

Faculty Senate Agenda

11/2/2018
9-10 a.m.
SUB 113 AB

Attendance: Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Atish Mitra, Katherine Zodrow, Diane Wolfgram, Dan Autenrieth, Tony Patrick, Chad Okrusch, Matt Donnelly, Peter Lucon, Stella Cappocia, Miriam Young, Laura Young, George Williams, Ulana Holtz, Courtney Young, Abhishek Choudhury, Kishor Shesthra, Carrie Vath

I. Welcome and Minutes from October 16, 2018.

Motion to approve and seconded. Motion passes.

Action Items

II. Grievance Committee Nominations –

Four names to the grievance committee per the faculty staff handbook. Chancellor will pick two of the four (with other groups represented). Rita Spear nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time), Marissa Pedulla nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time), Thomas Camm nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time), Rita Lamiaux nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time), Brahmananda Pramanik nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time). Joel Graff nominated and seconded (has not been asked at this time).

Since individuals have not been consulted, chair will ask individuals to see if interested. If more than four agree, then the chair will bring back to faculty senate, if four agree that chair will send the nominations to the Chancellor. A late nomination was added, faculty names were submitted, and the Chancellor selected Stella Cappocia and Rita Lamiaux.

Informational Items

III. Committee updates:

a. Program Prioritization Committee-

Report that PPC has met once since last FS meeting. The previous meeting rolled out the metrics for the academic side, with the next step in the process for the deans to receive feedback from departments. The deans hope to have their thoughts and observations based on feedback to the Chancellor next week. The meeting also raised the question on if the PPC meetings were open to the public. The latest meeting the chair of the PPC brought forth information from legal counsel indicating that meetings are open. The committee discussed having a section on the agenda to have public comment with the understanding that meeting times will need to reflect the agenda item. One comment regarding being open to all faculty, with the response from the FS representative that all should be open, with perhaps the exception of the meeting that will determine if the recommendations are endorsed or not.

The meeting also consisted a discussion regarding the review of administration and particularly administrators, with the knowledge that a majority of the PPC committee represent administration. The group agreed that all areas of campus, including administrators should be reviewed, but that the PPC committee may not be the right group for evaluating this group, but may have observations and information pertinent to a review. A recommendation to the chancellor is to form another method for the review.

The third agenda item was to consider what the voting mechanism would be, with an understanding that cuts would be made. The PPC agreed that there will not be a line item vote on cuts, but rather an endorsement of the final recommendations of the committee (which will include feedback from groups such as FS). A question was asked about when cuts would be made, with the response that the only hard date is recommendations from the PPC to the Chancellor by December 21.

Question/concern regarding what role of FS- shared governance- what say will we have?

Comment that students down, faculty numbers up, administrator numbers the same, which overall is an issue. If we have ideas, should speak up but in a way that is not petty but is strategic.

Tuition not raised, faculty members up with younger cheaper non-tenured faculty (able to get more), with goal of getting 4,400 students. Administrative salaries have been increased even though the number has been the same. Suggestion that people in administration should be taking salary cuts in order to educate kids.

b. Budget –

See attachment. Faculty Senate rep attended meeting this week. Purpose was to identify cost savings for this year. Total adds up to 453,000 (includes money lost for Chancellor search). Intention of the meeting was to then find focused reallocation. Some are a one time savings (those not marked with a 20 on the list). Request that some software will be paid in advance of next year. Still working to cover the \$ 1 million shortfall.

Worth noting that Provost stated that we are nowhere near financial exigency. Process is to “shore up” areas.

Comment that have two individuals on sabbatical and cut of adjuncts. Some students cannot get quality courses because of issue (faculty and adjuncts not available). Causes reputation and harm to our school. Dean of SME expressed same concern that adjunct budgets cut. First time seen in totally in this manner, with issues not being addressed.

Feedback for making sabbatical and money to cover was not accounted.

Concern that software for departments was taken out of IT and sent to department, which has direct consequences for department budget.

Will need to return to sabbatical and adjuncts.

Discussion Items

III. Advising Models – see agenda.

Dr. Carrie Vath looking to change advising model to improve retention to increase enrollment. Sometimes numbers and extra attention may make a difference.

One concern raised for a professional advising model as opposed to input from an academic advisor. The response was that the model would not eliminate department advising, but would focus on freshman and at risk advising. Higher level students (junior and senior) would be still receive advising in the departments. The model would have multiple touch points, such as enrollment. Would have extra attention such as math skills. Instances of students failing could improve with extra support (just an e-mail for outreach was not enough).

Comment that ABET requirement with a student as a declared major need to be affiliated with a department advisor. Even if a freshman declares a major, need to have a department affiliation. Response that professional advisor model should have an academic advisor, but can also have a professional advisor. The professional advisor would do outreach such as study skills, research, registration. Faculty still content expert. Professional can help to identify alternative path if failing in current path. Can help change major (skill set) that is better aligned).

Response that a professional advisor will work in tandem with faculty advisor if student is advised to potentially change major. Will work with faculty member to help with the process. Concept is to work with faculty and the student.

Concern that we are creating four full time professionals- is this too much? Comment that ideally for fall 2019 will start with a director and one professional advisor. If it determined to need another will be the following year, and then look

once again the following year. Question regarding director alone to be able to accomplish, then should not have a director level at that time (should be an advisor salary). Would prefer the director to have a PhD (at least a Master's). If to have only one, then professional advisor.

Concern that creating new position when eliminating faculty positions. Timing and effort should be improving advising capacity of faculty. Some departments don't have a chance to meet with students. Comment that faculty then should be more engaged, have someone in each department have more accountability.

