

Minutes of the 23 July Faculty Council Meeting

Meeting called to order at 10:00a by Steve Harrison

Members present: Steve Harrison, Brian Leblanc, Clayton Hollier, Bill Branch, Chris Clark, Kurt Guidry, Paul Wilson, Allen Hogan, Todd Shupe, Donald Boquet, Krishna Paudel, Denyse Cummins.

Chris Clark moved to approve the minutes as posted. Seconded by Brian Leblanc. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

Old Business

Faculty Loyalty/Satisfaction Survey – Steve Harrison reported that Vallerie Maurice had agreed to report to the Council on the survey but was ill and would not present the scheduled report. The report was postponed until the next Council meeting.

Faculty Evaluation Forms – Brian Leblanc reported that faculty input has been sought and obtained but no committee discussions were held. An update will be given at the next Council meeting on 20 August.

Support Services Survey – Kurt Guidry and members of the Survey Committee discussed the progress and problems with conducting the planned survey of support services. Committee members are Kurt Guidry (Chairman), Allen Hogan, Krishna Paudel, Todd Shupe, from the Council and Michael Dunn and Richard Vlosky.

Concerns and Issues identified by the committee:

What should the survey show?

With the diversity of service units a general survey would be not more than a customer satisfaction survey, which is already known or perceived.

To get maximum response a mail out survey rather than a web survey is needed.

A survey should not be done until after the results of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey are published.

Council Discussion of the Concerns and Issues.

Steve Harrison noted that the survey would be a Council survey and the lack of a report from the previous survey might not matter. Richard Vlosky thought the survey would be perceived as an AgCenter survey regardless of the origin and faculty would not respond until we get away from the perception that the results would not be made public. It is important that the faculty understand that this is not an AgCenter survey and the results will be published.

Paul Wilson brought out that anonymity had to be guaranteed to remove the fear of being known or many of the faculty would not respond.

Chris Clark asked how we should proceed if we don't do a survey, as the lack of satisfaction with support units is obvious.

Richard Volsky said we could do a simple one-page survey to identify which units have the most problems.

Allen Hogan noted that a committee he was on to evaluate support units had recommended that each unit have a user advisory group, but have had no feedback from administration on this recommendation.

Denyse Cummins said that she was asked to serve on a user advisory group but this was postponed indefinitely.

Paul Wilson asked if members of service units have annual evaluations that could be accessed by the Council. Bill Branch noted that evaluation of units should be an annual occurrence that needs to be ingrained and this has already been recommended by the Council and other committees.

Kurt Guidry suggested conducting a general survey to par down which units are the largest problem. Bill Branch agreed that this should be done to identify the problem units. Todd Shupe questioned whether Administration would respond to problems if identified. Bill Branch stated that we have to start somewhere. Brien Leblanc thought that if satisfaction levels were published, this would put pressure on Administration to respond.

Allen asked if a general survey could determine what units need the most improvement. Richard Vlosky said this could be done if the right questions were asked. A survey could identify difference among individuals within units. To do this, a survey would have to assess how much an individual faculty member knew about the units being surveyed. Michael Dunn said we know problems exist and our purpose is to identify the problems. Clayton Hollier added that this had to be done without the bias of individuals being a factor. Steve Harrison asked whether the survey could provide information on the units and what individuals within units do. Michael Dunn answered that the survey would have such introductory information and also describe the survey goals and what will happen with the results.

Michael Dunn inquired about a budget for the survey that will include 550 faculty members. The primary cost will be for post-paid return envelopes. Steve Harrison said he will approach the Chancellor about funding.

Richard Vlosky brought up for discussion ways to protect the identity of respondents. Fear of discovery will cause some people not to complete the survey. "We may only be able to guarantee confidentiality and not anonymity." In most surveys, the response is typically only 15%. Steve Harrison suggested that we send reminders by way of the AllAgCenter address. Krishna Paudel suggested creating a web site for the survey. Michael Dunn said that this will still not preserve anonymity. Denyse Cummins suggested one mail out with reminders through AllAgCenter.

Steve Harrison commented that the Council seems to have reached a consensus that we have a survey with a single mailout with email reminders. Michael Dunn said that a pre-mailout

notification prior to the mailing of the survey would be very important to the success of the survey.

Steve Harrison inquired at to how long it would take to put together the survey materials. Richard Vlosky said we had to have the previous survey results published and money for the mailout, then we can proceed. We also had to decide which units would be in the survey. It was decided that Sponsored Programs/Intellectual Property, Information Technology, Accounting/Purchasing, IROD, Facilities Planning, HRM and Communications would be included.

Richard Vlosky said that the survey would be agree/disagree type questions with a couple of qualitative questions.

Steve Harrison asked whether the units would be allowed to have input on the questions. Richard Vlosky answered that they would so they will perceive that this is not an attack on them but designed to help. Kurt Guidry asked how we will contact the units? Steve Harrison suggested developing a core set of questions – then ask the units to select someone within each unit to provide input. Richard Vlosky said that the Council will then preview the survey and sign off on it.

Steve Harrison asked if the survey could be finalized by December if we have the Faculty Satisfaction Survey results presented at the September Council meeting. Richard Vlosky said that he does not believe we will see the results of the earlier survey – but assuming we did, 30 days afterward, the committee will have a survey ready to preview. The process would be complete with the survey ready in January. Michael Dunn thought the survey could be disseminated in the fall – if the first survey results were available by 1 September.

Clayton Hollier asked how many surveys forms had to be returned for a valid survey. Richard Vlosky answered 200 to 250 of the 550.

Todd Shupe asked what form the survey results will take? Michael Dunn answered that the frequency of response for each survey question is needed.

