

Faculty Senate Meeting
October 31, 2013

Gwyneth Williams, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

Members Present: John Aleshunas, Ginny Altrogge, Jef Awada, Larry Baden, Glen Bauer, Don Conway-Long, Paula Hanssen, Victoria McMullen, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Terri Reilly, Warren Rosenblum, Joe Schuster, Roy Tamashiro

Committee Replacements

Faculty Senate – Replacements are needed for Spring 2014 for the following seats:

- 1) Jill Stulce will replace Don Conway-Long (At-Large)
- 2) Phyllis Wilkinson will replace Ginny Altrogge (SOE)
- 3) Terri Reilly will replace Juraj Bohus (SOC)

Terri Reilly was welcomed to the Senate meeting. This is the first time we have had an adjunct faculty member serve on the Faculty Senate.

Steering Committee Created to Work with CREDO Consulting Group

Gwyneth referred the Senate to the letter announcing the Steering Committee created to work with CREDO (consulting group). The letter gives the committee's charge as well as a list of committee members. We will be hearing more about this in the upcoming year.

Announcements

The Faculty Senate will meet again next Thursday, November 7th. There is much to be done prior to the November 12th Faculty Assembly meeting.

Roy Tamashiro drafted the Performance Pay Model evaluation form and this is the document that was sent to the Senate. The Senators were asked to review this document so that a working draft can be formed and put into place.

Greg Gunderson will present budget information at the Faculty Assembly. He will send a draft of his presentation to Gwyneth to see if this is the information the Senate would like for him to present.

The Salary and Fringe Benefits survey was sent out and people have had trouble adding comments. The question was asked if anyone has notified the committee of this issue. Gwyneth will contact Mike Hulsizer to let him know. The results of the survey will be presented at the November 12th Faculty Assembly meeting.

Guests - President Stroble and Provost Schuster

President Stroble and Provost Schuster were welcomed to the Senate meeting. Both had received a list of questions from the Senate a week prior.

Q: 1) As our allies as academics, we would like to understand how you go about trying to represent our interests to the Board of Trustees. What do you suggest the Faculty Senate should do to help the Board understand the fundamental nature of the educational culture and mission of the Webster University faculty?

A: President Stroble thanked the Senate for meeting with her. She has not met with the Senate for a couple of years and she is grateful. When she met with the Search Committee, prior to being selected as Webster University's President, it was clear that the individual hired needed to value academic excellence and help the institution achieve that goal.

The President and Provost are allies, but in a lot of institutions, that is not the case. As institutions across the country have faced a variety of economic situations, disinvestment on the state and federal level, competing priorities concerning government funding, costs keep rising and we can price ourselves out of the market so we have to control this. CEOs will look for one of their own to put the house in order and academic excellence may get lost in that.

While job seeking, President Stroble looked for an institution that was talking about and had a track record of academic performance. "To take us to the next level," that is a vague idea. We have been working on "getting to the next level" for the last four years and will continue to work on this through strategic planning. This will be our opportunity to say what we see next as a university. This will be an opportunity for the Board of Trustees to see faculty and administration work together to craft the idea of what happens next.

In working with the Board of Trustees, there are a variety of ways to get in tune with the process and get the Board to value that link. We have recruited trustees who come from a broader set of characteristics than those in the past. The Board will always look at fiduciary responsibilities first and foremost and the President's job is to have mission and drive. There is a partnership between the President and the Board of Trustees to make sure that the mission and money issue does not get divided. The most helpful thing faculty can do is give the opportunity for interaction with the Faculty Senate and to fully engage in the strategic planning process and the cooperative with the deans.

Q: It seems clear that a huge part of the President's job is the academic mission of the University. How receptive is the Board to being able to understand that we are first and foremost an educational institution?

A: There are 30 plus people on the Board. Significant decisions that have been made in the last four years signal the fact that focus is on the University's mission. We have hired more full time faculty in the last four years than in the past. The Board understands that is where money needs to be spent, that Mercer needs to be completed, and that building plans need to move forward. If they were only looking at profit margin, they would not have been convinced that money needs to go toward maintaining facilities, etc.

Q: 5) Some faculty are concerned that we spent our budget surplus and then had to cut our spending. With that money gone, what concrete plans do we have to ensure the university's health as we continue to face challenging economic times?

A: President Stroble stated that we try not to use the word surplus. It is important for institutions to not spend money that they do not have and many institutions do this. Just like in your family, you want to have a rainy day fund.

There was a surplus built up under the previous administration. Provost Schuster spoke to this: Representatives on the budget committee will provide information on this issue. When we work on budget, we have revenue and cost and balance that with a 5 percent margin. Some refer to this as a surplus. One-third goes into the Endowment to fund scholarships for students and the other one-third of the margin goes into the plant fund which is a special fund to keep us from going into debt, will fund the science building, and provides maintenance such as the windows being caulked in Webster Hall which would have cost \$3 million to replace. These funds are reinvested into the University. The entire margin of funds could be distributed into salaries for one year. Salaries are costs so the next year, there would be more costs. If revenue does not match costs, we have to cut costs. Most firms do not cut salaries, they cut people. If revenue is not meeting expenditures, you have to remedy that.

