Staff Senate Minutes
Wednesday, April 11, 2012  9:00 AM, Leggett & Platt

Members Present: Michelle Arwood, Natalie Bruce, Hiedi Carlin, Mike Davies, Josh Doak, Gary Edwards, Melanie Epperson, Brenda Hayes, Greg Killingsworth, Brenda McDaniel, Olive Talley, Bob Tessman, Julie Wengert, Judy Wilmoth.

Member(s) Absent / Excused: Bob Harrington, Ann Quade

Determination of Quorum: Fourteen of Sixteen active members present when meeting began quorum established.

Call to Order: Killingsworth called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.

Approval of Minutes: Wengert made a motion to approve the minutes; Edwards seconded the motion. Motion carried and the minutes from March 14, 2012 were approved as written.

Administrative Comments: Killingsworth welcomed everyone including the gallery.

Administrative/Special Guest Comments

SharePoint Basics Training will take place Friday April 20, from noon to 1:00 PM in Billingsly 341

Committee Reports:
Killingsworth called for committee reports:

1. Benefits Committee – Carlin discussed the Rec. Center fee proposal (fee exemption for employees); after the last meeting an email went out to senators concerning revision of the proposal, a discussion ensued and the proposal was pulled. The committee met and decided to re-evaluate the proposal. Wilmoth is investigating the implications to the university if employees who are maxed out on vacation receiving vacation pay without taking the time off. The committee approved a name change to Staff Welfare Committee to mirror the Faculty Welfare Committee. Arwood requested that Jack Oakes be notified so the SharePoint site can be updated.

2. Communications Committee – Arwood reported the committee met last week; SharePoint is an ongoing topic of discussion. For shared governance we’ve been asked to submit all sub-committee minutes to be posted on SharePoint for all-employee viewing. If all the subcommittees would submit minutes to our secretary, Brenda McDaniel, she will be the contact person for the Shared Governance/SharePoint site. We have the working Staff Senate site for posting drafts of documents; there is a notification process you can set so you can receive an email or text when something is posted. At some point a decision needs to be made about continuing to use the public website; currently information is being posted on the public and the private (SharePoint for MSSU employees) sites. Bob Tessman is taking over as chairman of the committee through June.
   - A guest asked for clarification of SharePoint versus the web site – SharePoint (Intranet) is available to all employees and is accessible on and off campus. This includes the Shared Governance section maintained by Jack Oakes which is an archive of specific committee minutes and information, including Staff Senate. On SharePoint there is also a separate Staff Senate site for Staff Senators under Other Internet Sites; what has been
referred to as the “working site”. The Internet site (www.mssu.edu) is public and accessible to anyone, anywhere. Once proposals are on an agenda they will be viewable to all MSSU employees.

3. **Election Committee** – Doak reported they met last week and reviewed first quarter nominations for the Southern Service Champ award; no professional staff were nominated. Checks have not been received from the Foundation; the winners have not yet been notified so no announcement has been made. Once the winners have been announced copies of the nomination forms will be sent to all nominees. Epperson asked if an announcement would be made in the Joplin Globe; that is handled by University Relations – there will be an announcement in Accents. Discussion about the window for nominations; could it be open longer or cover a weekend. Doak suggested leaving the nomination process open all the time; nominations are dated. Doak passed out a committee charge as requested by Jack Oakes for the Shared Governance SharePoint site. Nominations for Staff Senate will begin in about a week; elections will be in May. There will be six positions to fill.

- Tessman made a motion to leave the Southern Service Champ Award nomination form open with the stipulation that deadlines will be communicated. Epperson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. **Ethics Committee** – Wilmoth reported the committee has a proposal on the agenda to address anonymous comments. A Code of Conduct proposal will be presented at the May meeting.

5. **Executive Committee** – Killingsworth reported the bylaws addition to Article VIII: Committees has been approved by President’s Council. There is a lot of concern about the cost of the Noel Levitz project; if 26 students are retained per year in 4 years it will pay for itself. Question about the Employee Handbook; the most current version is online; Wilmoth advised the Human Resources department is making revisions and by fall a new handbook (hard copy) should be ready. Another town-hall type meeting (two meetings at different times) will take place in June or July once the state budget is set. Faculty promotions were discussed; raises for the 7 who received promotions will be spread out over 3 years. The promotion process is quite lengthy. The board was divided and the vote to approve was close.

6. **Campus Committees:**

   **Administrative Council** – The meeting lasted about 20 to 30 minutes, no new information was shared.

   **Appreciation Committee** – Epperson passed out Lion decals; these will be available for all staff at the one card office. They are continuing to work on a campus picnic.

