

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (FSEC) MEETING

January 21, 2010

---

*In attendance:*

<i>Paul Abegg (PA)</i>	<i>Munir Mahmud (MM)</i>
<i>Georgine Bills (GB)</i>	<i>Dennis Martinez (DM)</i>
<i>Gary Cooper (GC)</i>	<i>Tom McNeilis (TM)</i>
<i>Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)</i>	<i>Shane Prine (SP)</i>
<i>Costel Ionita (CI)</i>	<i>Ed Reber (ER)</i>
<i>Randy Jasmine (RJ)</i>	<i>Dennis Wignall (DW)</i>
<i>JL Lounsbury (JL)</i>	

DW: Usually we've looked at minutes just before each meeting, but since I didn't do that and since the notes we get are so well done, we have the opportunity to provide feedback on minutes right after each meeting. We looked at the last minutes just after last meeting, so is there a motion to approve them? (ER-1<sup>st</sup> motion, GC-2nd; approved.) Today, I just want to go over our Constitution – I'm not looking for policy changes today, but just for us to identify weaknesses in the text and get ideas for changes. A few announcements: (1) I have volunteered to host the Utah Faculty Council meeting on Feb 12, which will have presidents from all state colleges and universities. I have asked Commissioner Sederberg to be the keynote speaker for a lunch at this meeting. We'll talk about what needs to be done across the state from the faculty perspective. I am hoping that Commissioner Sederberg will give a "state of education in Utah" talk, followed by Q and A from all Faculty Senate leaders. (2) Does anyone have constituent reports on the appointment of President Nadauld?

MM: I didn't talk to anyone after the appointment, but before it, all were positive about it.

CI: I note the degree program proposals got approved just days later!

DW: One wonders if they had been expedited, but I don't know. Along with that, in the Board of Trustees meeting in which they voted for the appointment, I pulled Shandon Gubler aside and said that the faculty on this campus would be very receptive to a Memo of Understanding that President Nadauld gives both the Board of Regents and the faculty sufficient notice of when he plans to step down that a search can take place for replacement; he agreed that'd be excellent idea. I'll meet with Board of Trustees tomorrow morning and find out if they're doing that. Now, to the Constitution:

ER: Some work had been done last year and John Jones said he'd make comments, but I don't have that document yet.

DW: I'm working from 2002 version. Oh yes, the other issue I wanted to bring up: (3) I contacted the necessary person to enable Munir to supervise the Faculty Senate website; I got no answer, but I will get back on that.

PA: Rex Frisbey? Daniel Bay?

DW: It's a moving target!

MM: I can do it from my own server...!

DW: The URL is currently devoid of content; it needs updating. Munir volunteered to do that; I just need to get access.

PA: Different people have access to different parts of the site.

MM: Because the links on main page are controlled by other people.

DW: OK, comments on the Constitution. I have: Article III, concerning administrative members of the Senate? Why do we have this category? I think this is vestigial from our Community College environment – we need to see if we really want administrators in the Senate at all!

GB: At Weber, we had a Dean role, but not an HR role – they could attend and participate, but not vote.

ER: Yes, we can also ask them to leave if there are things being discussed they shouldn't hear.

DW: My feeling is that we should think about this – we can invite administration to General Senate meetings, or not, but we don't need an official role for them, which is what "membership" implies.

ER: We want their money! (Laughter)

DW: We have made substantial inroads into our budget deficit. But think about language for this membership.

RJ: Do we have any administrative members?

DW: According to our Constitution, administrators do pay dues, but I don't have that list of who.

SP: Doesn't this imply that if this is the *Faculty* Senate, then active participation in the classroom is a prerequisite for membership?

RJ: But this is acknowledgement of different status than faculty. At meetings where administration has participated, it's been valuable. Per Article II: do Department chairs qualify as administrators?

DW: And Associate Deans that teach, too! That's not in there. It *is* stated somewhere that any sort of administrator, at any level, can't do certain things that are faculty related, including the Executive Committee.

RJ: But they can be members of the Faculty Senate at large...?

DW: I don't know...that's the info I'm seeking.

ER: Associate Deans didn't exist when this was written. The most common complaint I've had for many years is that the floor wasn't open to anyone for the election of the President-Elect and not just the Executive Committee's decision to ratify. That sort of doesn't allow for new blood to get in if people think the whole committee is going in the wrong direction! Randy and I suggested that be changed.

RJ: That is probably the number one comment I've had, too, and some have said that this is why they don't participate. If it were open to open nominations for President-Elect, they'd join.

DW: OK; that's a bit later in the Constitution (Art. VI), but that can be addressed.

RJ: We have the system in place, and President-Elect sits for 2 years. To say that there is a term *and* that the person has to come from the Executive Committee serves a double purpose.