President Stroble stated that we usually budget for a 5 percent operating measure. When she arrived and looked into this, we had a 10 percent margin and we doubled the operating measure every year by starving the institution (example: no new hires, no maintenance, and no Mercer study). We constrained what was spent and took in tuition revenue with no idea of ever spending it. There was a moderation of the fiscal plan where we said 5 percent is what we are going to spend because academic quality demands it.

The statement was made that one issue may be with the word "surplus." It is a margin and not a surplus as surplus makes it sound like you have "funny money."

There is a sense that the 5 percent is not the concern, but that we had extra money and with the bad economic times, should that money have been spent.

Q: 2) The University is pushing forward a number of major initiatives (such as the Global Citizen Program and the deans' most recent initiative to completely internationalize the curriculum). In order for faculty to have the resources to fully realize these initiatives, there is a definite need to know about the development of new faculty lines. Is there a timeline for adding new faculty? Is there a process for applying for a new faculty line?

A: In President Stroble's first year at Webster, she worked to define what the next level of academic excellence is. When Provost Schuster came to Webster the first thing he noticed was the numbers of students to full time faculty. When he was a dean he had 60 full time faculty. Webster has 186 full time faculty with 22,000 students. He told President Stroble that this is not a sustainable situation. In the last three years, 43 new faculty have been hired with 23 out of 43 as new positions. With positions completed this year, it will be 30 new positions which equal approximately \$3+ million in salaries in only the full time faculty line. We can go school by school to see how many have been added or replaced and prepare a report. New positions were needed to close the gap that existed in the university. With that being said, some new initiatives are requiring more work from faculty. With the help of the department chairs, faculty and other academic structures, further enhancing the body of faculty. We cannot spend \$3 million every year on new faculty lines, but the Board and donors understand that this is important.

Webster had the first Endowed Chair in the history of the University. This is a really big deal. Some people out there believe in what we do. We will continue supporting academic excellence in general and full time faculty lines as we move forward.

The question was asked, "At what point in a year can we know the budget for new faculty lines?" The Board usually approves the budget in April. At that time, we know approximately what is happening the next year. We monitor revenues through the year and every eight weeks we have a picture of how we are doing financially and try to manage expenditures with revenue.

"To what expense do you think faculty positions are an immediate concern from a standpoint of academic excellence?" With some programs, it is a direct correlation of the needs of the revenue they generate and the registration numbers and it seems harder to get people to invest in that. Provost Schuster responded that some programs are the foundations of a university and should not be measured by the direct amount of revenue that they generate. In order to get new faculty lines, the issue is not decided at the President/Provost level, but is advocated through schools and colleges and when it is received by the Provost's office, the most critical need and resources must be determined. The statement was made that if we are offering a new program, we should not be offering programs without faculty to run them.

Each student needs to be exposed to a highly philosophical education. It is a lengthy process and simplistic thinking is not applied in this process. Regarding faculty lines, each dean knows more about what their needs are than the Provost does. The priority lies in academic units for faculty lines. The Board of Trustees/President is not involved in faculty line decisions. How those

decisions are made moves us toward a more fertile academic environment. It is now a more democratic model than in the past, but takes a little longer as a decision is not made until the April Board meeting. Business like thinking has not penetrated this process.

The general trend appears to be moving towards a business model and a wave of corporate education. How do we stop “the wave?” How do we protect ourselves when “the wave” hits? The corporate model applies to Webster as well since there is much competition in the St. Louis area for education. We must invest in our graduates. They attend Webster in order to get an education to enable them to do what they want to do.

President Stroble stated that she has communicated to the Board of Trustees the rankings by U.S. News and World Report how many eligible Pell Grants students we have. If we were truly a business type institution, there would be pushback as to why we are going after needy students rather than wealthy students. President Stroble likes being at an institution that serves a variety of different students to give them a quality education.

A question was asked how we, as faculty, can educate the Board. The reply was given to provide stories about interactions with students, student’s needs being met, humanitarian stories, faculty accomplishments, etc. to President Stroble. She will then use this information when she speaks to donors as well as the Board. She is working to engage them and educate them more.

The Chamber singers were present at the last Board dinner and it was a phenomenal evening. The suggestion was made to use them as a model [that is, a set of students from a given major or program meeting the Board] for future interactions with the Board of Trustees.

