

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: 10/24/24; 12:30 pm, Walker 2-91 and Zoom

Roster									
Guests: Blackburn, Audrey (reporter for the Hawkeye);									
CAES		CBSS		CHS		COP		Library	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Anderson, Jeff*	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ashworth, Burton*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glaze, Donna	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comeau, Jill	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deuber, Melissa
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ji, Jane	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bruce, Paul Robert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hardy, Tyesha	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jackson, Keith -excused		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Koers, Gregory	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David, Blair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jones, Ashanti	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tice, Hilary*		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McGuire, Pat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Harris, Courtney -resigned	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Richardson, Amanda				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Murru, Siva	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Johnson, Mark	<input type="checkbox"/>	Showers, Jo Ellen -excused				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rowley, Brendan	<input type="checkbox"/>	McDaniel, Janelle*	<input type="checkbox"/>	Traxler, Karen				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tresner, Clifford	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tolleson, Josh						
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Traweek, Adam						
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Wiedemeier, Paul						

X=Present; *Indicates member at large

Agenda

- 9/19/24 FS minutes approval
- Committee reports
- Possibility of Faculty attitude survey
- Policy considerations (posted in the CANVAS course)

Business Type	Item Description	Action	Follow Up Plan
Call to order	Time: 1230 Presiding: Dr. Jeffrey Anderson Recording: Hilary Tice		
Announcements	Reminder about forum with President Berry next week, 10/31 from 2-4 pm in the Terrace. This is being cosponsored by the faculty and staff senates.		Senator Anderson to send a reminder to faculty early next week.
Approval of Minutes	9/19/24 minutes review	Request made to change wording in misc. items discussed; second sentence to weather 'mesonet.' Senators supported the revision. A motion to approve minutes with the revision was made by Senator McGuire; seconded by Senator Jones; minutes approved unanimously.	Senator Anderson or Tice will send approved minutes to Robert Glaze to post on the ULM Faculty Senate website.
Unfinished Business			
	Update on items of concern from faculty	Two documents affiliated with this item were shared with senators via CANVAS and the highlighted items from the second document, published at the beginning of the discussion, were reviewed (document with highlighted items included in appendix 1). There were some submissions after the last senate meeting, so those were added. The items were shared with Dr. Arant at the last executive board meeting. Supplemental discussion from the senators included the following. For the summer and winter sessions, College's would like to make these more profitable. Dr. Arant is still analyzing winter, to determine if these generate or lose money. Summer loses money, not from classes (classes make money) but overall operating costs. A question was asked how updated the information is and whether it would apply to the upcoming winter and summer sessions. Senator Anderson shared that CAES will only be offering 1 winter session course, since the College does not make money. The summer should not be affected as strongly and will not be cancelled. Dr. Arant and some of the Deans would like to raise summer pay, but then that could raise the needed minimum student enrollment. There may be situations where the minimum is lowered, such as if a course is needed for majors to graduate. Senator Anderson has asked Dr. Arant for data over this information but it was unavailable during the last executive	Item #8 – Senator Anderson to contact IT to see if there is a paper trail to find the mental health course in Moodle, since he has not been able to locate the material.

		<p>board meeting. There are separate budgets for winter and summer sessions which do not come out of the general operating budget for the Colleges. For item #5, 360-degree appraisal – the tool is being reworked to try to obtain better feedback. Item #8 – Senator Anderson to contact IT to see if there is a trail to find the mental health course, since he has not been able to locate the material. Item #9 – Senate may look into the Unclassified Staff Grievance Policy later to see if the effectiveness can be enhanced.</p>	
New Business			
Announcements:			
	<p>Committee Reports -Academic Standards (AS) -Constitution and By-Laws (CBL) -Elections (E) -Faculty Welfare (FW) -Fiscal Affairs (FA) -Ad Hoc Committees: **Faculty Handbook (FH) **P&T (PT)</p>	<p>-AS: no updates provided. -CBL: update provided by Senator Tice. Due to technical issues, discussion of this item was minimal. Senator Tice started by highlighting the feedback received by two senators and opening the floor to discussion of the definition of faculty. Senator Anderson stated he felt the proposed definition does address items that the CBL committee was asked to address in the definition. Other senators were unable to share input since the discussion was cut short due to technical issues. During the tech issues, the online senators discussed preferences for a two-house version. Concerns were raised as to whether there would be a benefit from a two-house version and if so what would it provide. Senator Tice indicated that this was originally proposed as a means to allow tenured faculty to act as a buffer between administration and junior faculty senators so that senators could provide a means where more pushback could be completed by senior faculty. A comment was made that this could unintentionally marginalize the voice of the junior faculty. Further discussion will be delayed to the Nov. meeting. -E: no updates provided. -FW: update provided by Senator Rowley; committee looking at non-foundation University faculty awards and will try to meet with Deans to continue discussion over faculty workload. -FA: no updates provided.</p>	<p>FH committee to take the performance adjustment raises back to Dr. Arant to see if the post tenure wording can be removed.</p> <p>Senator Tice will bring the item of whether the wording for the post tenure review and raises could be applied proactively to when post tenure review started or starts to Dr. Arant during the next FH committee.</p>

