

# Faculty Senate Executive Committee

February 19, 2015

---

*In attendance:*

*Clint Buhler (CB)*

*Robert Carlson (RC)*

*Timothy Francis (TF)*

*Jim Haendiges (JH)*

*Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)*

*Linda Jones (LJ)*

*Curtis Larsen (CL)*

*Erin O'Brien (EO; President-Elect)*

*Helen Saar (HS)*

*Nate Staheli (NS; President)*

*Don Warner (DoW)*

NS: Here's the agenda for today, and some addenda that we'll use as exhibits that we'll reference as we go through (hands around). Let's go right from the top. As far as the Faculty Senate President's report, there's not a tremendous amount of information—we'll talk about a lot of stuff that will maybe be included in my report, and if there's questions or comments or concerns about things I haven't addressed, we'll reserve that for the end. We meet with the President twice a month, and lately about specific faculty issues as we deal with things on campus that need to be addressed. Academic Integrity was discussed extensively at our last meeting, and we'll bring that up as a conversation item later. Going down the list, first: commencement—is everyone familiar with the procedure this year? The President made the decision to do away with the specific division convocations, and just have one large commencement.

RC: I commented to him that the biggest benefit to having the smaller convocations was that I got to meet a lot of students' families—they liked introducing me to their families because it was small enough that you could do that. If our niche in the strategic plan is going to be our contact and personal interaction with students, we're going to lose that in this gigantic meeting—it'll be interminably long and there will be no chance of making those connections afterward.

CB: Would that do away with calling out individual student names?

NS: I think they're going to just call them all during the long one.

CB: At Ohio State, only Ph.D.s get their names called. Everyone else just comes in and they say "Congratulations, you're done; look for it in the mail." Which was kind of lame as a graduation day, but...

JDH: That's pretty standard.

RC: But it'd be one long list of names and less personal.

NS: In the meeting, we discussed this and I expressed RC's concern, and there I don't remember what the reason was for doing it other than cost and not drawing the day out longer, but there was no proof or evidence that the new way was better.

RC: It's money—they think it'll be a substantial savings, but I don't know where the "substantial" comes from.

CL: On setup and clean up.

NS: I bring that to your attention to ask what you would like faculty leadership to do? Would you like an official memo to the President saying we don't support this or that we ought to reconsider it? This year, I don't think it'll happen—it'll be what it is. Should we contact student government to see if they'd like it done a different way? Students are a big part of this...

CB: Does that mean this year it'll be just the one?

NS: Just the one—that decision has been made. The feedback is what type of approach you would like faculty and/or students to make to get it back to the way it was.

RC: Part of my concern was that they didn't solicit feedback; they just made the decision. It was unilaterally done based just on cost, without consulting the students. I think they should find out about what students and their families want.

TF: I think the students should be involved.

CB: It seems like you have to pay a fee for graduation, right?—what is the substantial cost and what does it divvy up to per student? If it's just \$2 more on their application fees... For me, it seems like if I'm graduating college, then \$2 to have my name called and to walk and have the professors meet the parents is worth it.

NS: I'll politic with the President about our faculty concerns, and you are more than welcome to solicit additional feedback from your constituents, and if you've got any supporting documentation, I'd love to have that in the files.

LJ: The only issue with having it separate—and I like the separate—is that the husband/wife, sister/brother—they had to join other peoples’ convocations so they could go to just one and didn’t have to split. That and the parents had children in different schools, they had to split up to attend all the convocations.

RC: They just need to announce louder that they can both go to one if they want.

LJ: But then they don’t graduate with their schools. It’s a small number, granted.

NS: We’ll take that back to Academic Council. We’ll also involve students—maybe they already have been. Maybe they’re fine with it. Ultimately, I think if the students are fine with it, we may have to be, too. I’ll make that an action item.

NS: Next: the Faculty Evaluation policy. One thing came up that I got email from a senator about the substantive change in the peer review process. Previously, the peer-review form was kind of worthless—I’d go in and sit down in a class, and have them just sign that I’d done it, and I’d send them a memo attached to it. What was presented to us two weeks ago was that the intent of the change is that you do a peer review, but it’s more of a—CB?

