

Present: Tom Marshall, John Bohac, Cynthia Cooper, Bryce Jones, Dana Delaware, Lucy Lee, Diane Johnson, Kit Hadwiger, David Gillette, Kathryn Brammall, Amanda Langendoerfer, James Guffey, Brian Kubin, Mike Ashcroft, Peter Rolnick, Candy Young, Sal Costa, Terry Olson, Troy Paino, Rebecca Charles, Scott Olsen, David Hayes, Joan Mather, Wolfgang Hoeschele, Ed Rogers, Ian Lindevald and Jana Morton.

CALL TO ORDER

J. Guffey called the meeting to order on February 26, 2009 at 3:05 pm.

IDENTIFICATION OF ALTERNATES & THOSE CARRYING TWO VOTES

Carrying two votes: K. Hadwiger and E. McDuff; **Alternates:** three; **Votes at the table** - 21

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

It was noted that a correction to those present at the January meeting should have been Joan Mather only. Dana Smith was not in attendance. A motion was made by D. Delaware to accept the minutes with this change. P. Rolnick seconded the motion. A vote was taken and all were favor. Motion passed.

At 3:10 pm the votes at the table changed to 24.

REPORTS

Provost's Report – T. Paino reported that there is good news from Jefferson City this week. Flat funding is being recommended for higher education but we'll know more in March.

T. Paino discussed his proposal to reorganize the College of Arts & Sciences. He presented a handout with the proposed reallocation of the departments based on feedback that he has been receiving from the current Dean, Doug Davenport and the Department Chairs. At this time there are nineteen departments within the College of Arts & Sciences and he feels this is a weakness for the University. After some discussion with President Krueger and the Board of Governors he was encouraged to follow through on this proposal. He sees this as a tweaking of the existing structure. He noted he met with the department chairs from the College of Arts & Sciences in small groups to gain feedback and provide information that the department chairs could take back to their areas. Most departments have been very supportive of the change but have indicated few concerns: 1) smaller units would be weaker within the new department structure 2) internal searches to find a Dean and/or Department Chairs 3) will this take the best teachers from the classrooms and put them in administrative roles and will this diminish the teaching quality at Truman.

Question/Comment – Has the external search been taken off the table? What resources will be used?

T. Paino – I will make a slight reallocation of faculty resources due to hiring from other departments. When creating this model, I tried to accommodate the strong feeling/suggestions of all departments affected, this is not a final model.

Question/Comment – The School of Social Science seems to be hodge/podge but in terms of the number of faculty more even compared to the other schools, more diverse maybe.

T. Paino – Yes, the number of faculty was the main decision of how to split, to keep a good balance for each school. I don't want to set us back, just to see a better balance.

Question/Comment – Why schools vs colleges?

T. Paino – I'm not married to either name.

Question/Comment – Will this affect governance?

T. Paino – No.

Question/Comment – What about clerical support? Will there be a location problem if Psychology is placed with Math & Computer Science?

T. Paino – There are currently two full-time secretaries in the College of Arts & Sciences so new hiring won't be needed. Doug Davenport has been working on a plan for this and for office space. The dean of Science and Math will be housed in Magruder, the dean of Arts & Letters will be located in either Baldwin Hall or Ophelia Parrish and the dean of Social Science will be housed in either Baldwin Hall or McClain Hall.

Question/Comment – So there will be no additional costs for clerical or administration support?

T. Paino – I see a one year transition due to contracts signed by the associate deans prior to my arrival at Truman so some costs through fiscal year 2011. After that it will be cost neutral. I plan to take the salaries of the dean and two associate deans and divide them three ways to pay for the three deans. The associate deans were given three year contracts so they still have one year left on their contracts. We could wait until that year is up but the President has encouraged me to move forward. Since the Grant Director and Assessment Specialist positions have not been filled and these are positions paid out of the Provost office, I will use the funds from these two salaries to help cover the three dean's salaries for the first year. After that, those funds would go back to the Academic Affairs funding. I also plan to rewrite the two Associate Provost positions job duties and add grant writing and assessment to them. I will then take on some of the duties from Dr Di Stefano to allow her time for her new duties.

Question/Comment – I'm very disappointed that a Grant Director will no longer be available. Someone needs to handle the post award process. The Business Office is not set up to do this.

T. Paino – One associate provost will do the grant work and research and just focus on these things. The post award process has been taken into account and the Business Office now has someone in place that just processes grants.

