

Faculty Assembly Meeting

Thursday, February 6, 2014 (original meeting scheduled for Tues. February 4 was cancelled due to weather)

Winifred Moore Auditorium

Gwyneth Williams, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order.

Announcements

Gwyneth stated that any problems being encountered with ADP Payroll Services should be reported to IT or the ADP hotline.

The At-Large Senate election will close this Friday with results announced on Monday. The request for School/College self-nominations will go out next week.

The Spring Institute will be held in the Sunnen Lounge on Friday, March 28th and will focus on Student Centeredness from a student's perspective.

Performance Pay Model

J.P. Palmer-Schuyler gave a brief slide show presentation showing the results of the survey that the faculty took in November about different aspects of the model.

There were four questions in the November 16th survey –

- 1) Do you agree with the primary responsibility for yearly performance assessment residing with the departmental chair? (106 responses, mean = 2.37)
- 2) If you disagree with the department chair being the primary evaluator (18.86% of survey participants disagreed), indicate your preferences as to who should assume this role (20 individuals answered plus 9 individuals who answered “neutral”).
- 3) In the model proposed, each faculty member will choose the percentages (within the prescribed guidelines) for each of the three areas of evaluation. These are the percentages that will then be used to evaluate each faculty member. Do you agree with each faculty member choosing his/her percentages?
- 4) What is your view of allowing departments to “customize” the criteria by which each of the three areas (teaching/advising, professional development, and service) are evaluated?

It was announced that the survey results could be viewed on the Faculty Senate webpage.

The process for developing the model to date was outlined: The online survey was sent to faculty in November. In December/January, the Senators from each school/college met individually with their dean to obtain feedback. Gwyneth attended these meetings and stated that the deans were supportive of the model. A change was made to the model for Professional Development to include the last three calendar years since some research activities take more than one year to complete.

Gwyneth met with Betsy Schmutz, the Chief Human Resource Officer, who suggested changes to the model in order to comply with current law. Faculty evaluations cannot be destroyed, but must be kept in Human Resources as well as Academic Affairs. Betsy also suggested that it be clarified that this model applies only to full-time status track faculty at the home campus.

Gwyneth also met with the Associate Provost, Nancy Hellerud, and they discussed the issue of dean recusal. Nancy suggested developing a process for recusal rather than criteria for recusal.

A statement will be added to the evaluation form making it clear that this evaluation has no relation to status or promotion. They are two separate processes. The Senate would prefer that language be added to the University Handbook stating that the yearly evaluation has no relation to status or promotion.

The next step in this process will be the Faculty Senate presenting the Performance Pay Model and Evaluation to the Provost, CFO, Associate Provost, and Chief of Human Resources. A summary of the model will be sent to the Board of Trustees. This model will not be applied this academic year. It is anticipated the Performance Pay Model will be implemented AY 2015.

Q: A faculty member asked how lecturer positions will be evaluated for raises.

A: Gwyneth replied that this is something that will need to be worked out with the dean and department chairs. This model does not cover lecturer positions.

Q: How will administrative roles that faculty perform be evaluated?

A: Gwyneth stated that departments will populate the criteria in ways that make sense to them. Administrative roles would most likely fall into the category of “service.”

Q: Will the Capstone fall under service?

A: Yes, we are working within the criteria of the University Handbook and the Handbook states that there are three parts of our job – teaching, professional development, and university service. A strict across-the-board university policy about specific criteria cannot be created because there is too much variation from department to department and school to school or college.

A faculty member stated that the AAUP advises against post-tenure review being placed in the hands of a single administrator. In addition to the above statement, another faculty member replied, that it seems that we are lacking some level of due process by not including faculty input. The appeal is to the Provost and/or Dean and they might be putting pressure on the department chair in the first place.

Q: A faculty member stated that using three years of the Boyer Model is ex post facto. Many received status under a model that was not the Boyer Model. Now we are asking them to be evaluated on criteria that were not on their status evaluation, and using a standard under which they were not originally given status. Faculty approved the Boyer Model for status and promotion – not raises.

A: Gwyneth replied that the Boyer Model does not ask faculty to do different or exclusive work, it simply asks them to use a different language.

Gwyneth reported that in December, Betsy Schmutz reported to the Compensation Committee of the Board where the Performance Pay Model is at this point. The Board was pleased to see progress on a systematic multi-part system.

A faculty member stated that performance pay is such an important issue that an elected faculty representative should be present when the Board discusses this type of issue. Gwyneth replied that she would bring that matter up, but that the Board will probably not allow this.

Faculty will receive updated drafts of the Performance Pay Model as changes are made. Gwyneth suggested that it would be a good idea to begin working with respective departments to populate criteria for the model.

Q: Are there examples available for what to discuss when one is dealing with a probationary faculty member?

A: Gwyneth explained that there were some examples in the model and that you would include criteria that are normally discussed with probationary faculty.

BASS Proposal

Gwyneth asked Mike Hulsizer (Chair of BASS) and Don Conway-Long (Director of Sociology/Anthropology) to explain the BASS Proposal to the Faculty Assembly.

Mike stated that this proposal is to take the Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BASS) and split it into two new departments: The Department of Psychology and the Department of Anthropology and Sociology within the College of Arts and Sciences. By dividing into two departments, focus can be placed on better meeting students' needs and the disciplines can concentrate on their own needs more effectively.

The Department of Psychology would house 7 full-time faculty members and the Department of Anthropology and Sociology would house 5 full-time faculty members. The recent move of interdisciplinary programs to departments is independent of this proposal to subdivide BASS. There are several University Handbook changes that need to be made relating to the interdisciplinary programs, while the division of BSS into two departments follows current Handbook language.