PA: Is there anything saying nominees need to be dues-paying members of the Senate?

ER and RJ: Good point; I suspect we'd want that in there.

DW: Art. VI, paragraph 2 (by-laws): (read aloud; mentions that President-Elect serves as Vice President).

RJ: I think it strengthens our case for having open elections.

DW: The existing policy doesn't say *where* the President-Elect comes from...!

ER: Really? I remember that there was an alteration to specify "Executive Committee" somewhere...!

GB: There's also no description of "Vice President" anywhere, so maybe that ought to be deleted.

TM: There's different wording in the Executive Committee by-laws from the general Senate by-laws – that's probably where this confusion comes from!

DW: Article I, #3: Associate members: many departments have 0.5 and 0.74 faculty, and they need to be included. Various faculty rank designations are articulated in this section, too, so no one is overlooked. Next, Article IV, #1: this needs to be updated for department designations – new departments, degrees, etc. need to be added. Article IV, #2: officers of the Executive Committee – this is confusing: who are they, and where are they from? Do only officers make up the Executive Committee? That needs new language.

RJ: We should change "officer" to "Senator" based on previous article! That was what was intended there...

GB: If we're going to clean these up, are we going to integrate our past notions of integrating voting membership vs. general membership, etc.?

DW: Excellent point – let's work on that and come back with suggestions to incorporate that.

GB: This already says some of that...I'm somewhat leery of removing "Senator" to make us look all-faculty friendly.

DW: That's where my Faculty Association idea is from – we distill from that to Senator, then further to Executive Committee.

GB: Yes – I don't know if there's any people that don't want to be called "Faculty Association." But we need to put this out for discussion.

DW: Agreed. Article IV, #3: the Executive Committee nominates people for 2 year terms, but it's not clear where this comes from. Clarification in Article IV, #4: the Senate is elected by secret campus-wide ballot and delivered to the Senate at the next meeting – if we have overpopulated departments vs. new, small ones, this is a problem for representation – it's division votes that come forward, where divisions have both large and small departments...is representation equal? This is 2002 language in 2010.

MM: It says Senators are *any* dues-paying faculty...

RJ: It's more duplication of other, separate documents. All four of these articles are saying that departments pick their Senators, then others say elections pick Senators.

CI: We had elections for Executive Committee.

RJ: But here it says *all* faculty are Senators...!

CI: But if *your* department wants you on the Executive Committee, do *I* have a say in that?

RJ: In the past, yes. We need to consider that.

DW: Some marginal things. I was pleased to note that Article 4, #7: the Secretary/Treasurer is appointed annually. I negotiated release time for that. Article VI: Senate shall associate with other professional organizations...what other ones are there?

RJ: AFT, as per UVU.

DW: The language says "shall" – that's directive.

RJ: Do we want "is allowed to" instead of "shall"?

DW: I'd like more wiggle room. The thing that's going to cause the most discussion is Article VIII (3<sup>rd</sup> page from the end): the Faculty Senate as a negotiating committee. Last year, Tom realized there was a salary negotiating committee, but Martha says it never meets, but it's a specific article in the Constitution, so currently we're *not* negotiating salary and benefits.

TM: Pam said "you're on the Executive Committee, so don't worry about it."

RJ: That committee, the benefits committee, disappeared this year. We need to look into that.

MM: President Caldwell had idea of determining salaries based on national averages.

DW: That's equity.

RJ: Was there a committee for that, though?

DW: Yes, but it died out, and now all we hear is from Pam. So we need this committee to get us up from our current salary of position of 10% below average.

RJ: The Constitution doesn't say that *we* meet with administration – this is *our* committee, so we need to make it meet with administration.

DW: So as President, I need a “bull terrier” to take this and chair this committee. Randy?

RJ: I can't make that commitment now.

PA: Article VIII, #4 says the chair of this is the Past President.

DW: Oh, OK – that'd be Tom. But for now, we need to begin getting all of this in place by end of this semester/over summer so it's in place for next Fall. If we do it quickly and go argue with administration, we'd be in a Don Quixote position.

GB: It troubles me that it says all business transactions should not be reported to anyone else except the Executive Committee – we should aim for transparency.

CI: When we try to find someone for this committee, we need to acknowledge that our teaching loads now are still at Community College levels, and too high for anyone to work on the committees mentioned! I was on the workload committee in the past, and I asked about when we'd get down to 12 credits; it was said that that would be down the line, when we're big enough, etc.

GB: That's a great point – while we're at this, there should be release time for very active committees! A couple of credits per semester, at least.

SP: If they keep us busy enough, there's no time to complain!

CI: 15 credits is a community college level.