CB: I was reading it—I was surprised how big a change it was with no conversation! They did away with requirement to list pros and cons to promote more open dialog and not to feel hostile...?

RC: Who is “they?”

EO: The deans.

CB: It was a “we met, we talked, we got feedback” collaborative kind of thing. Now it requires, as the policy is written, that you to list strengths, make constructive feedback of problems, and submit them to the appropriate dean, department chair, and faculty member—it seems substantive, but it should have been talked about.

RC: Is it following a policy’s wording?

EO: No, this is new policy and includes a new evaluation form that requires certain things. On top of all of this, part of the discussion has been to consider that in addition to faculty members evaluating *you*, that new faculty are required to go to established professors’ rooms and make observations and learn from that. And that’s how they’d flip some of these peer things, and discussion would follow that. That’s come up in discussion all the time, but not in policy.

JDH: It was mentioned in the Policy Steering Committee meeting that some of the intent behind this switch was to make the peer review less about reviewing the peer and more about reviewing yourself based on what you see about the peer.

NS: That’s not a bad idea in terms of collaboration...I do that on my own anyway. I often thing “I could do that in my classroom!” and incorporate some of this or that. I don’t think it’s a bad thing, but that’s not what the request was—the problem was that we just hadn’t talked about it. Do we need to issue a statement about this?

RC: This is a policy that’s going through right now...Who created this if faculty didn’t?

NS: It was part of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and carved out to be separate.

HS: This is where I wrote to you also because in December, I brought up that this policy part will come back to us, but it never did—it went straight to the 30 day review.

EO: Do we own that policy?

NS: Yes.

EO: We can take it down, then

NS: Well, we can leave it up through the 30-day period and gather the comments.

EO: We should take it down before that because we don’t want it to finish going through hoops automatically at that point, and we don’t want it to clear this hoop if we want it to be a discussion.

CL: I believe, in a conversation with Martha, that part of the push behind this was a Board of Regents policy that requires a peer review with more steps than what we had. *[Addendum added post-meeting: it’s accreditation that requires this, not the Board of Regents.]*

EO: So this is not anything actually within our control—if we’re going to comply, we *have* to do all this?

RC: The details *have* to be somewhat within our control.

CB: Even just modifying the requirement that there be a section that lists what they did well and what they did poorly—it seems that could get hostile, where you’re requiring a faculty member to go into another faculty member’s room and find things that are going wrong in their classroom and then criticizing them...?!?

EO: We don’t want this to be a love-fest if someone is struggling...!

CB: It should have a letter in which these are the *types* of things that should be in there. As it reads, it sounds like it’s required that each of those elements be in there. Sometimes when I go in to do a peer review, I do have suggestions, and sometimes I don’t, and I don’t want to artificially come up with something negative that will end up in their tenure review portfolio just because I *have* to.

TF: (Pulls the policy under review up) It says that not more than 2 weeks after the meeting, the reviewer will submit a letter... (reads requirements).

EO: So you could say you don’t have any suggestions for improvement and that would satisfy that requirement.

CB: It says “must include suggestions.”

TF: You could include the suggestion “Look for ways to improve.”

NS: Let’s parcel this out: do we have a concern that the letter needs to go to the faculty, the chair, and the dean?

JH: I always ask myself what the consequences are of a policy. I ask myself “What if it doesn’t go to them?” There’s a lot of things we’re starting to have to manufacture to prove our worth. Are there consequences if we don’t?

NS: If you consistently don’t follow policy, in this manner, i.e., don’t do a peer review, you could have marks against you in your portfolio.

JH: I go up for tenure next year, and none of this stuff seems to be a requirement. I like to write letters for people; I think it’s good to go into their classrooms.

EO: Every change we make to this process, the people in charge of Faculty Review need to be given instructions that with this policy change, what will be grandfathered in from before this date. That needs to be spelled out. But as Faculty Senate, we need to make those instructions explicit because things get said and people start freaking out and we have to say “Oh, no, don’t worry; it’s fine.” Even members of that committee make statements like that, and we get in trouble.

JH: And there are people in the middle, who have to say “Half the time I was here I was required this, and the other half I wasn’t.” It gets really messy.

