MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF
OCTOBER 4, 2000

ATTENDANCE:
Arts and Sciences: Christine Bridges-Esser, Kevin Dodson, Bruce Drury, Iva Hall, Vernice
Monroe, Joe Nordgren, Joe Pizzo, Kathy Roberts, Pam Saur, Walter Sutton. Absent: James
Stevens, Cindy Stinson.
Business: Larry Allen, Richard Jones, K.C. Sen, Celia Varick
Education: Kimberly Griffith, Willaim Holmes, Desmond Rice, Kimberly Wallet-Chalambaga,
William Worsham.
Engineering: Valentin Andreev, Peggy Doerschuck, David Read, Alec Matheson. Absent: Keith
Gonthier
Fine Arts and Communications: Randy Deal, Kurt Gilman, Lane Roth. Absent: Wayne Dyess,
Steve Hodges.
Library: Jon Tritsch, Sarah Tusa

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Senate President Randolph Deal.

MINUTES
A motion was made by Walter Sutton and seconded by Desmond Rice to accept the minutes of
September 6, 2000, with the following amendments:
New Business Section: Library Search has six applicants, corrected by Sarah Tusa, to read:
Library Director Search has six applicants.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT
President Deal presented an outline of topics to be discussed. Before beginning his report the
President stated that the purpose of the Faculty Senate has never been nor will be to single out,
harm, or “go after” any individual person. All concerns brought up in the topics for discussion
dealt with problems of policies either not existing or not being followed by the appropriate
parties. It is the duty of the Faculty Senate to investigate and bring to the attention of the
Administration any breaches of policy or conflict of interests. Questions pertaining to what policy
and/or procedures were used by the Deans to distribute salary increases and accountability for the procedures used were raised by the Faculty and brought to the Executive Council. There were readily identifiable disparate raises given by the Deans to the Faculty. President Deal contacted a Dean to come before the Faculty Senate. He declined. President Deal asked him to come before the Executive Council. He declined. President Deal asked him to meet with the Senate officers; he declined, but agreed to meet with President Deal and Vice President Monroe. One question posed to the Dean was about a Department Chair receiving an unusually high raise. The Dean’s explanation was that the Department Chair could no longer teach overloads. Thus, they made up for the salary loss by adding this amount to his base pay. The Dean said that the person would not accept the position with a salary reduction. He also stated that in his College he used the Cooper-Stevens Plan to distribute the money based on a dollar amount, not a percentage. Thus,an evaluation of the F2.08 of high merit would receive X amount of dollars, merit Y, and no merit would receive Z. Each Department Chair was to look a the F2.08 for the past three years and rank faculty. Based on their ranking they received the corresponding amount of money determined for that ranking. It was unclear what the Dean’s policy and procedures were on free lines, faculty that resigned, the salary for the Chairs, what the Cooper-Stevens Plan is and the universality of its usage by the Deans of the other Colleges.
In the open discussion of these issues that followed, it became apparent that the problem
in not having had a university wide policy in place beforehand will become evident upon appeal of a faculty member’s raise. If there is no universal policy nor awareness of what an individual’s increase was in relation to other faculty, how does one determine if he or she should appeal, what procedures he or she needs to take and who to take it to.
Another problem arises in the use of the F2.08 form. Dr. Rice pointed out that there are
no clear assumptions about how people are evaluated. Questions are also raised when the
categories are not clearly marked. Where the mark is placed along the lines of merit is not a fixed point, thus, how do you attach a dollar amount to all possible placements?
It was determined that a uniform plan needs to be instituted. This plan should not be left
up to each Dean and there should be Faculty feedback. There should also be an Appeals
Committee created with Faculty representation.

OLD BUSINESS:
None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:
Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Committee: Chair Sarah Tusa urged everyone to attend the
2000 Distinguished Faculty Lecture scheduled October 16, 2000 in the University Theater. This
year’s Distinguished Faculty Lecturer is Jim Jordan.

Budget and Compensation Committee: There is now a Salary Equity Committee that meets on
Wed. at 2:00 in the Plummer Building. Al interested parties are invited to attend. This committee is looking at salary equity for Faculty and Chairs. Toward this end they are in the process of hiring an external consultant to look at such issues as experience, terminal degrees, market value of the discipline, etc.

Faculty Issues Committee: Chair, William Holmes stated that the process of selecting the Minnie
Piper Award Nominee is ongoing. On the first ballot there were 18 nominees. He encouraged all
to vote and return the ballot in a timely fashion. It was suggested that, in the future, the Faculty be provided with background information on the finalists in order to facilitate making a choice.

NEW BUSINESS
Sarah Tusa stated that Kathleen Murray will be conducting a faculty survey for library use at the
end of the month. She urged everyone to complete the survey as it will help the library meet the
needs of the faculty.

A motion was made by David Read that the Faculty Senate recommended that Academic
Computing have a separate budget and report to the VPAA rather than its current structure. The
motion was seconded by Walter Sutton and passed by acclamation.

A motion was made by Kevin Dodson that a policy should be in place for requiring written
administrative feedback to any committee that puts forth recommendations. Such feedback
should include (1) the decision made, and (b) the rationale for the decision. Additionally, in the
case of budgetary matters, there should be an administrative oversight responsibility to ensure that the money was spent for what was proposed. The results of this should also be reported back to the committee to assist in future deliberations. Bruce Drury made a motion to table Kevin Dodson’s motion. This motion was seconded by Valentin Andreev and passed.

A motion was made by Bill Worsham that the Faculty Senate minutes include a flow chart for
each motion illustrating: the rationale behind the motion, the action to be taken, who it should go to, and the decision made. The motion was seconded by Kevin Dodson and passed by
acclamation.

Christine Bridges-Esser asked about the status of Anti Virus capabilities of the University
computers since our contract with McAffee was no longer in place. She was informed that we are
using the Solomon Anti Virus check that can be acquired by logging onto the Lamar web site.
She was also warned that trying to download this to your home computer will cause serious
problems to your home system.

Question: what should be done when pieces of office ceilings fall on people’s heads? When
they call the physical plant they are told that the university is in the process of remodeling
buildings and will get around to you as soon as they get to your building. Answer: The Risk
Management person is John Whittle. You should write a letter to him and send copies to Dr.
Simmons and to the Physical Plant.

The Senate was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

If you have anything you want the Senate to discuss, please contact your Senator or the Senate
Secretary: christine.bridges@lamar.edu or extension 8600.