

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Oct. 18, 2012

In attendance:

Robert Carlson (RCa)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Ani Comeford (AC)

Rob Cowan (RCo)

John Goldhardt (JG)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Lish Harris (LH)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Del Parson (DP)

Rick Rodrick (RiR)

Russ Ross (RuR)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MSL)

Betty Stokes (BS)

AC: OK, we have enough people to start. I neglected to put at the top of the agenda that we should approve the minutes from previous meeting. Could I have someone move to do that?

RCo: I move.

RCa: I second. (All approve.)

AC: OK, the Curriculum Committee—not a lot there. If you look at the changes made in that meeting, most were course changes for prerequisites and such. At the beginning, though, there was talk of changing a prerequisite in Figure Drawing, which would have excluded introductory students from taking it, and DP suggested that the change would have negative repercussions, so they didn't move forward with that, but sent it back to the department. Which is good—it's an example for future cases, that if you have such changes, have your faculty look at the Curriculum Committee agenda and attend. English had an issue where an item that was not on the agenda was introduced, and our chair was able to stand up and say something to halt it. Misunderstandings happen, and it's important that we, as faculty members, have the ability to say that faculty need to be on board.

DP: We asked for one thing; they gave us something else. Then it was changed—it was almost as if we had to go along with it. I just thought that there would be so many people that have taken that class that aren't art majors. But we didn't know it was going to be on the agenda at all, so it was a shock that it came up.

AC: Exactly—a great example about why faculty need to be more involved. It's important to look at those agendas and know what's on them, and RCa and I will continue to keep an eye on these things to try and catch issues as they come up.

DP: I kind of wonder: who makes those decisions about what's in the agenda?

AC: It's supposed to be in consultation with department chairs and faculty.

RCa: But if that happens early, and things come in later, they don't go back.

AC: And that's an issue we need to bring up to them: that before anything goes forward on an agenda, faculty must know about it.

MSL: Does that need to go through *all* the chairs?

AC: I think what we're asking for is that before it's submitted to Sharon (Lee), we have some documentation that says that when it goes to the Curriculum Committee, there's proof that it's been put in front of faculty.

LH: But in our department, we have lots of program heads that aren't on the Curriculum Committee; the chair gives them lots of freedom. Is there a way to flag *who* submitted any issue? Then we'd know, and you could say "No, this needs to come from "X person" instead."

AC: In the process, someone higher up might make a change that s/he thinks isn't a big deal, so s/he doesn't send it back after making a change. This problem is a bigger issue in some areas than others. But we need to work on figuring out how this doesn't continue to happen. A flag/attachment would be great.

LH: Just the name of the person, attached—then, 2–3 days before the meeting, it could be sent back for final approval and, thus, permission to be brought up in the meeting.

AC: I often don't have a chance to review stuff that comes up very shortly before these meetings—I have classes just before them!

MSL: It sounds like the posted agenda isn't the *final* agenda, but the posted one *should* be the final one.

AC: I will recommend that if it's not posted on the agenda X number of days before the meeting, then it has to wait until the following meeting.

LH: I'd guess that they'll complain about being pressured by faculty to deal with something quickly and that they can't always meet such a policy commitment.

AC: But I think Daphne (Selbert) will be amenable. We just need to have the whole Curriculum Committee vote on the proposal.

RCo: In the government, for any policy revision, there's a change-record sheet that goes with it and documents any modifications and when they happened. I hate to impose paperwork, but that's a good fix.

AC: It's a great idea.

RCo: And changes have to be approved after they are made.

AC: OK, the .68-faculty issue: did anyone have feedback? (Going around the table, no from everyone until back to AC.) Of the 3-4 faculty members that I heard from, the full-time faculty voted "no" because they didn't want non-tenure-track faculty voting on faculty issues.

JC: I got the same concern from one person.

AC: This is one issue that I would like to maybe hold off on until we see how the Faculty Senate restructuring will happen, so the feedback that we do have fits.

SL: It's not accurate to say that the feedback is "no."

AC: True—just that the small amount we have suggests that it's an issue.