The question of how faculty reviews will be held was asked. Mike responded that the two entities have been operating separately since August 2013. Mike has been overseeing the reviews of psychology faculty, and Don has overseen those of anthropology/sociology faculty. No problems are anticipated.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the BASS proposal. All were in favor; motion carried.

Presentation on the University Budget by Provost Julian Schuster/Vice President and CFO Greg Gunderson

Provost Schuster gave background information on the budget situation and shared details regarding the budget shortfall.

Webster University is 65 – 70 percent dependent on graduate tuition. This is atypical of college education with the exception of a few schools.

The size of Webster's incoming freshman class is relatively small, as is the number of transfer students.

National enrollment trends have been negative since 2008. Some of this is due to the downturn in the economy.

There has been a 2.3 percent decline in the enrollments in Webster's graduate programs in the last two to three years. This decline is primarily attributed to loss of students in the MBA and Counseling programs. The Kansas City, Florida, and South Carolina campuses in particular have seen a decline in enrollment in the last few years. Leadership changes have been made at all three campuses and we have managed to arrest the decline.

The decline in enrollment caused a \$12 million shortfall in this fiscal year. Much of that was managed by controlling expenditures in a wiser way. The academic enterprise will not be affected and no drastic measures will be taken this year, but next academic year changes will occur. How we currently operate needs to change. Even if Webster has a good undergraduate year and we bring in 100 more undergraduate students that is only \$1 million additional revenue. One-hundred students cannot make up for 350 graduate students leaving our system.

As we move farther by designing the budget for next year, faculty members Gary Renz and Joe Stimpfl will be working with Dr. Gunderson and others on the budget.

Dr. Gunderson began his budget presentation and spoke on the following topics:

- 1) FY 2013 compared to FY 2014
- 2) Summary of our trend enrollment – Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Contact Justin Bitner at justinbitner77@webster.edu
- 3) Operating Revenue
- 4) Revenue Growth of Undergraduate Tuition
- 5) FY 2014 Expense Impact
- 6) Healthcare Benefit Alteration
- 7) FY 2015 Financial Goals Budget Impact

The floor was opened for questions:

The statement was made that the decline in counseling programs has to do with accreditation only, and nothing to do with the quality of faculty teaching in those programs.

Q: For years KCREP accreditation has worked diligently to keep the counseling program afloat, concerns were shared with the administration, and these concerns were ignored. What sorts of mechanisms or institutional supports can we expect to aggressively pursue KCREP accreditation?

A: Full-time faculty lines have been added. This program will not be as big as it was, but a "leaner and meaner program."

Q: To what extent do you anticipate structural changes in the way academic departments are organized? Are we talking new departments? Schools?

A: Julian: we need to come together as a community and fine tune what we already have in place to be true to our vision and mission.

Q: Referring to the graph that Dr. Gunderson shared, why did we decide to base a budget on a 6 percent growth when that is not what is going on within the country.

A: Greg: There was a shift in graduate enrollment that we did not anticipate. The marketplace did not deliver what we based budget projections on.

Q: With regard to tuition discounting, do we have a dollar idea of how many discounts we have given?

A: Greg: The undergraduate enrollment did go up. We did net slightly more revenue. Corporate partnerships have not influenced any of our enrollments yet. That is what will start showing up in FY 2014, netting a revenue growth.

Julian: Our undergraduate discounting is not out of proportion (actually less) than other institutions. Other institutions have funded discounts (scholarships, etc.) and we do not have that. Unfunded discount rates adversely affect operating budgets.

Q: There is a \$4 million dollar savings by discontinuing medical benefits for those seeking early retirement. It seems that the University is encouraging people to retire early and getting rid of those huge salaries and this should subsidize the medical benefit.

A: Greg: The early retirement medical benefit was discontinued because of the huge cash reserve that the University must maintain for that program. This change affects fewer than 20 people and Human Resources is having conversations with them. If someone retires by June 1st, they keep the medical benefits that the University pays for. If someone retires on June 2nd, they would keep the medical benefits until age 65, but will pay for the cost of the medical benefits.

Q: Are the overseas campuses making budget this year?

A: Yes; even with the political unrest in Thailand, they have a record enrollment for the third year in a row with 62 new students this spring. Vienna is getting better, Geneva is going to meet budget and Leiden has bounced back.

Q: There is much concern over the tremendous movement and instability in the Development Office. It raises questions about how our Board is operating.

A: With the departure of Faith Maddy and the appointment of the Interim Vice President, President Stroble wanted to accelerate the process of hiring a permanent replacement. The Search Committee has been established and we assure you that we will find the best possible candidate in the shortest period of time. The members of the Board of Trustees have committed themselves to a total of \$350,000, President Stroble is working on possible continued gifts.

Q: It appears that administrative costs are rising with new hires.

A: The biggest increase in cost was in faculty lines. It might appear that administrative costs are increasing, but they did not increase as fast as some other parts of our enterprise.

Q: There is news about movements in Tennessee and Oregon providing free community college tuition. How will that affect Webster?

A: We are working with a local community college to work with transfer students. This is an opportunity for us, but we will not compete against free tuition. We are partnering in this and holding public town hall meetings. You will be kept up to date. The suggestion was made that when we talk about administrative costs, we pay attention to the proliferation of non-academic positions on campus. In each academic unit, faculty voices need to be heard. Speak up as to which positions are serving students. Those should be our top priority.

Final Announcements

Any further feedback on the Performance Pay Model should be sent to Gwyneth Williams.

With no further business, the assembly adjourned at 4:46 p.m.