RC: I’m concerned that this has such far-reaching effects that we need a much longer, more open dialog among faculty about this. I don’t know if there’s any problems with this, but we need time to think through it.

NS: I think we had access to this, and brought it to the Senate at one time.

EO: We were too busy with Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

TF: I think you brought it, but we hadn’t seen it.

HS: There was discussion that it was going to be separate, and the next thing we knew it was up for review already.

CB: In this new policy, is there an out-clause—you could say “Look for areas of improvement.” I think this policy is more likely to turn into a love fest than the current one because under the current one, you could make a critique without any fear. But if I’m writing that down and giving it to your dean and chair and it’ll be on your tenure review...you’re more likely to say something orally than submit it written. You’re making a big enemy if you make a giant suggestion on paper to their bosses. It’ll make *less* constructive criticism.

EO: Sometimes they’re minor things, but in the context of the conversation, the easiest way to phrase them is “Hey, I just noticed that some students were doing X, Y, and Z, and something I do to deal with that is \_\_\_\_\_, and that might help you as well.” But the easiest way to put it in writing isn’t quite that informal—it can suddenly look like a major problem.

NS: March 1 is when its 30 day review is up. If we let it run through that and then compile all of the comments, and then incorporate those in, if we wait until the first, what’s the fear?

RC: I don’t know that most people have even *started* talking about it. Us in here just barely started now! More faculty need to know about this. Trying to nuance a written peer review that will be *that* official and part of someone’s record is tricky and a big responsibility that people are going to be very leery of. One concern I’ve had about the review process; the goal of it is to determine if they’re good faculty members. The more of these hoops we have to jump through that aren’t related to our main faculty responsibilities, the more chance we’ll have of kicking people out for reasons other than their teaching and scholarship. We’re starting to get to the point where those other responsibilities are so onerous that some people that really have trouble with them are going to be left out, even though they’re excellent faculty members.

NS: I’ll contact Martha and see if we can pull it down for an additional review period because we have some additional questions.

JH: Should we take it to the General Faculty meeting for more dialog?

EO: I think so.

NS: There’s one on Monday. We’ll pull it from the 30 day review process and I’ll e-mail the faculty and invite comments.

CB: Are the General Faculty meetings put on-line? Recordings?

NS: In the past we had recorded them, but had some push-back—people have had concerns about that. The concern is that if we record them, people don’t feel they can speak freely. I was going to ask if you want them recorded. Think about that and I’ll ask at the end. Next, in that same vein: evaluation of faculty and administrators. I think we already crossed this one a little bit. RC asked about role statements and if there’s an impasse with getting an agreement on the statements. The answer from the Policy Office is that you go through the formal grievance process. Do we need anything different than that? So the question is: if I say I do something and my supervisor says “no,” and you can’t agree on it, and you think it’s outside the scope of what your contract requires, what do you do? Martha’s answer was go through the grievance process to appeal that.

RC: But in the meantime—suppose we accept that—what happens until the grievance process goes through? There’s no role statement if it’s not signed by both. What happens when there isn’t a role statement in place?

NS: I think it’s just a general understanding of what that person should be doing.

EO: Well, the reality is that if we’re going to evaluate people on this, that situation can’t exist because faculty review depends on these documents, and if you don’t have one...

JH: Can it move up the chain to the dean?

RC: The dean is the one that probably wouldn’t approve it. What then?

EO: Yes, you work it out with your chair, and it goes to the dean for approval. If you and your chair think the dean is unreasonable, the next step is the Academic Vice-President.

RC: It's been the dean that has not signed off on a role statement in some existing cases.

NS: I don't know the grievance process. What other options do we have?

RC: There are different reasons that a statement might not be accepted. One that has been articulated so far is that the duties are beyond the scope of a normal, full-time faculty member, and that issue should be resolved by the Workload Committee. That committee should have some say in what is a typical workload for faculty, and that committee would have faculty representation.

EO: We're currently in this limbo, and we need to spell out and force administration to carry out the Workload Committees as they're currently being discussed. Bill keeps vacillating on what the institutional Workload Committee will do, and there's school-level Workload Committees, too—at what level does it go to the school one vs. the institutional one?

