
12:30 pm, Walker 2-91 and Zoom

Blackburn, Audrey (reporter for the Hawkeye);							
Anderson, Jeff*		Ashworth, Burton*		Glaze, Donna		Comeau, Jill	Deuber, Melissa
Ji, Jane		Bruce, Paul Robert		Hardy, Tyesha		Jackson, Keith -excused	
Koers, Gregory		David, Blair		Jones, Ashanti		Tice, Hilary*	
McGuire, Pat		Harris, Courtney -resigned		Richardson, Amanda			
Murru, Siva		Johnson, Mark		Showers, Jo Ellen -excused			
Rowley, Brendan		McDaniel, Janelle*		Traxler, Karen			
Tresner, Clifford		Tolleson, Josh					
		Traweek, Adam					

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

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

rev

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

wording. Senator Anderson shared that the post tenure

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.

Faculty Concerns

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.

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