-FH: Update provided by Senators Anderson & Tice. Senator Anderson gave an overview of some background history of the updates the FH committee has made. There were six conditions the FH committee was asked to address from the previous review by the senators. The committee has been able to address four of them but there are still two pending items. The two items still pending are funeral leave and excused absences. Dr. Arant is looking into whether the University can give funeral leave above the state requirement and excused absences. After senator Anderson finished, senator Tice began a review of a table posted to CANVAS that summarized the revisions made to the handbook during the handbook committee meetings with Dr. Arant since the last senate meeting. In consideration of time constraints of the meeting, Senator Tice reviewed the items that were still pending while also allowing Senators to ask about other items in the document being reviewed. During the review of the merit/performance adjustment raises, a question was asked if this was intended for full professors only. A senator mentioned that as worded, non-tenure track faculty would be left out and if full professor wording was added then lower ranked faculty may not appreciate being overlooked. A few senators questioned where the money would come from to provide these raises; however, senator Anderson shared that Dr. Arant proposed the change from 7 years to 5 years and indicated funds would be found. Discussion included that having this raise apply to all faculty would help offset any lapses in income boosts from the State &/or University. Other concerns were voiced. These included: 1) faculty are not receiving consistent annual evaluations in some Colleges; however, the general consensus was that evaluations that aren't completed should not go against the faculty member in being eligible to receive this benefit; 2) one negative annual evaluation would reset the clock in order to be eligible and 3) annual evaluation criteria may go against the criteria a faculty member will use to go up for promotion. How the raises

would be implemented is still to be determined. Senator David reminded senators that the FA committee asked Dr. Graves about the merit/performance adjustment raises and he was unaware of the item or where the funds would come from. Technical issues started during the remainder of this discussion and continued until the meeting was adjourned. In-person and online groups continued discussion separately at various time points but once reconnected, shared their points of discussion. These included whether individuals meeting the minimum expectations should be included, whether 'negative annual reviews' should be further defined and whether the wording should include annual reviews 'that have been completed'. Senators were ok leaving the wording as is and that this should be applied to those individuals meeting the minimum expectations since this can help negate the effects of inflation that salaries do not keep up with but also as a recognition for individuals that have put in time of service and commitment to the organization. The senators then looked more in detail at the 'post tenure review' wording. Senator Anderson shared that the post tenure review wording came from the initial University T&P committee review but the process has actually been mandated by the state for many years, it just hasn't been implemented at ULM yet. A question was asked if the post tenure review was on a three-year cycle with Senator Anderson stating he thought it is a five-year cycle in the handbook. The senators felt the wording should be removed so that the raises apply to as many faculty as possible, including non-tenure track individuals (eg. instructor ranks, clinical track faculty). Senators asked that the FH committee take this back to Dr. Arant to see if the post tenure wording could be removed. Senator Anderson announced that the handbook should get reviewed annually and what doesn't get addressed in this revision will have a chance to be updated starting with the Feb. handbook meetings for the new version. During disconnection between the in-person attendance and zoom

		attendance, a question was asked in the online community if the wording for the post tenure review and raises could be applied proactively to when post tenure review started or starts. An example was given to inquire whether someone completing a successful post tenure review would then get a raise. Members were unsure if post tenure review has started. Senator Tice will bring the item forward to Dr. Arant during the next FH committee. -PT: Congratulatory letter. Due to technical issues, this item was not discussed.	
	Policy Review -Faculty guidelines for foundation awards -Rubrics for foundation awards	Due to technical issues, this item was not discussed.	
	Proposal to schedule meeting locations with different colleges	Due to technical issues, this item was discussed separately between individuals attending in-person vs virtually; however, the senators support the idea of scheduling spring semester senate meetings with different Colleges.	
Adjourn	Time: ~1355		

Appendix

Faculty Concerns

1. Faculty pay for Winter and Summer – The minimum enrollment number stated was 7. Both the Wintersession and Summer are separate budgets, not part of the deans' regular budgets. Total operating costs for summer are still negative, but the total loss has been reduced from \$500,000 to \$100,000.

President Berry has stated that the "break even" number of students for a winter or summer class is around 6 people. Anything above that is profit and we should run those courses. What is being said at the college level is that these courses are pure expense for the college and when a faculty member teaches one, the money to pay the faculty comes out of the adjunct budget. That suggests that offering courses is a "disincentive" for the deans. Cutting these classes out is a disincentive towards faculty who want or need to teach these courses.

2. Communication disconnect between the Administration and the campus. – President Berry has set up a forum to address faculty concerns on October 31 from 2:00 to 4:00 pm on the Terrace.