RC: I don't know the answer to that right now. It would seem like *some* committee involving faculty would determine what an appropriate amount of workload is. The school-level one would know what the time requirements are for those kinds of responsibilities within their school. It's complex with Health Sciences or Art because different disciplines have different requirements. But I'm worried that the Academic Vice-President will fairly consistently side with the deans in a dispute.

NS: That could be the case. Again, I don't know the formal grievance process.

EO: There isn't one right now.

NS: Well, in general—there's a Grievance Policy.

RC: This kind of issue could be a lot more common than grievances in other contexts. So having a specified procedure that can resolve it quicker than the current process...the current process might even allow lawyers and all kinds of other things, which is farther than we want.

IJ: It goes to the Human Resources Director, not the Academic Vice-President.

RC: How would they be able to answer that question? Convene a committee?

IJ: (reads) Yes, a Grievance Committee is formed.

RC: We need an intermediate step.

NS: Could you articulate what you envision as a formal process and send that to me?

CB: You could alleviate some of the pressure by laying out deadlines for these things, so it has to be signed by the faculty member and chair by X date, and leave some time before it has to be signed by the dean so that if there is a dispute, there's time for that grievance to work.

IJ: Could you get a signed role statement and omit the one area that's controversial and add that as an addendum later?

NS: Yes, you could get creative, but the ultimate philosophical issue still hasn't been resolved.

IJ: But at least you'd have something in place for evaluation purposes.

RC: I'll come up with something—if you have any thoughts, like EO just had a good thought that if the dispute is with the dean, then there would be a lot of pressure from within the school, so the faculty in that school might be under pressure.

EO: The school workload committee might not be the best committee to evaluate the situation, and it might make sense to move it up.

RC: But people outside the program might not know what appropriate workload is for that kind of discipline. I don't know what the answer is.

EO: But again, because the institutional Workload Committee will have a representative to speak to that, it'll just take the pressure off of the mixed incentives.

RC: Please pass your thoughts to me. I don't know that there's a quick, easy answer.

NS: Our next issue is supervisor evaluations, and that came up in University Council—the President said that an annual review of the deans in which faculty are involved is *not* appropriate, and that a 3 year review is appropriate.

RC: And by the same token, a 3 year review of faculty by students is also appropriate.

EO: There's a discussion about faculty evaluation and supervisors needing to do things. As long as you're meeting a certain bare minimum of requirements, you don't have to go through the same level of hoop-jumping. But that's not been formalized yet. Cutting down on the frequency of evaluations just to cut down on the workload, whether peers, deans, whatever, is desirable.

NS: We still have the right as faculty to express concern about a dean or supervisor, even if not through a formal annual process. We can submit information to the Academic Vice-President. That's another option of expressing concerns. But the President was adamant that it'll be 3 year reviews on deans.

RC: By a subcommittee of a few faculty members.

NS: Yes. Do we want to push against that and mandate 1 year? Or leverage that we're getting evaluated every year by students?

RC: We're as capable of evaluating deans as students are of evaluating us.

NS: The only thing I'll say on that is that I think our review of deans has more weight on their renewal than a student's does of ours. The weight of the review is different. I haven't seen a situation where a negative student review threatened a faculty member. ...It has? OK, I haven't seen that.

RC: It only happens on the tenure committee—they're the only ones that could use that information in that way, and I've heard indirectly that that is seriously considered. The numbers sometimes are.

NS: I'll bring that up. I've been on that committee, and my philosophy about using student comments is that if there's a consistency of horrible evaluations, then there's a weight as to needing to work on that. But if the faculty member sees that they got low scores in some area but then constantly improved...I think that's phenomenal for faculty.

RC: But you *are* using them.

NS: True. But never to threaten their employment or their rank or tenure.

RC: Even if they're consistently horrible?

EO: Yes, it has.

CB: If students are constantly complaining that it's hard...

RC: But that's not a negative.

CL: I've also been on that committee, too, and I look more at comments than the numbers. Sometimes, it's just one bad semester or class—just horrible reviews, and everything else is great. Either they had a bad semester or there was a bad apple in the bunch of students.

