University Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, March 8, 2016

Attending:

Zed Adams, NSSR  
Adria Benjamin, Performing Arts, Co-Chair  
Craig Bernecker, Parsons  
Erin Cho, Parsons  
Josh Furst, Lang  
Danielle Goldman, Lang  
Richard Harper, Performing Arts  
Rachel Heiman, SPE  
David Lopato, Performing Arts  
Frank Nemhauser, Performing Arts  
Derek Porter, Parsons  
Richard Salcer, Parsons  
Barry Salmon, SPE  
Elaine Savory, Lang  
Christian Schneider, Parsons  
Earl Scott, Parsons  
Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons  
Sven Travis, Parsons, Co-Chair  
Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang  
Scott Whitehurst, Performing Arts  
Jennifer Wilson, Lang

Not Attending:

Elaine Abelson, Lang  
Charles Allison, SPE  
Julie Boyd, Performing Arts  
Candy Schulman, SPE  
Marcus Turner, SPE  
Inessa Zartesky, Performing Arts

I. Approval of minutes from the previous UFS meeting

Barry began the meeting and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made. It was seconded and then approved.

II. Town Hall Report

Barry asked if there were any comments about the recent University Town Hall. He said that there was an acknowledgement of software fatigue around the university since there were a lot of new platforms that were rolled out at the same time. There was also an acknowledgement that there were some problems with some of the software and that they will be addressed.
III. Budget Committee Report – Sven

Sven reported on how the budget committee works. He noted that if colleges want money for different or new things they have to petition this committee. The requests are compared to the adjacency of what’s available. This is where salary increases come from. Salary increases are not operationalized. Last year there was about 4-5 million to work with. Around 25 million dollars of requests where submitted. Capital is not being considered on this committee. The committee responded to the requests saying that they need to be more urgent. What eventually was approved were the salary increases for FTF and staff, 3% increase. This year was very different. There was a lot less money. They are going to have to come up with a new process for next year. Last year the school borrowed money to give salary increases. This year the BoT does not want to borrow money. The POs list of new initiatives must be funded since many of them are not yet operational. Overall, the school is in a difficult situation. Sven felt that is was Important that the UFS continue representation on this committee once he rotates off. It’s a big time commitment, up to half a day a week.

Discussion:
Elaine S. asked if it was possible to have an alternate. Sven thought it wouldn’t work. She continued to say she had a lot of IT issues this semester. She also knows that a lot of stuff in the new building is not working. So, if a lot of issues has to do with student attrition, perhaps this is something that needs to be funded. One senator asked where the right place was to get into the discussion at large? In particular in regard to centralization of advising.

Barry said he serves on a technology committee and the big thing right now was lap tops for students. Barry felt this should go to the Learning Environments committee for discussion and then they should give a recommendation. It costs about $1800 per laptop to make sure it runs all the right software. It was noted that not all students need a laptop. The trustees might support this as a separate budget item. ANother suggestion might be to change the layout of the computer labs too if the university ends up needing less desktop computers. The university would increase financial aid to make sure that students could purchase a laptop. Jennifer asked if there was a list of computer programs that were only available in specific locations. The point of a computer lab used to be to use programs that were hard to get.

IV. Chairs’ Reports

A. Design Within Limits (re: Faculty/Staff Lounge Space)
Design within Reach is coming to review the space. No structural changes are going to be made. More or less it will be just a redecoration. Zed asked about the open space and wondered if it was going to be addressed? Zed would like to make a motion to have the fundamental problem with the space addressed. The motion was seconded. One senator says they don’t want just a redecoration and that the real problem with the space needs to be addressed. Sven said that the design company is going to come and give suggestions, before they make any changes and suggested it might be useful to see what they recommend first.

B. Remuneration and Senate Profile
The co-chairs presented exactly what the UFS voted on about remuneration to the president and the provost and it was well received. They didn’t get any clear commitment but the co-chairs have a meeting later today with them, where they are hoping to finalize something. In regard to PTF there was some concern about the $ being open ended.

C. Middle States "Return"
Barry reported that Middle States are returning to follow up about FTF and UFS. There is going to be a reassessment in the form of a report submitted by the administration but they are not physically returning to school. The co-chairs suggested that it would be good to have someone from the PO come to give a report on the follow up information for Middlestates. Jurgen wondered if the administration could also be reminded about their promise of sharing faculty salary banding data.

V. Technology/Software Systems Adoption Procedures and Practices
(please note and include attached/included NSSR Memorandum)
Barry and the other co-chairs felt it was important to push for procedures and policies about how software adoption is decided. It was also noted that there are significant problems with the way some of the newly adopted software works. Barry referenced the proposals that NSSR faculty put together. He felt that the UFS should adopt some of them. In particular Perceptive Content is the major issue. No one ever heard anything about this software before it was introduced. One senator suggested starting out the proposal by referencing student cohort community building and retention first, and then faculty workload. It should also address the Chief Technology Officer. Another thing that would be good to communicate is that the faculty welcome helpful software, but more have a problem with software being brought in without consultation. Jurgen felt it would be good to address the proliferation of systems, since there are so many. Sven said that Perceptive Content is an extension of an existing system, but that it is not going to continue being used because it was so bad. Josh asked if the first proposal took PTF workload into consideration. Barry felt it was important to emphasize all faculty. Josh also brought up an issue about how these software can track faculty. Barry suggested inviting the president and provost to the next meeting. Jennifer shared that she noticed that some old software being used for different purposes, in particular the fact that teaching fellowships are back on the Human Resources website. She noted that this switch was also done without consultation. Zed made a motion that the UFS senate adopt the NSSR recommendation with amendments. The motion was seconded and approved.

VI. Elections
Adria reported that she will email all the colleges, updating them on their membership status and asking them to hold elections. David asked about the timing of remuneration confirmation since he felt it would effect elections. Sven said that the co-chairs need to review of how alternates work.

The president and provost will be invited to the next meeting.

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved.