I. Announcements
   A. Welcome and Introduction of Faculty Senators and Visitors.
   B. Appreciation of Service and Farewell Wishes to Senators Eric Marland, Pam Mitchem, Brian Raichle, Jim Sherman, Connie Ulmer, Margaret Werts, and Wayne Williams.
   C. Nominations for three elected positions on the Faculty Senate Executive Board: Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

II. Visitors’ Reports

III. Provost’s Report

IV. Committee Reports (Committee Chair’s name is in bold print)
   A. Academic Policies (Miller, McCaughey, Newmark, Sherman, W. Williams)
      No Report.
   B. Agenda Committee (Ramey, Rardin, Carpenter, W. Williams)
      No Report.
   C. Budget Committee (Anderson, Aycock, Brown, Frindethie, Geary, Short)
      No Report.
   D. Campus Planning Committee (Mercer-Ballard, Marland, Scharer)
      No Report.
   E. Committee on Committees (Rardin, Gross, Mitchem, Napiorski, Stephenson, Stoddard)
      1. A motion to approve the new faculty representatives to serve on various University committees.
      2. A motion to approve the new faculty representatives to serve on General
Education’s Faculty Coordinating Committees.

F. Faculty Handbook Committee (Ramey, Stella Anderson, Gates, Reesman, W. Williams, Carey)

No Report.

G. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Carpenter, Gonzales, Ulmer, Wangler, Werts)

No Report.

H. Welfare of Students Committee (Winn, Galloway, Horst, Jackson, Jennings, Sanders)

No Report.

V. Unfinished Business


B. Academic Policies Committee’s Recommendations regarding Gift Policy (Appendix B).

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment
Appendix A: Faculty Senate

Recommendations to Supplemental Pay Policy Proposed Changes

Committee Members: Alecia Jackson (LES), Frank Aycock (COM), Amy Galloway (PSY), Lisa Gross (C&I), Pam Mitchem (LIB), and Karen Reesman (NUR).

The Ad-Hoc Committee for the Supplemental Pay Policy has gathered data from various departments on campus and has met with administrators in Academic Affairs in regard to the proposed changes in the supplemental pay policy. The Committee has concluded that some of the proposed remedies are reasonable, fair, and necessary to create a more transparent policy for supplemental pay; therefore, the Committee supports the recommended cap increase and the suggested system for approval of exemptions. However, the Committee is concerned that two of the proposed remedies create onerous and unreasonable expectations and consequences for faculty, namely, the elimination of the tiered stipend for distance education and the putting the onus of cap compliance on individual faculty. Below are rationales and recommendations from the Committee.

**Rationale for Retaining the Tiered Stipend**

Teaching off campus requires a significant amount of time traveling to and from extension locations, sometimes amounting to 4-6 hours of round-trip travel per class meeting. While this time could be otherwise used by the faculty member to further prepare instruction or grade papers, or engage in service or scholarly activity, it is used instead to offer these off campus programs. In traveling, these faculty face various hazards on the road (darkness, rain, snow, fog, ice, deer crossings, exhaustion, etc.), putting their well being and even their lives in jeopardy every time they go to class. Once at an extension location, it is not uncommon to find the facility locked, the room without the proper arrangement or equipment, software out of date or uninstalled, or computers that do not function. While the effort to provide this educational opportunity to remote students is worthy, the experience of teaching off campus is more challenging than teaching the same class on campus. Faculty who have accepted these conditions have done so as a result of their commitment to their students and programs, and with the understanding that they will be compensated for their additional time and energy invested.

Thankfully, ASU has recognized and acknowledged the hardships faculty endure when teaching off campus by compensating them for taking on these additional burdens at a rate equivalent to the % of their time spent in a car traveling to and from the sites. While this amount does not take into account all the other challenges noted above, it does acknowledge that there are many more barriers and challenges related to teaching off campus.

Consider this scenario: A faculty member who teaches three distance-education courses in one semester will be required to travel anywhere from 60 to 270 hours per semester. The round-trip travel time does not include teaching, office “hours” at the site, grading papers, or preparing for courses. That is up to 270 hours – in one semester – that faculty are not spending on service and scholarship or even actual teaching. That is up to 270 hours spent on the road, driving.
Recommendations Regarding Tiered Stipend

1) The tiered travel additive policy should remain in place to adequately compensate faculty for the additional burden of teaching off campus.

2) The online teaching supplement should be lowered in response to the budget concerns of Administration.

Rationale for Eliminating the Faculty Cap Compliance and Payback Clause

The Committee has concluded that there is an erroneous assumption regarding individual faculty decision-making and control over their own teaching schedules; this assumption has lead to the Administration’s inclination to expect faculty to comply to the cap and, if the cap is exceeded, to pay back excessive earnings. The Committee, in talks with various faculty members, believes that the realities of faculty teaching loads/grant payouts should be considered by Administration.

Faculty members have been hired for three specific purposes: teaching, scholarship and service. Each expectation contributes to the reputation of the university and has a direct impact on student enrollment and retention. At the department level, faculty are assigned to particular courses months in advance, based on course demand and required coursework for degree or certification purposes. They are assigned accordingly, to both on and off campus groups, according to expertise, experience and contractual obligation. With the growing demand of this cohort arrangement, many junior faculty have been hired purposefully to teach courses at these sites. Refusing to teach a course or two because it exceeds the salary cap could result in tensions or conflict with department chairs or department personnel committee members—circumstances that might later interfere with reappointment, tenure, and promotion. For such reasons, compliance must be the responsibility of the chairperson or program coordinators, who are ultimately accountable for scheduling distance education courses.

Faculty are involved in a variety of other university-related activities that result in supplemental pay (grants, program coordination, study abroad, workshops, etc.). In particular, faculty in certain ranks (i.e., junior) and different colleges who have lower salaries would reach their cap sooner than faculty who are paid at a higher rate, especially when the payouts are flat sums for overload teaching and grants; this is a serious equity problem that needs to be considered. In essence, creating high expectations for both grant activity and distance-education course delivery, while implementing a payback clause, sends conflicting and confusing messages to faculty.

There are other concerns voiced by faculty. The committee wonders if working for “free,” as a result of payback, is a violation of EEO compliance. The committee is also concerned about complications related to taxes and retirement if the payback clause is implemented.
Recommendations Regarding Cap Compliance and Payback Clause

1) Cap compliance must be the responsibility of the chairperson or program coordinators.

2) The “exceptions” clause of the proposed supplemental pay policy must clearly state
   1) the circumstances under which administration will approve requests to exceed the cap,
   2) the process for making such requests, and 3) the conditions under which approval will
   be granted. This permission granting procedure must be made transparent and explicit to
   ensure all faculty of a fair and equitable process should this policy be approved without
   regard to these recommendations.

3) Eliminate faculty payback clause. Administration needs to oversee the chairs and
   program coordinators to monitor stipends. Good recordkeeping in the form of standard,
   online recordkeeping between Academic Affairs and departmental chairs/program
   coordinators needs to be the solution (using a system similar to Digital Measures).
   Individual faculty members should be expected to report their supplemental pay activity
   to chairs/program coordinators; however, those in charge of departmental scheduling
   should be the ones who monitor/report cap compliance.