NS: So the 3 year annual review of their continuing status—would it be appropriate if we had the ability to submit our own reviews annually?

RC: The information should ultimately be used by the President because he makes the final decision, but if he makes it without hearing from faculty in the schools on a consistent basis, then he's missing some information. What he will see in Dean's Council and in other interactions isn't the same as what the faculty see in the schools on a regular basis. He can use it however he wants; it shouldn't be deterministic in any way—I agree with that completely. But by not having it, he's missing out.

NS: Let's bring this back to the students and deans. We get evaluated every semester, but we're only up for review every 3 years. So I think the President is saying that we're not going to have a *formal* review every year—he's only doing such a review every 3 years, but part of that evaluation process should include annual review. I'll make sure that that's clearly articulated, that it's open to faculty annually making comments. I think the President's concerns is that an annual review is too onerous.

IJ: And you can do it similar to how the student evaluations are done, on-line and anonymous.

RC: If you had a whole school doing those anonymous evaluations, it'd be hard to trace any one evaluation back to any one person.

HS: If everyone submits their comments, it's great group feedback.

RC: If that's the President's concern, then I think a compromise is possible.

NS: Next is: I got an e-mail from Bill on the timing of student evaluations (reads)—he doesn't want the timing to be part of a policy, and he's willing to defer it to Faculty Senate and Academic Council. Putting it in policy would place undue stress on our ability to adapt.

RC: So can the policy say that the Faculty Senate will determine the time?

EO: With approval by Academic Council. Just like we did the calendar.

NS: And if we want it there, we can vote on it. Next: Faculty Adjunct salaries. There was a discussion in the last University Council that the President is adamant about improving adjunct salaries—he wants to go to bat for our adjuncts and get them more money. He also wants to bring faculty up to 100%, rather than 90% equity.

EO: They're encouraging us to put that into the strategic plan.

NS: If you see the minutes of that, I expressed a concern that staff have equity issues, too, so it needs to be looked at as a whole package—staff need to know that we support them. I have a salary comparisons worksheet from across the state that I can send you if you're interested—we're about \$10,000 on average below where we should be. If you have questions or concerns from your department meetings about adjunct or faculty salaries, please let us know. The President wants to be well informed so he can go to bat for us on this.

RC: One other question: historically, our overload has been tied to adjunct salaries. It doesn't have to be; it's not very much, and it's most of the time insulting. We do overload to be nice. I don't know what is fair compensation—it's between adjunct salary and a proportion of our salary.

EO: (reads from document) At the University of Utah, they have an overload policy, but it's not listed here.

RC: They probably negotiate it.

NS: We need to put together evidence from faculty. Maybe we need to convene a subcommittee that works on this. This will probably come up in another agenda at the next meeting, too, and we'll convene a subcommittee to promote increased faculty salaries. That should involve the adjunct representative, too.

CL: I'm not as worried about the overload as I am about adjuncts.

NS: Next: Title IX updates: I don't have a ton of information other than that on March 25—

EO: There's two different things. In order to comply with federal regulations, we have to train a bunch of faculty in many different ways. There's two ways. There's an easy way, which everyone is required to do and is required by the Clery act, and then there's the one where you can be really helpful. The one everyone has to do is March 25—she's going to schedule this every hour on the hour, starting at 8 AM, and I assume the last one will end at 5 PM. You can go to any of them. They're trying to determine if they can video-tape them and have you watch the tape and have that count, but that's not been signed off on. The other way is a 2 day training, on March 23-24, to become a Title IX deputy investigator. Cynthia showed us a folder of current investigations. They had to be color coded, and even then you couldn't count them. People are learning that there's ways to report problems, and are coming forward. We have tiny cases and much more serious cases she's investigating. In order to investigate, you have to go through this 2-day training, and the university needs to have a pool of people trained to investigate cases in pairs—you'd never be given sole responsibility for something. They're in dire need of people to volunteer for this. This is standard practice. The training is all day.

CL: Too bad that's not on days we don't have class...

NS: We need to announce this for faculty, to attend one of the things on March 25. If they can't, there'll be ways to make up that training.