Comment that not enough study support for students (enough tutoring, hours of tutoring). Would rather have more tutoring support. Concern that students who are enrolled and advised outside of the department are not doing well (as opposed to those advised internally). Response that accountability and expectations would be welcome, including summer advising and registration. Time that needs to be dedicated to advising should be at least ten hours a week to do so correctly. Only 52% turned in 20 day advising grades. 43% of student have at least one failing grade. (this is up 1% over 2017 and 6% from 2016). Further, 54% of the 20th day midterm grade sheets were returned (92% Highlands and 38% North Campus). Of the 60 advisors that were asked to contact students, 52% returned the forms. Will be down with students who failed and on academic foundation. Retention of first year students is critical. Fall will be another decline, first time freshman lower until 2025. Best we can hope for that we retain, need to be proactive. Right now down 124.

Comment that one faculty member has 54 student advisees. As such, a full time advisor would not a problem. One suggestion to eliminate freshman engineering, not touching students until a later date (right now all focused on freshman engineering program). Recommendation that the use of banner system to track and trend like MSU would be helpful. Response that freshman engineering is part of SME, and that the college has taken accountability.

Dr. Vath indicated software was purchased to pilot this spring. The software was not purchased earlier due to faculty advisor assessment, which was opposed by faculty. The advisor assessment portion will be taken out of the pilot run. The software features a dashboard that will allow to track and trend, including the use of Moodle. Right now Tech will have a three year contract with the product. However, the software requires information to be placed in Moodle such as grades (not every faculty does). Intended for professional advisors, but can be used for faculty advisors and can check and be held accountable.

Response that with professional advising, we can have a one year contract and can remove a person if not performing at a high level.

Concern that high learning curve for a new person in learning the curriculum of all the programs. Turnover and revisionism may be an issue. Response that having the faculty advisor would be a part of the process. Will have professional advisor help with at risk individual on a regular basis, such as 2-3 hours a week to help and guide. Some have not met or do not know who their advisor is. Some advisors response is to do their own paperwork without any guidance. Traditionally private schools get more money, but public schools do not receive as much for student support, such as tutoring.

Question regarding the number of at risk that were admitted. Response that all the students meeting with Dr. Vath are calculus I ready and have academic scholarships, but are failing and do not return. The group of students are least likely to ask for help, are used to being smart and not failing.

Dr. Vath would like senators to bring back information to departments to determine if have faculty senate support. If departments are not willing to support, would like to know what accountability within the department will be. Will continue discussion and potentially recommendation at a future meeting. Chair asked the group to determine if two weeks should be enough. Will bring back next meeting.

Meeting upstairs after meeting (not able to discuss since meeting right after).

VI. Other Items

Meeting adjourned.

Notes from October 29, 2018 Budget Meeting

20 = FY 20's budget

Budget Book Page #	Item	Savings (Cost)
1	Gammon late start	\$9,000 ✓
1	Crooker salary savings	\$3,680 ✓
1	JJ Adams salary savings	\$50,000 -20
3	Gonshak Busch Professor	\$3,000 ✓
3	Hobbs salary savings	\$57,517 -20
4	Add Asano salary	-\$48,000 -
4	Chamblin salary adjustment	-\$1,500 -
5	Net Noel and Sutton salary	\$7,000 -
6	Hunter salary savings	\$50,580 -20
6	Kishor salary	-\$1,000 -
7	Donnelly not on sabbatical	-\$27,552 -
9	Autenreith salary	-\$1,000 -
10	Vice Chancellor reduction	\$15,000 -20
10	Budget/Payroll reduction	\$8,000 -20
10	HR budget reduction	\$10,000 -20
11	Conley late start	\$12,500 -
11	Elakovich	-\$2,000 -20
11	McDonough 1/3 salary	\$33,333 -20
12	Hoskins salary savings - half year	\$31,000 -20
13	South Campus Merit	-\$5,000 -
13	Foundation Faculty Salary Supplements	-\$168,600 -
17	Gjeltema salary savings	\$11,500 -
17	Cote salary savings - half year	\$23,000 -20
17	Library Database Subscription	\$22,000 -20
18	VCDUR travel	\$10,000 -20
18	VCDUR Discretionary	\$20,000 -20
18	Campaign Readiness	\$32,000 -20
19	Joyce O'Neil salary savings	\$3,000 -20
19	Bracco salary savings	\$34,788 -20
19	Stillwagon salary increase	-\$3,300 -
19	Enrollment/Recruiting Student Budget	\$6,944 -20
20	DAA Recharge	\$14,776 -20
22	Mary Lou Jones salary savings	\$12,000 -20
23	Chancellor PT	\$4,400 -20
23	Chancellor Operating	\$20,000 -20
23	PR & Other	\$2,600 -20
23	Wire Stipends	\$1,000 -
24	Doug Evans late start	\$10,000 -
25	Vacant custodian savings	\$7,421 -
25	Custodian	\$11,960 -
25	Maintenance Engineer	\$24,637 -
25	SSC O&M	\$80,000 -
25	Grounds Keeper	\$22,860 -
26	Telecommunications	\$84,000 -
	Benefits on Salary Savings	\$52,000 -
	Chancellor Search	-\$60,000 -

* items in this year that have been saved

9 AREAS FOR FOCUSED REALLOCATION

1. Part time salary
2. UG Research
3. student clubs
4. Research Match
5. operations
6. campus projects
7. discretionary funds
8. Prepay
9. one-time contract for Carrie's software

Net = \$483,544

453,000

how should this be reallocated to campus?