Steve Harrison asked Kurt Guidry to put together a summary of the Council's deliberations and conclusions on the survey to send out to the Council members.

CMS Web System and Password Consolidation update

Megan Moran

Paul Wilson asked What is the rationale to have to change passwords?

Answer There is good news – bad news on passwords. Bad news is that the Baton Rouge Campus will also now require changing passwords every 90 days. Good news in that the PAWS password will only have to be entered once and can be set to whatever one wants, so it can be the same as the AgCenter password.

CMS - One of the goals is to create a system that will allow faculty to enter content easily. It has been delayed because AgCenter initiatives have changed. The search and retrieval functions have been improved and made more powerful. About 40 animal science faculty have been trained and made about 1000 entries in the Beta testing phase, which is now complete. CMS is moving into the next phase – going live – taking down the present site and transferring content to the new system. About one-half of the content is no longer current and will be deleted. Individuals have to decide what to keep. CMS means moving away from departmental delivery to a “Communities of Interest” format in which there are eight channels (topics). These are selected because they are consumer friendly. Information can be in one place but appear in other topic areas through linking and can also be referenced to department channels.

The CMS review system will validate content for accuracy and relevancy.

The next phase is going to the parishes, stations and departments. Departments are last in line because they deal with different issues such as class materials and the main campus and so is more complex.

Steve Harrison asked how materials that should not be made public will be handled?

Answer There will be a place to put these materials that will not be in CMS.

Kurt Guidry asked How long will it take to post content?

Answer This will depend on the department heads and directors. The slow down will be at the peer review level. It will be up to the faculty member to work with peer reviewers to speed up the process when this becomes necessary.

The system will track authorship of publications. All faculty will have a place of their own to post whatever they want. This site will also show everything the member has on the system.

Steve Harrison asked Will reviewers be qualified for all content?

Answer Reviewers may be overloaded initially. They will have to identify others to assist with content review. This is not a peer review but will only decide if the material is accurate and appropriate. Reviewer will also decide the location of the content on the web. Information will be tagged for intended users and will be put into the land grant system for national use.

Steve Harrison asked Can all users access all content?

Answer Yes, but users can decide what level of content they want to read.

Todd Shupe asked How are reviewers selected?

Answer The reviewers will be selected based on the topic of the article.

Clayton asked If an area has a limited area of expertise and all share authorship, who will review the content.

Answer This will have to be decided within departments.

Denyse Cummins asked Can we complete a search on a topic without pulling up 10,000 press releases?

Answer Yes, Audience designation of content will limit who retrieves data plus key words will allow us to find exactly with we want.

Steve Harrison asked When is the launch date?

Answer February - March 2005

End of Discussion on CMS

Campus Wide Promotion and Tenure Update

Steve Harrison reported on the draft of the guidelines for an AgCenter Campus Promotion Review Committee. The proposed makeup of the committee of 23 would be 5 administrators, 5 Council members with 18 faculty to be appointed by the Chancellor.

Paul Wilson suggested that the committee should not have administrators as members. Todd Shupe, Clayton Hollier and Steve Harrison voiced agreement. Steve Harrison stated that the appointment of the committee should not be entirely in the Chancellor's hands.

Grievance Procedure Committee Update (Committee members are Paul Wilson (chair), Clayton Hollier, Linda Hooper-Bui and Jerry Whatley)

Paul Wilson handed out a summary of the committee progress report and a copy of PS20 with comments for discussion. The committee suggested changes to PS20 including having in place a faculty grievance committee to hear complaints of faculty members as is done on the Baton Rouge Campus. Todd Shupe noted that a statement on page 3 of PS20 appeared to say that the employee had no legal right to grievance consideration, which may require some clarification. Chris Clark suggested the Council should develop its own draft of a Grievance Policy. Steve Harrison asked the committee to develop a report for the next Council meeting.

New Business

Travel Policy Revisions

After brief discussion, it was decided that the revisions to the travel policy required no action by the Council.

Cell Phones

Steve Harrison noted that personal calls were sometimes necessary to enhance a faculty member's job performance especially when working late hours and the employee should not be charged for these calls. The Council should write a statement on PS45, which was written without consulting the Faculty Council. Todd Shupe suggested that the Council write a policy statement on how policy statements are written.

Ann Coulon's Reports

Job Description PS – The job descriptions for Research should be similar to those for Extension. The PS should be in place soon – same time schedule as PS42.

Promotion and Tenure Committee – Steve Harrison pointed out what the Council had discussed earlier in the meeting as deficiencies in the PS. Ann Coulon agreed that only faculty should be on the committee, that the selection method of members should be changed to include more input from the Council and that there should be more structure in the selection process to ensure a balanced committee from academic ranks and field agents.

End of Discussion with Ann Coulon

Todd Shupe inquired about any responses on the Council letter regarding voting privileges and graduate school membership. Steve Harrison answered that the Baton Rouge Campus Faculty Senate will discuss these issues at the September meeting and they would probably initiate some action at that meeting.

Continuing Education for Faculty - Krishna Paudel introduced a new proposal that would allow professional rank personnel to take one class per semester to further their academic careers. The tuition would be paid by the AgCenter. Ann Coulon noted that this could be done now on an individual basis if the department head agreed. She suggested that, if the Council supported this proposal, the Council write a letter of support to the Chancellor. Steve Harrison appointed Krishna Paudel and Todd Shupe to draft a statement of support for a policy that would allow additional training with paid tuition, The policy would limit employees to one course in 2 years and could not be intended for a degree.

The next Council meeting date was set for 20 August.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00p.