Q: 4) The deans’ initiative on internationalism brings up a number of issues concerning the relationship between the international campuses and the home campus. More and more, the overseas campuses are running independently, which often compromises the ability of faculty at the home campus to build curriculum, send students abroad, and engage in faculty mobility. (For example, the loss of 8-week classes at these campuses makes it harder for students to afford a study abroad experience, and more difficult for faculty to rotate from campus to campus; curricular initiatives from the fulltime faculty here are impeded by the campuses abroad.) Do the international campuses have an obligation to help our international objectives succeed? Do you feel that the academic directors and program heads in our overseas campuses should respond directly to queries and proposals from St. Louis faculty or should these interactions always be mediated by a university administrator (e.g. a dean)? What is your vision for the relationship between the home and international campuses?

It was stated that we want to try and distinguish ourselves in terms of internationalism and this brings up a host of problems that we already have in terms of the relationship with the other campuses. It seems to be even more problematic now than in the past as they are operating more autonomously as each try to gain their own accreditation. It is difficult to work with faculty on

curriculum at other campuses and appears that we are losing student centered focus on these campuses.

A: The reply was that it is an immensely complex situation for which there is no simple answer. Each site will have its own unique situations. Some of the campuses have grown and established themselves. Some of their success comes from achieving their own accreditation through the agencies operating in those countries. There is friction between what is done at the home campus and what is done at the international campuses. They have their specific needs, but we are one University. They cannot be disciplined like children. There are challenges on both sides and the relationship is in a state of transition. Some of the campuses have age and maturity and are so well established with local alumni, local partnerships and focused on their regional locality. If you tighten up on those campuses, it will force rebellion.

The statement was made that in their current state, some of those campuses are not serving students well at the moment. As we are figuring this relationship out, it seems we need procedures to handle the issues.

It is felt that certain issues tie into global reach – accreditation that South Carolina imposed on us and concepts of internationalism. Those students are a different population and it is unsure whether we, as one organization, have really worked that into the plan. We have students that do not exist on those international campuses. There are various issues that the Senate has discussed regarding non U.S. campuses. It is thought that once those issues are resolved, it can help us with the U.S. campuses.

The Webster pizza can be sliced in only so many ways – 40 percent of undergraduate students are at our international campuses. Almost half of our full time students study at the 6/7 international locations. This is less than 60 percent of our graduate students spread out among domestic campuses. We are presently located in more than 80 locations. Some of those locations may not have a critical mass of students, but that does not mean they are losing money. This is a perfect topic for strategic planning for the model of Webster University in the next five years. President Stroble stated that space needs to be created to map this on the strategic plan.

The statement was also made that regarding problems with faculty at international campuses, they are subject to local law in each country. It was suggested to make a list of subtopics regarding what the relationship is between St. Louis and Webster X. There needs to be communication between campuses on propagation mechanism of courses, etc. It is felt that we are on another fast track program without shoring up the problems in infrastructure already present at international campuses.

Many of the concerns at the international campuses relate to faculty curricular and academic issues. The St. Louis campus is aware of our responsibility regarding academics. There needs to be a chain of communication between directors at international campuses and input with departments in St. Louis.

President Stroble stated that as we revisit the strategic plan values, maybe the language could be changed to ensure that we are collaborating enough between campuses.

There was discussion about the dean's initiative email that faculty received yesterday and the aggressive timeline. Faculty are still trying to figure out the issues that plague them and now have a December 15th deadline. Provost Schuster stated that the Faculty Senate has a need and desire to learn more about the dean's initiatives and encouraged the Senate to invite the deans to a future meeting to discuss this.

Q: 8) Recently the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reported that Webster University is involved in the purchase and renovation of a very large building downtown (the Arcade Building). Is this project going forward? If so, can you please tell us something about the university's intentions for this space? How will it relate to the Old Post Office?

A: President Stroble responded that Webster was approached a while ago and asked if we wanted some part of the building as it is being renovated. It is unsure if this will take place or not. It depends on whether or not it makes sense financially, if it can be worked into the business model, is the space appropriate for classes, etc. They have looked at what might be available, if it would come to that. Each time you move, it has to be for strategic advantage. Is the Arcade Building more advantageous than the Old Post Office? It is possible, but she will not make any type of decision until she has all of the information financial or otherwise.

At this time, President Stroble and Provost Schuster had other obligations and left the meeting.

After some discussion, the Senate decided to invite the deans to attend a Faculty Senate meeting on November 14th or 21st. An email invitation was crafted to send to the deans.

Miscellaneous

Webster University talks about being student centered yet there is no place on the website that announces that registration begins next week. If you are off campus, you cannot even find a phone number to call people.

It seems that there is a lack of transparency in how non-academic departments operate. It was suggested that if we group problems by department, we may be able to get answers to some of the issues people are experiencing. Also, perhaps policies could be put into place after documenting the issues.

Performance Pay Model

Gwyneth asked that everyone review the final form as it needs to be completed this next week. This final document will be sent to the Task Force made up of faculty, deans, and administrators.

Gwyneth would like to announce at the November 12th Faculty Assembly that the document has been finalized and will be sent to faculty as well as a survey for faculty to provide feedback. The final document is a result of information gathered from all of the different forums.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.