

## AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Approval of the minutes for the September 5, 2013 meeting.
3. Updates:
  - a. Will increased compensation for tenure/promotion under consideration be retroactive?
  - b. Phased retirement being “researched”
4. Begin discussing changes to Annual Faculty Senate Calendar (attached)
5. Handbook - Doug
6. Visit by Mike Bitzer – 11:30 am
7. Adjourn
8. Next meeting: October 3, 2013

## MINUTE APPROVAL – APPROVED

### UPDATES

Will increased compensation for tenure/promotion under consideration be retroactive?

There is some research being done on whether this would be feasible

Phased retirement being “researched”

President was unaware of this program

This still existed as of the 2009-2010 handbook

Issue raised of sabbatical program in the past

### DISCUSS CHANGES TO ANNUAL FACULTY SENATE CALENDAR

Goal to move April items earlier in the year

Possibilities: Move Committee Assignment Requests to January  
Move Swink and Trustee Awards to January and make two calls for nominees rather than one

Goal to discuss the bylaws of the faculty senate to fit with current operating practices, including having elections for faculty senate one meeting earlier

### HANDBOOK

Goal to excise all employee related items to the Employee Handbook

It appears there were changes over the summer without faculty approval

### VISIT BY PROVOST

Question: Does the provost have any role in retirement packages that are offered?

Answer: No direct role. It is based on financial health of institution. Based on budget approval in October trustee meetings.

Question: Is there a possibility of the school contributing to retirement funds without a matching contribution from the employee?

Answer: Retirement contributions would still be dependent on the employee matching the contribution.

Question: Changes to the Faculty Handbook. What purview does the administration have in regards to control of the handbook, specifically a change about GEAR committee dealing with SOARS and LEAPS? What is the policy from an administrative side?

Answer: Much of the non-academic, non-faculty material will come out and be put in the Employee Handbook. The president has indicated that faculty can recommend policy changes to the administration, but not institute them directly. Handbook changes also have to go to the board of trustees for approval. When it comes to faculty recommendations on policy it would go through the cabinet. There should not be changes that are made independent of the faculty, unless there are legal reasons for changes that occur over the summer. For example, there was a recent change regarding handguns on public campuses. If this had applied to private institutions we would have had to change our handbook over the summer, but still in consultation with relevant members of the campus. Related to this issue the cabinet is currently reinforcing the policy that guns are not allowed on campus.

Question: Shouldn't there be a QEP that talks about faculty replacement and development if we are interested in rich personal attention?

Answer: There is no written QEP at this point.

Question: What is the timeline for hiring new faculty?

Answer: Once the budget is finalized by the board there will be requests related to tuition, perhaps a little under a 3% increase. The current plan involves looking at all faculty vacancies and needs. Some departments may have additions, such as English, since almost half of the comp sections are taught by adjuncts. There may also be retirements coming up. First wave of searches late this semester to early spring. Second wave early spring semester as the starting point. Still not developed based on budget. Based on current list of visiting faculty. Beginning the process of prioritizing at this point.

Question: Is there ever a possibility of moving this process earlier in the future.

Answer: Not at this point.

Question: Some schools post positions with the possibility based on funding.

Answer: This is something to consider in the future.

Question: There seems to be increase in number of visiting professors.

Answer: Funding for tenure track is an expensive proposition and requires careful consideration. The provost is aware we have cut very deeply into these positions. There is a related to desire to have more classes under 20 students.

Question: What about turning visiting professors into tenure track positions?

Answer: There are serious financial considerations, but there is a desire to make this a possibility given the high quality of the current occupants.

Question: Graduate Programs?

Answer: Any initiatives would be in the strategic plan. There is some question about the logistics of this in certain fields. We might need to wait on certain ones.

Question: What about current issues related to salary?

Answer: The provost has not heard anything further on this issue.

**ADJOURNMENT**