

Missouri Western State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
March 23, 2006
Blum 220

Senators Present: President Mullins (presiding), K. Andrews, Chevalier, Fulton, deGregorio, Gregory, Heider, Noynaert, S. Nandan, Roberts, Tushaus

2006-2007 incoming Senators present: Blake, Hiley, Cronk,

Senators Absent: Hunt, Kriewitz, M. Nandan, Ottinger

2006-2007 incoming Senators absent: Sauls, Bergland

Non-voting and Ex-Officio Members Present: President Past Senate President Larry Andrews, University President James Scanlon, Acting Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Jeanie Daffron

Guests: Dale Krueger, Ann Thorne

Call to Order: President Phil Mullins called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of March 2, 2006 Minutes as amended: Approved

Approval of Agenda: Approved

Election of Officers:

Senator Heider withdrew her name from nomination for Faculty Senate Secretary. After conferring with departmental colleagues, she simply has too many other departmental and institutional responsibilities to be a Senate officer next year.

President Mullins opened the floor for nominations for the office of Secretary.

Kathleen Andrews was nominated as Secretary and there were no further nominations.

The following slate of officers was elected by acclamation:

President: Phil Mullins

Vice President: Shauna Hiley

Secretary: Kathleen Andrews.

Report from the University President:

The Governor's proposed 2% increase, (which amounts to only a little over \$400,000 for Western) is moving through the legislature. With the increase Western's state funding is still less than it was in 2000. Western administration will bring a proposal for a tuition increase to the Western Board of Governors in April. Tuition increases at other state institutions are currently being announced and they are in the 4-6% range. Western's increase will be in this range also. The Board of Governors will consider the upcoming institutional budget in May.

The Lewis and Clark Discovery Initiative is also moving through the legislature. The House proposal contains elements that are different than the Governor's proposal. It focuses on scholarships, debt reduction, and unspecified capital. Western and the other four-year institutions do not support this version of the bill. The Senate will probably produce a bill that is more similar to the Governor's proposal. The MOHELA Board has met recently to re-do the proposal for selling assets (this avoids litigation). President Scanlon recently testified.

Western is increasingly being recognized by AQIP as a leader. Strategic planning and AQIP at Western are folded together. Those providing leadership for AQIP at Western are now being invited to make national presentations. President Scanlon commented that the good work on planning at Western is attracting the recognition it deserves.

Jason Baker met with President Scanlon recently about the soon to emerge Ad Hoc Graduate Studies Committee report. President Scanlon and Dr. Bragin will very soon be given drafts for review. Campus forums soliciting faculty input are at the end of the month. Baker requested that President Scanlon arrange for outside review of our draft proposals by seasoned graduate deans. President Scanlon has arranged for this.

Report from the Acting Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

Senator Shiva Nandan was congratulated for being awarded the Governor's Award for Teaching Excellence. He will soon go to Jefferson City for a ceremony.

On April 30th we will be hosting Western's first early registration/orientation for high ability students. 333 scholarship students (whose ACT average is 26) have been invited with the anticipation that between 100 and 125 will likely attend. This is part of our enrollment management program.

The committee to review applications of candidates for the Board of Governors' Distinguished Professor Awards has been appointed and will soon begin its work: Members are Jim Estes, Phil Wann, Kelly Henry, Jeff Poet, Evelyn Brooks, Martin Johnson, Brenda Blessing and Jeanne Daffron (chair).

Report from the Senate President

The Executive Committee has met two times since the last Senate meeting.

Old Business

(SB3-2006) Motion to add the attached Academic Honesty Policy, Due Process Form and Violation Report to the MWSU Policy Guide in Section IV Instructional Policies. It should be placed as letter H., preceding “Grade Appeal Process” (this and subsequent headings should be re-lettered). (Noynaert/Fulton). See Appendix A

Passed unanimously by voice vote.

(SB4-2006) Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitutional Bylaws (MWSU Policy Guide, 260) to establish a new Faculty Senate standing committee, Academic Honesty Committee, as described below (Fulton/Hunt):

11. Academic Honesty Committee

Purpose: This committee serves as the final review board for violations of the Academic Honesty Policy.

Membership: The committee shall be composed of one member from each college and three additional members from the faculty at large. The committee shall elect a chairperson whose responsibility it is to receive documents, convene the committee and sign documents on behalf of the committee.

Duties: The committee will act as the final review board for students who have been accused of violating the Academic Honesty Policy. The committee will base its decision on the written statements and evidence submitted by the student and the faculty member. The committee’s decision, which must be made within 30 days, is final. If it is determined that no violation of academic honesty has occurred, the committee will recommend to the Provost that the student’s alleged violation be removed from his or her record.