Question/Comment – Concerned that giving grant writing to an associate provost who doesn't have any experience in doing this. Will you be redoing the administration in the Provost Office?

T. Paino – At this time I have not had time to review the associate provost resumes or abilities to see if who can handle the grant writing but will look into this closely before a decision is made.

Question/Comment – Are we moving too quickly?

T. Paino – Many have said that we move too slow which gives us too long to worry about things and to try to find problems. This is not going to change your overall duties or day-to-day life.

Question/Comment – Should we try to reorganize before the curriculum changes are made? Is there any advantage to reorganizing before the change?

T. Paino – The administration doesn't need to be based on the changes of the curriculum. This is a structure that I would like to work under. I'm more comfortable with this type of structure and in order to do my job, I would like to get my team in place as soon as possible. I can work within the current structure but would really like to refine the structure to this model.

Question/Comment – How do you see us advancing interdisciplinary with the curriculum changes?

T. Paino – This is more about the size of the schools than where everyone is grouped. This will allow the faculty to work with deans who know their departments and its professors to better assist with teaching, grant writing and research.

Question/Comment – How will the hiring process be handled?

T. Paino - A search committee will be formed to review applications for the new deans. The committee will consist of three faculty from each unit and one outside member. A forum will be offered so that the faculty can give feedback and then the committee will make recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will make the final decision on who to hire.

Question/Comment – It seems that the dean becomes more relevant to the faculty and will get to know you better with this new model.

Question/Comment – The history faculty are all in support of the new proposal. The current structure doesn't seem to be working well and we want to see this move forward right away.

Question/Comment – So what do you want from Faculty Senate, a resolution in support of this change?

T. Paino – I would like to have the support of Faculty Senate before I move forward.

Question/Comment – Have the other units outside of the College of Arts & Sciences been included in these discussions?

T. Paino – No.

Question/Comment – There doesn't seem to be any problem from the School of Business. We believe it's a good idea.

Question/Comment – So do we need to go back to our departments for more discussion and then have a special meeting next Wednesday?

At this point P. Rolnick made a motion that a resolution be made that states “Faculty Senate supports in principle the Provost proposal to split the College of Arts & Sciences into three separate schools.” B. Jones seconded the motion.

The item was moved to Discussion. After some discussion, a vote was taken and 20 agreed, 1 agreed as 2nd vote, 0 declined and 3 abstained. Motion passed.

Staff Council Report – R. Charles noted that the Staff Council had passed a resolution in regard to the budget.

Undergraduate Council Report – C. Young noted that they have been talking about double counting in the LSP and that UGC had to make a technical correction to their by-laws – SB 3408.

D. Johnson made a motion to move SB 3408 rev to an Action item, D. Delaware seconded the motion. A vote was taken and all were in favor. Motion passed.

Faculty Senate President's Report – J. Guffey handed out a sheet that contained the disclaimer that Faculty Senate had requested be added to the Instructor Ratings survey results. This document also contained a draft of the email that will be sent out on Monday, March 2 to all faculty about the survey results.

He noted that five year reviews are coming up but not sure who will be presenting to Faculty Seante yet.

K. Brammall stated that several faculty have reported that the Instructor Ratings survey results have been posted already. She's wondering if we can ask that they be taken down until the email can be sent to the faculty. J. Guffey noted he would check on this with ITS and in the meantime get the email sent out.

Discussion Items

SB 4308 – J. Guffey noted that the first sentence of #8 on page two and the words “that is” in the second sentence should be removed. P. Rolnick made a motion to move this to an Action item. D. Delaware seconded the motion. A vote was taken and all were in favor.

The vote count changed to 22. A motion was made by D. Johnson to extend the meeting 15 minutes. S. Costa seconded the motion. A vote was taken and 20 agreed and 2 declined. Motion passed.

SB 4308 is now an Action item. After much discussion regarding the grade appeals and the attendance appeals deadlines, it was moved to withdraw the motion to move the item to Action and leave it as a Discussion item so that UGC can revisit the document at their next meeting.

ACTION ITEMS-none at this time.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Six Questions for the University-Wide Committee Composition – This item will be postponed until a decision is made regarding the reorganization.

CONSENT ITEMS - All items were approved without objection.

INFORMATION ITEMS- All items were noted without objection.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by D. Delaware to adjourn the meeting; the motion was seconded by C. Young. A vote was taken and all were in favor. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5:14 pm.