Faculty Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes: March 26, 2018

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 1PM in JC Long 131.

We originally scheduled this meeting from 2-3 but then were asked to prepare a report concerning the current state of faculty morale and the campus climate to present to the Presidential Search Committee. We extended our meeting from 1-3pm to complete that task.

**Committee Members in attendance:** Emily Beck (Chair), Keonya Booker, Phyllis Jestice, Mary Jo Fairchild, Martin Jones, and Richard Lavrich

Guest John Morris, Executive VP

**Agenda:**
1. Prepare report of faculty and staff morale to share with members of the Presidential Search Committee.

**Discussion of Agenda Items:**

1. Prepare report of faculty and staff morale to share with members of the Presidential Search Committee

   A. Next President should ideally have significant experience in higher education and higher education administration. Someone who has served as at least a dean.

      The reasons for this are:

      - More awareness of the assessment process and ways to bridge communication between faculty and higher administration.

      - The rationale given for hiring a president who had experience in politics did not result in better funding or amplified voices at the state level. It did not improve our standing or image in the state to have a president who came from politics.

   B. Issue of Faculty Morale is Low:

      - The new president ideally should have some experience at a different institution responding to faculty morale issues specifically

         o The current faculty and staff morale can be characterized as disgruntled apathy
• Process of the previous search left faculty feeling that their voice is not valued or appreciated
• Salary is not competitive for cost of living; problems of salary compression; a new president should explore new forms of compensation, including livability issues (childcare, public transportation, tuition discounts for dependents, etc.)
• The upper administration has fallen into a habit of scolding/hazing/berating faculty and staff for generalized “You’re not getting things done”. Current operational practices are affected by micromanaging at the upper administrative level and an inability to delegate responsibility or trust lower administration to handle tasks.
• Lack of faculty and staff attendance at the meetings regarding the Presidential search committee is not reflective of lack of interest:
  • Holding meetings at 5pm affects family time
  • Faculty have repeatedly tried to work with upper administration and feel stymied and that their voices are not appreciated. There is a general sentiment that there is no reason to continue trying to work productively with upper administration.
- New approaches, new vision, alternate ways of articulating the mission of this institution and reaching out to parents, prospective students, faculty, community members.
  • Grounds are beautifully maintained but inside many of the buildings are falling apart (heating, cooling, leaks, rats, spaces that haven’t been cleaned)
  • President who is proud of faculty and champions their achievements

C. Questions to ask Search committee:
  a. Could we have some assurance that finalists will be brought to campus during the regular semester so faculty have the opportunity to provide feedback?
  b. Could we have some input on the prompts/instructions given to the candidates? Provide questions?
  c. Would you consider a survey process following each campus visit to allow faculty to provide detailed feedback? In the rare case of a finalist who prompts the majority of faculty to have a vote of no confidence, would you consider removing that finalist from the search process?

There is a desire for more clarity of regarding processes.

Could there be a more clear responsibility chart?

When one reports an issue, we have an initial contact # but it’s difficult to know who to contact for specific issues and with whom to follow up

JM: We are working on revising and updating the work order management process: As you submit your work request and there should be an email with a work # to log in and check it yourself. Customer contact points that should be automated.

PP should be able to plan and schedule: e.g. we will be there to fix this Tuesday 2-4; At the moment there is not a process for letting people know that the process has been fixed.

JM would like to bring customer focus back into the process; better communication. Supervisors should have some sort of oversight regarding the process, put into the dispatch system so the call operators can give updates when one calls.

Is it possible to clarify a system of updates? (IT has open ticket system)

There is no a clear way to see where in the process a request is.

There is follow through but sometimes it can seem to take a long time; isn’t as quick as 3 years ago. If a part is missing it seems logical and appropriate that there might be a delay but it would be great if there were a way to follow up with ETA or feedback about the time required.

Not always clear work has been done.

Where in work flow are things in processing and how the priorities are determined?

Who has supervisory duty over various branches? If there is not a response, who should be contacted?

JM: Custodial still unclear: some buildings are PP, some are contracted out.

Sometimes it seems to take a long time to complete for tasks. Are you short staffed? Can we advocate on your behalf for increased staff? What sort of resources do you need?
JM: 1. Capital renewal, modernization; 2. Facilities gets initial budget cuts: we need more staff. Generally we want to aim for managed care (2nd level, not pristine, not reactive)

Changes in process over the past years:

Before all requests went through Dept Admins but now the Faculty email the PP directly

JM: He came from an institution that used that system of an admin reporting issues. Proctors/liaisons trained with PP practices/priorities. It reduces the number of times one receives reports about the same problem.

Interested in hearing: plan and hierarchy in mind for repairs to most damaged buildings on campus.

JM: Buildings that are most important to student success or research success; faculty offices slightly lower than classrooms;

We mentioned classroom cleanliness, heating, materials issues, smoking signage and increased visibility of the smoking policy. Asked about how to flag certain issues as being priority but not necessarily emergencies (like ADA compliance issues).

He took notes and mentioned interest in adding these dimensions to the improved work order management process.

Questions that were answered as a result of his comments:

What are the priorities of PP?

How do they decide which tasks get priority?

What things incur charges and what things are free?

Have you considered implementing a system of customer feedback or allowing surveys to evaluate the job completed and incentivize service?

The FWC was very impressed and encouraged by Mr. Morris’ engaged discussion with us. We are hopeful that we will all see positive changes in the management of the Physical Plant in the coming months and years.
Meeting Adjourned: 2:50pm

Next Meeting: scheduled for April 16, 2018 from 1-2pm in Maybank 209