There have been repeated requests for town hall meetings (where there is equal dialog between faculty and the administration). There are concerns of faculty disengagement, possibly because of a lack of two-way communication and the perception that ideas proposed by faculty tend to be unwelcomed, discounted, or not valued. The following are some areas that have been mentioned as areas of increased communication needs:

- a. It has been indicated that we are having to deal with the possibility of large or extreme budget cuts over the next few months and years. Some have suggested that at the college level, decisions are already being justified based on the potential of reduced funding. More communication about the current state of funding and how potential decreases are being addressed from the university, college, school, and program level would be appreciated.
 - b. There have been some mentions of lack of communication or slow communication regarding strategic plan goals.
3. Although ULM's administration is diligently pursuing strategic initiatives, faculty and students have expressed a desire for greater transparency in the decision-making process. This could involve improved communication regarding administrative decisions, program changes, and budgetary allocations that impact the university community as a whole. – See above
 - a. Some faculty report their college strategic plan development process are not truly inclusive, as they believe faculty input was requested but not addressed. In other words, feedback was collected only to fulfil a requirement of collecting feedback.
 - b. Some faculty have reported that their insight into their program needs such as curricular changes and innovation have been ignored or unanswered at the college level, even for changes needed for accreditation purposes.

4. Another potential area for development is the enhancement of engagement and collaboration between the upper administration and faculty. Although there are avenues for faculty input, some believe that there are more opportunities for collaboration in the development of university policies, as well as in the more effective resolution of concerns regarding work load and compensation. – The Faculty Welfare Committee continues its work on a new workload policy. Dr. Arant suggest a meeting between the committee and the deans, which is in the works.

5. 360 degree appraisal. – This did take place, but it was in December rather than the usual time.

Why was faculty not allowed to evaluate our deans and the administration in the last academic year?

6. It was suggested that the FS conduct a formal faculty attitude survey. – My hope is to put this together and administer it in the spring.

7. Facilities Concerns – These concerns largely fall outside of Academic Affairs. I will reach out to him regarding them.

a. Elevator in Walker – Will it be renovated to become more stable?

b. Lack of board (whiteboards or blackboards) in classrooms – Needed for teaching and when technology does not work

c. Lack of satellite printer in Walker – Would be handier there than the nearest one in Hanna Hall

8. Online Mental Health Program – Dr. Arant was unfamiliar with the program, and I was unable to locate it in Moodle. After the provost had forwarded our concerns to the deans, Dr. Pratte, CAES Dean, spoke with me about the program. He was concerned that it did not properly protect medical privacy.

Developed by John Anderson along with some mental health professionals. This was created as a Moodle course and could still be archived and transferred to Canvas for sharing with faculty.

9. Concern about Harassment from supervisors – Should be addressed as a faculty grievance using the Unclassified Staff Grievance Policy.

Claim from faculty members of past abuse that was unresolved through regular channels. Mechanism for faculty to address work-environment issues in a safe manner are lacking.

10. Concern about harassment from peers – See above

Claim from a faculty member that peer worked with supervisor to harass

11. Could you please address the problem with the voluminous, non-academic related emails that are sent? – The provost stated that he understands the annoyance but that email is the primary method of communicating regarding campus events.

Faculty Positives

1. I think the upper administration at ULM is known for its emphasis on improving student performance. I think they emphasize the development of academic programs and support services that facilitate students' academic and professional success. Their commitment to the students' future success and well-being is evidenced by initiatives such as mentorship opportunities, career readiness programs, and enhanced student support services.
2. Our upper administration has been proactive in the development of the university's infrastructure, ensuring that the campus continues to modernize and expand. Investments in new facilities, including the expansion of research opportunities, student accommodation, and academic facility renovations, demonstrate a dedication to remaining competitive in the recruitment of new students and faculty.
3. Campus appearance remains top notch and continues to improve
4. New program development is a positive for students and budget
5. Proactive approach to building our own income base
6. Faculty appreciate many opportunities to contribute to strategic plan.
7. Greater effort is being implemented by the administration to listen to and respond to the needs of the various stakeholders of the University. This includes, faculty, staff and students. Though communication can improve, leaps and bounds have already been made when compared to other administrations.
8. Finding creative ways to generate revenue for the University to decrease reliance on tuition and the state budget.
9. There is more involvement being requested from the Faculty Senate to provide feedback on policies and procedures and administrative processes.
10. Changes have been and continue to be implemented to improve the competitiveness of faculty salary and retention.
11. There is a greater effort to include faculty outside of the tenure system in the University community.

Faculty Requests

1. Could the President or Provost provide us with the University Assessment and Evaluation Committee data regarding the completion rates of incoming freshman for the past few years, please? – Dr. Arant plans to host joint sessions with Dr. Fields to address who our students are in regard to background, level of education, and the like.
2. Could we please go back to the practice of getting the enrollments broken down by programs, schools, and colleges each semester? That data is very useful for addressing program initiatives. – The provost, working with Allison Thompson, has put together some resources for faculty, which are as follow:
 - a. <https://www.ulm.edu/academicaffairs/data-resources.html> - A collection of links to mostly university-level data of concern to faculty.
 - b. Power BI generates program-level data. It can be accessed by visiting the web-based version of Outlook and clicking on the “waffle” of nine dots in the upper left-hand corner of the window.