Passed unanimously by voice vote.

(SB5-2006) Motion to recommend that the *Student Handout* be revised so that the current (2005-2006) Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process sections (p. 9) be deleted and replaced by the new Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process provisions. (Gregory/Fulton)

Passed unanimously by voice vote

New Business:

Dale Krueger, chair of the FS Salary Committee, distributed a report summarizing matters related to the Salary Committee proposals. See Appendix B.

President Mullins reminded the Senate that our April 20 meeting will be lengthy.

Adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Appendix A

Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process

Academic honesty is required in all academic endeavors. Violations of academic honesty include any instance of plagiarism, cheating, seeking credit for another's work, falsifying documents or academic records, or any other fraudulent classroom activity.

Violations of academic honesty may result in a failing grade on the assignment, failure in the course, or expulsion from school.

When a student's grade has been affected, violations of academic honesty will be reported to the Provost or the designated representative

Violations of Academic Honesty

Violations of academic honesty include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

1. Copying another person's work and claiming it as your own;
2. Using the work of a group of students when the assignment requires individual work;
3. Looking at or attempting to look at an examination before it is administered;
4. Using materials during an examination that are not permitted;
5. Allowing another student to take your exam for you;
6. Intentionally impeding the academic work of others;
7. Using any electronic device to transmit portions of questions or answers on an examination to other students;
8. Using any electronic device to improperly store information for an exam;
9. Knowingly furnishing false information to the University or its representatives.
10. Assisting other students in any of the acts listed above.

Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a specific kind of academic dishonesty in which you take another's ideas or words and claim them as your own. When you draw on someone else's work, you must indicate the source of that material, whether you are repeating another's words, argument or thought. Even if you paraphrase another's work and are not using the exact wording, you are still required to indicate the source of the material. This material must be clearly identified with appropriate citations. If you do not do that, you have plagiarized those materials. Any time you copy and paste any writing that is not your own for an assignment, you must use quotation marks and give the source of that material. If you cut and paste without noting what you have done, you will be guilty of plagiarism. Even if the writing is your own, if it has been used for a previous assignment that should be indicated.

Student Due Process Procedure

A student accused of academic dishonesty will first meet with the faculty member who made the allegation of academic dishonesty. If the faculty member decides academic dishonesty occurred, consequences could include giving the student a zero on the assignment, asking the student to rewrite the assignment, or failing the student in the course. If the student's grade is affected, the faculty member must file a MWSU Academic Honesty Violation Report. If the student disagrees with the faculty member's decision, the student may submit a written appeal of that decision within ten days to the department chairperson and request a meeting with the department chair. In the event there is no assigned chairperson, the request should be made to the division dean. The chairperson's decision shall be provided in writing to the student and faculty member within ten days. Should the student or faculty member disagree with the chairperson's decision, a written appeal may be made within ten days to the Provost or designated representative to present the case to the Academic Honesty Committee. The Committee will base its decision on the written statements and evidence submitted by the student and the faculty member. The Committee's decision, which must be made within 30 days, is final. If it is determined that no violation of academic honesty has occurred, the student's alleged violation will be removed from his or her record.

Any student who has been found guilty of violating the academic honesty policy a second time will be reported by the Provost to the Dean of Student Development for disciplinary action.

MWSU Academic Honesty Violation
Due Process Form
(To be completed by the Department Chair)

_____ G - _____
Last Name First Name Middle Initial Student ID Number

Course Number Course Name Semester and year

I have read the Academic Honesty Violation Report Form submitted by the faculty member as well as the evidence of the violation and have met with the student regarding the Academic Honesty Violation; and I

- agree with the faculty member's findings in this case.
- disagree with the faculty member's findings in this case.

Department Chairperson's Signature Date

I have met with the department chairperson and I

- agree with the chairperson's decision, and I am stopping the appeal process.
- disagree with the chairperson's decision and will continue the appeal process.

Student's Signature Date

The portion below this line should only be completed if the appeal process is continued beyond the department chairperson.

The Academic Honesty Committee has discussed the details of the above Academic Honesty Violation, looked at all evidence of the violation, and

- find that the student did violate the MWSU Academic Honesty Policy and that the violation be forwarded to the Office of the Provost.
- find that the student did not violate the MWSU Academic Honesty Policy and that any records of this violation should be destroyed.

Academic Honesty Committee Chairperson's Signature Date

A copy of this completed form needs to be sent to the student, the faculty member, and the department chairperson, and, if appropriate, the Provost or representative.