   **Budget Advisory Council** – Carlin reported the council is confident they will be able to make the necessary budget cuts without layoffs. The challenge was to continue to think of ways to save university money. The plan is to be pro-active; not reactive. They will look at all areas to better improve our business processes. One example was the $3.00 record fee charged to students each semester; the fee has been the same since 1979 and covers an unlimited number of transcripts, cap and gown and diplomas. We are in the hole about $27,000 per year for graduation costs alone. Killingsworth noted some transcript requests (per person) have been as high as 64 to 70 copies. Edwards was surprised that with the reworked budget there is only a $12,000 deficit. The council has done some fantastic work. Wilmoth noted at the previous meeting we were told the ideas that will be implemented were to be posted on SharePoint but that hasn’t happened yet. Carlin has asked the same question of the council.

   **Shared Governance** – Talley reported there hasn’t been a meeting since the board meeting where the last pieces of the proposal were to be presented and approved (or not); waiting on board meeting minutes.

   **Faculty Senate** – Cheryl Cifelli was not able to be present due to a departmental commitment. Talley passed out Cifelli’s report and noted there is still a vacancy for a Staff Senate representative on Faculty Senate. Discuss ensued; Talley suggested committee assignments be reviewed at the next meeting. Cifelli also complimented the structure of the Staff Senate minutes.
Old Business:
1. Staff Survey – Senator conclusions
   Communications was a big issue, and wages. There’s a lot of information there; it’s been suggested a committee be assigned to review and summarize the comments. Talley expressed concern about allowing a committee to arbitrarily and unilaterally decide what’s important to the staff – what would the charge for the committee be? Arwood responded it would be grouping and summarizing the comments; compiling and making the responses usable. Training and orientation was mentioned; are there other ideas there the Senate can work on? Bruce was in favor of forming a committee that would also be responsible for future surveys. Wilmoth noted the Senate is committee heavy and suggested it go to the Welfare Committee instead of creating a new committee. Bruce feels the Communications Committee is a better fit.
   • Bruce made a motion to make the Staff Survey part of the Communications Committee; the information will be shared with the Welfare Committee. Wengert seconded the motion. The motion carried.

2. Location of future meetings
   McDaniel reported in June, July and August it would not be a problem to find a meeting room on campus and suggested the May meeting be held in the board room (classes will still be in session at that time). Doak asked if the bylaws were changed to allow the meeting location to be moved. Killingsworth responded Rob Yust advised the President’s Council feels as long as we maintain our “home” location we can have some leeway with the bylaws.

3. Parliamentarian Proposal (document attached)
   Wengert introduced the proposal to add the position of Parliamentarian as an officially recognized position of Staff Senate. Article IV, Section 3 has formatting changes; the new Section 4 adds the Parliamentarian position and duties. The addition would provide the opportunity to conduct Staff Senate meetings in a highly efficient and productive manner. Currently we are stating that Robert’s Rules of Order will serve as parliamentary procedure but there’s no one specifically responsible for making sure that happens. Doak asked if we will follow Robert’s Rules to the letter; Killingsworth advised that needs to be determined. We need to find a happy medium. Carlin referred to the proposal for the rec. center at the last meeting; a parliamentarian could have stepped in and said it’s been voted on; it’s no long up for discussion. Carlin also mentioned when the ad hoc committee was working on this proposal they came up with 4 different versions of the by-laws from different locations. There is an educational component included in the proposal to begin when the newly elected members begin serving.
   • Wengert made a motion that the change be made to the by-laws as written in the proposal effective July 1, 2012. Epperson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

New Business:
1. Standing Committee Addition (document attached)
   Wengert introduced the proposal to establish a standing committee on the Staff Senate to be named the Staff Senate Legislative Oversight Committee. This is related to the parliamentarian position. We want to be sure we are all working from the same document (by-laws). The formatting on the current version of the by-laws is not consistent. This committee would conduct a yearly review; in addition they would review/edit future proposals for by-law changes. McDaniel commented on the various versions of the by-laws and noted under Article VI, Section 1 Meetings the number of members needed to establish a quorum was not updated when the elected representation area (Article IV, Section 2) was increased. For clarity the quorum required should be stated as a percent.
   • Wengert made a motion to establish a standing a committee on the Staff Senate to be named the Staff Senate Legislative Oversight Committee effective July 1, 2012. Talley seconded the motion. The motion carried.

