. University Affairs Committee:** Did not meet. No report.

#### **IV. Old Business**

##### **A. Report from FS Chair on items from meeting of September 19, 2018**

Chair Althoff noted that the following items require follow up action by him from minutes:

Treasurer’s report – Chair Althoff has not made inquiries about deductions for FS awards and also has not explored possibility of allocating award to other categories.

Budget committee requested ad hoc committee. Chair Althoff needs clarification from budget committee on which issue the ad hoc committee should address. Althoff has not met with VP Westman regarding budget based on last year or not; have not explored student fees. These issues did not come up at September 25, 2018, meeting.

Personnel Policies Committee issues from 4.E. at September 19, 2018, FS meeting. VP Clark indicated in regard to number of candidates to bring in there is no policy and it is based on individual situation. Some departments are told one and other departments are bringing in more. VP Clark disputed that in the meeting. Tim Smith, guest, said that in his department he was told that funding would be provided for at least one candidate. Zoom was used for initial screening. They covered local funding with other sources. Smith said that VP Clark had limited funds and indicated they may have to take it out of departmental funds. Money from last summer’s interviewees came from another fund in VP Clark’s office. But they were asked to limit it to one. May have been due to time frame and amount of money at the end of the year. Chair Althoff will follow-up with VP Clark on this issue as well as the reference to \$1,000 premium to develop online course which may be a conflict to APPM, 7.10.3.

The salary proposal was emailed to President Burrage following approval at the September 19, 2018, FS meeting.

#### **V. New Business**

No new agenda items received. It was mentioned that FS address faculty adjunct pay at the shared governance forum. This also was discussed at September 25, 2018, meeting with President Burrage and the Executive Committee. There was a recommendation from the budget committee for an ad hoc committee and adjunct pay may be addressed there, however more details are

needed. Chair Althoff will talk with Budget Committee and possibly Personnel Policies Committee.

It would be helpful to know how much money is available before we make requests. We could request an amount to work with so that we can decide a recommendation based on the amount of money available. It was suggested that FS should recommend reasonable pay to give FS a long-term record of being underpaid. Currently \$1M is being spent on adjuncts but it is unsure if that includes Faculty overload pay and summer pay.

There needs to be a proposal for adjuncts and staff before the president moves forward with faculty pay increases or incentives. Part of the discussion has to also be a way to make the increase equitable. Ad hoc committee should address this.

There was discussion on moving raises to January based on enrollment and collections. The rationale is that the bulk of revenue comes by September 30 and also do not know state allocations until December. The model is less about planning ahead and more about incentives based on enrollment. If these are raises and not stipends, they would stay year to year.

We have a large number of freshmen. There was a survey discussed at September 25, 2018, meeting with President Burrage and it has been developed and is ready to be distributed. If FS is interested, Senator Frinkle has copies of the survey available. Meg Cotter-Lynch has student workers who will transcribe and tabulate the results. The survey asked for classification so that we can pull out first-time freshmen for analysis. The instructions indicate that if the student has already taken the survey, please do not take again.

The survey highlights how administration and faculty being together brought out the great idea to do a survey in class. This was a great dynamic of all being together—this was a faculty-driven solution.

Shared at the chair's meeting – increase in freshmen is 27% from DHS. But they do not know why.

## **VI. Adjournment**

Senator Alluisi moved to adjourn. Second by Senator Scheuerman.  
Approved by Acclamation.