SL: So it's more accurate to say is that the overwhelming feedback is that most people don't have a problem with it.

RCa: It may be a simple policy change to say that to vote on tenure issues, one must be tenure-track.

AC: True, and how we structure the voting may affect it, too. We may want to bring that up at a full Faculty Senate meeting. But we'll keep it on our radar for the new policy. Was there any feedback on the Faculty Workload issue...? (none)

DP: For those that weren't here last time, what was the issue...?

AC: (Summarized the issue of the FYE Coordinator position requesting release time of 6 hours/year +1 hour in the summers.) I did have some feedback from folks that had been department chairs and from someone that teaches in FYE, who suggested that there's already too much waste and spending in that area that she was concerned about; adding more funding would not be helpful. The Faculty Workload Committee didn't even consider the model up against that for department chairs, so chairs would have less than the FYE Coordinator.

SL: Not just *that* position...!

RCa: The Faculty Workload Committee was sensitive to fact that the coordinator does a lot of work, but didn't consider *how* much compared to the workloads of department chairs, which seem similar.

AC: Right, so we proposed to send it back to them to consider that comparison. This issue was originally raised by one of the deans, not the Executive Committee.

JC: What is the standard by which they decide workload?

AC: They don't have one.

JC: We need one!

RCa: Yes, and I brought that up in the meeting.

AC: And Academic Council agreed with that. But we can recommend the it get sent back because of the discrepancy and state that they need a better way of making such an assessment objective.

JC: It seems rather willy-nilly.

RuR: Is there a chart somewhere on which all these equivalencies can be lined up?

AC: I assume Pam has something like that.

JC: Erin O'Brien is working on that.

AC: Can you find out where she's at with that?

JC: Sure.

AC: The coordinator person has done a lot of work, putting together a manual, etc. Does this body feel strongly enough that we can recommend sending it back to the Workload Committee for reconsideration? This will end up being a model against which future proposals will be compared.

RiR: We need to say, if we send it back, that we want this to be the impetus for reconsidering how such things are calculated in the future.

AC: Any concerns? (None.)

DP: I'm a coordinator, and I don't think I'm reimbursed, but it sure seems like a lot of work...!

JC: And that's the problem—it's not done evenly across the board.

RCo: Isn't it just a matter of asking?

JC: No, because some people get it and others don't, even when asked for. I coordinate workload for labs with adjuncts, and others do that too, but some get release and others don't.

DP: It seems strange that I can do as much work as a department chair, but lacking the label, I don't get compensation.

RiR: I disagree—the institution will take as much as you will give them without giving you compensation. If you don't set parameters, you'll just give until you have a nervous breakdown.

RCa: But this tit-for-tat basis is what makes it inherently unequal.

BS: We have nursing professors that coordinate clinicals, but we're given workload for that. But if you're a coordinator for 32 students in many different institutions in the area in which students are working, and have to liaise with them and deal with any problems that come up...! Yeah, it's complex. I would think that coordinating labs is similar. I don't get workload for coordinating labs, just for teaching them.

MSL: This is a bigger issue—it needs standardization. The portal would have been just another thing to coordinate, and doing that for classes in my field isn't my job.

RiR: It sounds harsh when just put out there, but it really is the universal experience of organizations becoming 24/7, and you're on call all the time.

BS: Productivity is the bottom line.

MSL: So what is and is not workload release needs to be set.

DP: I don't feel bad asking people to pitch in if I'm coordinating something...I'm not getting paid, so I need to spread out the responsibility.

RiR: But I'd say "no" if you asked me—I don't need extra work! It's not about "I don't want to do my work;" just "If I do work, it needs to count for something." There needs to be a measure for that.

RCa: I move that we, as the Faculty Senate, move that the issue be tabled as part of a larger consideration of workload issues as a whole.

SL: Second.

DH: We (on the Workload Committee) didn't meet this week because there were no new requests to consider. But we should have met to deal with this issue.

RCa: Yes, we're voting to give this issue back to the Workload Committee.

AC: I would imagine that this hasn't come up because it was originally introduced as an informational item, not a proposition issue. But next time we can make a proposal.