MWSU Academic Honesty Violation Report
(To be completed by Faculty Member)

_____ G - _____
Last Name First Name Middle Initial Student ID Number

Course Number Course Name Semester & year

Details of the academic honesty violation (attach all evidence associated with the violation)

Consequences for the student

- I am forwarding this violation to the Office of the Provost.
- I am not forwarding this violation to the Office of the Provost.

I have met with the student and I have determined that the student violated the Missouri Western State University Academic Honesty Policy.

_____ Date _____
Faculty Member's Signature

I have met with the faculty member and I

- agree with the faculty member's decision and the consequences of that decision.
- disagree with the faculty member's decision and the consequences of that decision.

You have the right to appeal this through an appeal procedure. See the Student Handbook for an explanation of the due process.

_____ Date _____
Student's Signature

Appendix B

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Dr. Dale Krueger
Chair of the Salary Committee

Subject: Salary Proposal

Date: March 22, 2006

To place the salary proposal in perspective, there are number of aspects that require clarification to understand the ramifications of the present salary proposal. The current salary proposal addresses the inconsistencies within disciplines in regard to differences in pay between faculty with the same degree, the same rank, and years of service. The committee used the means consistent with other four-year state colleges in relation to rank and then calculated years of service using the Missouri Western standard approach to adjust for equity inconsistencies that have developed within disciplines. These inconsistencies have been caused by inflation, inadequate promotional amounts not indexed to inflation and supply and demand conditions that have changed over the years. For example, a faculty member more than likely received an appropriate market offer fifteen years ago. However, when you factor in the lack of inflationary adjustments at times, different promotion amounts, the lack of indexing promotional amounts to inflation, and changing supply and demand conditions or market conditions, faculty members can end up with a lower market salary and purchasing power years later than when they were first employed. In the salary proposal there are 108 faculty members identified (57 % of the faculty) that need equity adjustments, and the salary committee used a standardized comparison (again, means of all four-year state colleges) to place Missouri Western State University faculty on an equitable basis.

Why do these deviations exist? In Missouri, state aid has decreased over the past twenty or more years and as a result higher education has not been able to maintain faculty pay over time consistent with the rate of inflation or changing market rates. Therefore, at some point in time any pay system periodically needs adjustment. Without adjustments, faculty that fall behind teach extra courses to supplement current salary levels or seek outside sources of income. The extra income enables faculty to maximize retirement benefits and maintain a standard of living consistent with when they entered the labor force.

To further explain these pay differences in greater detail with the same result as the present salary proposal would require a historical analysis of the inflation rate for each year since their date of employment. Then data would have to be collected for each percentage salary increase per year assuming increases were given in each year during the faculty member's employment. Next, promotional amounts would need to be considered in relation to what year each faculty member was promoted. If we were to calculate this data and use compound rates of growth as economists would suggest, we are then moving to an extremely sizable research study to explain the salary deviations now present within each discipline and across disciplines. By considering

other external variables mentioned such as changes in supply and demand per discipline, further complicates any salary study and sizably increases the amount of work. Such a study would provide more detailed explanations of the pay deviations at Missouri Western, but would not necessarily change the conclusions in the present salary proposal or lower the amount needed to adjust for equity. Therefore, the present salary proposal provides an equitable foundation and standard for all faculty and provides specific salary adjustments over time to eliminate equity problems that cause resentment, anger, and job dissatisfaction. The equity cost is \$1.50 per credit hour or one percent of the current credit hour cost for three years: less if distinctive awards are placed on hold for three years and perhaps other programs are held up for a short period of time. This approach still allows room for an overall inflationary adjustment given the fact that other colleges and universities in the Missouri system are raising tuition rates anywhere from four percent to six percent per credit hour.

Furthermore, the current salary proposal is consistent with current leadership principles consistent with the research in management, where management establishes equity and then supports and guides employees to higher levels of productivity and job satisfaction. Once equity is established, recognition awards become more of a motivational incentive, and when an educational institution uses the same standards for promotion for all degrees, this approach eliminates any unintentional discrimination. Without equity, motivation suffers and job satisfaction and productivity becomes less attractive to employees, and with equity more favorable market deviations in specific disciplines become more acceptable to faculty in other disciplines not subject to changing competitive conditions..

In addition, to the information provided the present administration, and Faculty Senate, the Salary Committee did provide a copy of the salary proposal for the new Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs to enable him to evaluate and support or act on the current salary proposal before or when he arrives in June 2006.