1a. This is an amended Parliamentarian Proposal adding the duty of serving as chair of the Staff Senate Legislative Oversight Committee to the duties of the Staff Senate Parliamentarian.
   • Wengert made a motion to add to the duties of the Parliamentarian to be the chair of the Legislative Oversight Committee. Carlin seconded the motion. The motion carried.
2. Proposal Procedures (document attached)

McDaniel introduced a proposal listing a suggested procedure for submitting proposals. During review of past senate paperwork and proposals it was noted there are no dates on the documents, or the originating committee. The guidelines include: proposals must be listed as an agenda item before discussion can take place; all proposals must reflect originating committee, creation date and any revision dates; proposals will be assigned a number (the example given was 11-12:01, the 11-12 designating the academic year, then a sequential number to be assigned by the secretary); at the end of each year a summary will be created listing all proposals and their outcomes that can be posted for all staff members to review. Discussion ensued about whether to make this proposal part of the by-laws. Killingsworth suggested the Staff Senate Legislative Oversight Committee review the proposal in July and bring forth a proposal for a by-law change in August or the Communications Committee can present it as a formal proposal in May or June; effective in July. It was agreed the Communications Committee will present this as a formal proposal in May.

3. Handling Anonymous Comments Proposal (document attached)

Killingsworth noted all senators have access to the Staff Senate anonymous comments site. Wilmoth introduced this proposal; noting it is not going to be added to the by-laws, it is just a process. The Staff Senate secretary shall provide a summary of the submitted comments and distribute them along with the agenda; names will be redacted, each comment will be reviewed to determine how the comment will be addressed; follow-up on comments will be addressed; the resolution of the comment will be published in the Staff Senate minutes.

- Carlin made a motion to accept this proposal and add a section to the agenda for anonymous comments.
  Doak seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Comments and Announcements/Guest Input:

Anonymous comments from the Staff Senate website (Staff Senate discussion/response in italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Comments or suggestions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012 8:15 AM</td>
<td>Why are we bringing in a consulting firm to tell the people we hired in to generate enrollment and keep them here, to tell these people how to do the job MSSU hired them for in the first place?? Can't we hire into those positions people that know what they're doing? I can think of a lot of ways to utilize that money rather than educate those who are already supposed to be educated. Raises, cost of living increases, gas allowances... Without the consumer, we would not have jobs or presidents, or all the vice presidents. Please tell me we are smarter than this? And we wonder why there is very little moral at MSSU? In reference to the hiring of Noel Levitz, an outside consultant, - this was discussed earlier in the meeting (Executive Committee report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Comments or suggestions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/27/2012 10:17 AM</td>
<td>I have been curious for some time why staff members have to work longer hours in the summer AND take a shorter lunch just to get Fridays off. We also had to work longer hours and take shorter lunches to get two days off over Spring Break when the faculty gets the whole week off. I would think that it would be a nice gesture of the administration to allow us to work our normal schedules with normal lunch times in the summer and give us Fridays off since we haven't gotten raises for several years. Just a thought. I definitely think it would be nice to let us do normal schedules to get the two days off over spring break. I just don't get it when they give us something like a day off, but then want something back in return. Again, just a thought, but if they want to build morale around the campus, then they need to be willing to give the staff something without stipulations. We need to get our 40 hours in; we actually work 37 hours in the summer. We didn't have time off at Spring Break in the past; that was a request made to and approved by the Appreciation Committee. Faculty work schedules are different than staff. These are two separate issues if anyone has a question...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I just received word that a student on campus won a faculty/staff parking sticker.. I do have some serious issues with this in that with all of the construction that is going on, parking in certain areas is limited as it is in that a lot of students are parking in our spots anyways, not to mention some of us are leaving alone after dark. One of the so called "perks" of employment at MSSU is having these spaces allotted to us so that we aren't having to walk quite as far. I would see it to be ok if they allocated a specific student spot for this student, but with the free reign of any faculty/staff spot, that just cuts a faculty/staff member out of a parking spot.

*It was a fundraiser, students bought tickets to be entered into a raffle and one student’s name was drawn out to win a parking space for a specific amount of time. Student organizations have had approval from administration for many years to raffle off parking spaces. Typically they will approach a department head or dean and ask if they will donate their designated spot. It was noted in this instance it was a general faculty/staff spot. The perk is not that we have an allotted parking space; the perk is that we don’t have to pay for it. We don’t want to make a big deal about this.*

Note: *Research on parking at other universities shows Missouri Western employees pay $20 per year, Pitt. State charges from $52 to $139 annually, MSU in Springfield employees pay $96 and at MU in Columbia faculty/staff pay from $216 to $372 per year.*

**Adjournment:** Talley made a motion to adjourn. Doak seconded the motion; motion carried.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, May 09, 2012 in Billingsly Board Room

Respectfully submitted by: Brenda McDaniel