JC: Does it have to go through the Policy Committee?

AC: We have to table it first.

RCa: I think asking the Workload Committee to change the policy is the best approach.

AC: All in favor? (All ayes.) It carries! We'll make that motion at Academic Council next month. Onto the Faculty Senate meeting time...?

RCo: Alternating the times (between noon and 4 PM) seems to be favored in my area.

RuR: Most people in my area didn't like the 4 PM time.

SL: Alternating was favored in my area.

DH: I received positive on alternating from a couple people, not because it's a problem in the library, but out of concern for other faculty.

AC: I didn't get much feedback on this one—only from a couple of people, one of whom said alternating creates confusion.

MSL: Plus, some people might be able to make it only to one meeting per semester.

AC: Yes, but the original idea was to ensure that people could make it to *at least* one meeting. We could also record the meetings.

MSL: But wouldn't it need to be live?

BS: I ran through my whole building last time and dragged out every faculty member I could find to go to last 4 PM meeting, but lots of people didn't want go so they could do things like have hair appointments, etc. I got one person who said he'd come, so I'm pretty sad about faculty's response. I come to these meetings and I'm enlightened because of all of your input! I'm so busy doing other things that I wouldn't think about these issues otherwise.

DP: How was our attendance at both times?

AC: About the same.

RCa: But better than last year! I think more people now are taking the meetings seriously.

BS: Maybe we need to give it more time.

AC: We can go back to noon next semester if need be.

MSL: But I do think that alternating is confusing.

AC: So should we leave it at 4 PM for this semester?

DP: Noon is better for me than 4.

BS: And I have many faculty that teach at 4...

AC: Can we have consensus to leave it at 4 for this semester and revisit it next year?

BS: I so move.

MSL: I second.

RCo and DP: Abstain.

AC: OK, the last few items should go fast. About the name change: make your constituencies aware that there's now a web link about this issue and remind them that if they want some say, they should go there. Also, encourage them to attend the town hall meeting that Steve Johnson e-mailed us about.

DH: I was going to ask if we could either talk about at the general faculty meeting or start an opine discussion about it...? I'd love to make suggestions, except I don't understand all the different ramifications for choosing a particular name. I don't want to make a suggestion without a reason.

RCa: We can recommend starting a dialog on it.

JC: One of the reasons we didn't join with the University of Utah was because we wouldn't be "Dixie" anymore.

RCa: There apparently is a focus group that I'm on about this, though I don't know why. But if you have recommendations, that's a much smaller meeting.

JG: We have a true opportunity to create a brand here. The question is if the old-timers are going to get their way and force "Dixie" to remain.

AC: Do we want me to send a message to the faculty-all list saying that this has been posted and we want to start a discussion, or do we just want to leave it to individual faculty to leave feedback through the forum?

JC: If we came up with a name on which the faculty all agreed...

AC: Do we want to put it on the agenda for the full Faculty Senate meeting and ask for specific suggestions?

MSL: It'll end up dominating the meeting...!

RCa: Put it last on the agenda.

AC: Or put it on faculty-all listserv?

JC: Both.

DH: I find those e-mails to be very entertaining.

SL: It casts the faculty in a bad light because there's so much junk that goes out there—it may be entertaining, but it's counterproductive.

AC: OK, so just at the end of the full meeting?

SL: Encourage faculty attendance at the forum Steve Johnson announced, too.

AC: Please send reminders to your constituencies a week and again 2 days before the forum, too.

DH: Is our full Faculty Senate meeting before the forum?

AC: Yes, it's next week at 4 PM. OK, I'm condensing the next bit. Policy Program update: I got an update from Martha, who's been inundated with other stuff but is still working on this; as soon as she's got enough together, rather than bits and pieces, she'll be in touch.

SL: Is anything that was tabled last year going to come back?

AC: I'm not sure. They're working with the Attorney General on the post-tenure review and textbook policies. The others...I'm not sure what those are? Could you get me specifics? OK, the LDS Mission age change: a committee has been formed to deal with this, and I'm trying to find out what its mission is and how it impacts faculty. We'll have to leave the accreditation meeting feedback issue for next time.