DW: It's old language, and we just need to start dealing with this.

TM: Workload has increased since class sizes are not limited.

DW: But we also haven't lost jobs, and that's an important consideration – we're the only one in Utah that hasn't.

RJ: But the points are clear that these types of committees are essential and we need to guarantee quality; compensating for committees needs to go before the workload committee; they won't generate that on their own.

DW: And that representative has the power of the Senate behind them. So it is an administration vs. faculty issue, and we're not represented on that issue. A year ago, I was told it was OK to raise course caps by 3 every time because faculty don't complain about that. (Gasps of horror.)

RJ: That's the end of this anticipation – we're waiting for the Legislature. If they cut our budget more than we thought, and we have these positions that say "dependent on funding," if they cut, and we lose half of those positions, the only option is to increase enrollment in classes – that's the only way to compensate.

DW: Or maybe the Commons building gets put off.

RJ: But that's a building, and that may be separate.

GC: We need to lay groundwork now for the future – if they increase our funding when the economy gets better, we want this reversed.

DW: Yes, it's a temporary thing, or should be.

TM: But the latest thing I've heard is that they'll be cutting *more* on education...

RJ: I've heard that, too, and Commissioner Sederberg has said "this is what the consequences will be," like SLCC not renewing their lease on one of their buildings, putting out 3500 students.

DW: We have to monitor this closely; that's why we need to populate a salary negotiating committee – to negotiate longevity, cap sizes, etc. This is a huge responsibility, so I'd like a chair in place *today*, and we can form the committee over time. Any volunteers for this?

SP: Should you be tenured to be on this committee?

DW: Good idea. This committee won't be active until after the newest tenure letters go into effect.

RJ: If someone wants to serve as chair, according to our wording, it's Tom as Past President; if he has time issues, other members can do more work.

JL: DW will be Past President as of the end of this semester.

RJ: Either way, it's a tenured person.

DW: But service on this committee by non-tenured members shouldn't create problems.

SP and GC: I'll serve on committee.

DW: Excellent. This leads to another option: PA suggested upping the term of service for President from 1 to 2 years. I support this for continuity – if President-Elect is a 2 year term, then President should also be 2. The current 1 year thing is a "get new blood in" idea, but it takes too long to get into the swing of things, so by the time you are, you're not as effective. Next time, I want a vote on this idea. I think faculty will benefit more by having continuity for that role.

RJ: So that's a 5 year commitment – 2 as President-Elect, 2 as President, and 1 as Past President.

ER: So we'd only elect a President-Elect every other year?

SP: Actually, it's 6 years with the mandated committee chairs as Past President.

DW: I personally have no problem with that, but...

PA: But will that be an issue for others considering the role?

ER: That's what I wonder – it's a huge burden.

SP: Maybe make it optional to serve for 2 years.

DW: One reason we have a President-Elect is so that if something happens to the President, the President-Elect steps in. If that happens in the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of a year, then the service is *not* considered to be for full year, but in Fall it is. So there is language that describes all this.

RJ: We could cut the term length to 4 if only the President serves 2 years, the President-Elect serves 1, and then when there's no Past President, the President-Elect serves those functions, too.

PA: Wouldn't there always be a Past President?

RJ: No, every other year there would not be a Past President.

MM: In one of our other meetings, we decided it had to be tenured, too.

PA: Yes, that should be in writing.

DW: This will require a vote since it's a change to an amendment. We also need language that if the person in the 2-year President position isn't sufficient, the Executive Committee can change who it is.

ER: Tim Eicher is the only person that remained for 2 years; someone told me he said "I thought I'd be incorruptible, but in my 2<sup>nd</sup> year, I did things I didn't think I'd do," so the position may be wearing.

DW: The Executive Committee monitors the leadership and contributes to ensure constructive processes unfold

SP: How would an inept president be removed?

DW: We need to discuss that. Mentoring, counseling, etc. We just need to think about this. What else? OK, two people for the salary negotiating committee – will one of you be a temporary chair? (GC points at SP.) OK, SP. Good, that's moving. Think about a 2 year President role; I like RJ's suggestion a lot to make it a 4 year commitment. People know this in advance, too.

MM: A point I want to make also pertains to the Faculty Excellence committee: our student evaluations were kept open until the *end* of the last exam period! I posted my grades before that, but that

compromises that students are supposed to complete the evaluations *before* seeing their grades! – the deadline should be *before* exam week!

DW: Yes, that's a huge error.

GC: They can still have the condition that in order to see their final grade for a class, they must complete the evaluations.

CI: The deadline should be midnight before the first day of finals.

DW: In the past, when the evaluations were written instead of on the computer, they had to be submitted *by* a student, so I don't know why this was changed for the electronic version.