EO: It's possible that they'll video tape the 2 day ones for an hour here and there in case people end up having to miss an hour. The University is paying a lot for people to come to campus to present this, and these are the dates that we got. This is the fastest, easiest way to make sure we're all in compliance.

NS: If you have a chance to talk to faculty members, and this'll go to staff and administration as well, see if anyone wants to volunteer to be a deputy. I had an e-mail about this wondering who approves release time, or if we get paid for becoming deputies—if there's an additional service component. I deferred that to administration. We all have plenty to do, so to take 2 days to go get training so we have *more* work to do isn't great incentive for people to become involved.

EO: But for people in need of service, this is easy way to get it. Most of these, they are thinking, won't require a lot of time—a couple of phone calls, meet with someone face-to-face, and evaluate the veracity of a report. There are certain guidelines for this; sometimes it's "he said, she said," "are there witnesses," etc.

JH: Just to be clear: this doesn't interfere with the duties of the ombuds? This is for students, and the ombuds is for us...?

EO: The ombuds is for everyone, and the Clery act is for everyone, but it targets specific issues. The ombuds is because we want people to be able to make complaints and resolve problems. The Clery act is because federal universities and colleges have been bungling these investigations, and they've tied our hands and are forcing us to do certain things so that hopefully we stop bungling as much as we have.

NS: Cynthia Davis is our Title IX coordinator now. That will be coming up—it's just for your information. Next: Faculty funds: we have \$15,829 in money left over from our dues-paying past, and we need to decide what to do with it. We've talked about it in previous meetings, and never come to a conclusion. Today I'm just asking that you consider a possible use for those funds and be prepared in a subsequent meeting to make a request or proposal—e.g., scholarships, student government, something of that nature. I'd like to have that worked out by the end of the semester. Let's vote on those in the Senate. Next: our ongoing budget. We get \$12,000/year ongoing from the school.

EO This is to compensate for us not getting dues and to allow us to represent all faculty members.

NS: I think all we've spent has largely been on food for General Faculty meetings. I'll put together a proposal by next meeting of what's been used thus far in terms of food, etc., and then I'll include a request for your approval for training of leadership every other year—for us to go to some conferences, and/or to fund a work study student to do more administrative stuff as we gain more responsibilities in terms of keeping track of committees and things of that nature. I'll probably put that to you for a vote the meeting after next.

EO: NS and I have been doing phone conferences with USHE faculty senate leadership, and we're planning a face-to-face meeting in March. We're trying to host it here, but if it's not, we'll have to travel up to attend that, and that cost could come from this. Because of the amount we're talking about, that would have to be approved by the group.

NS: Keep thinking about this and we'll put it up for a vote later. Next: elections are coming up—I don't know of names we have yet, so please *please PLEASE* recruit!

CB: Just for the next Faculty Senate President-Elect?

NS: Yes.

RC: Are we under the new rules or the old?

NS: I think we're governed by the old rules for now because the new rules haven't been approved.

RC: So that means just not from my, your, or EO's department. Others from the same *schools* can apply, though.

NS: Yes. Think about that; we've got to get that going. Next: there's new faculty contact and follow-up...I want to reserve time at a subsequent meeting to actually ask about each of these faculty; I've contacted Kristine Olson, who is the chair of the New Employee Committee, to see if there are things that they're doing or questions we ought to be asking these new faculty regarding resources or things like that. I'd like to be more personal and intimate with them to make sure

their transitions to Dixie are good. Those are names that are listed; you can see the departments they are in. Some of you have continual dialog with them, which is great; I'd like just an informal report.

EO: Oh—we need to have a vote on travel because we're going to travel before we meet again. (CB moves; RC seconds; passed.)

NS: OK. Next: the Constitution and Bylaws feedback—the only thing on that is a small discussion about proportional representation, but I think we've settled that in here.

RC: How did the President react to that?

NS: He said we'll eventually want to change that.

EO: We've actually been getting a lot of comments saying that it should change. A lot of this is coming from the Health Sciences, which has lots of little departments, and we discussed that they can merge departments and pick a representative, but as they see it, they have to scramble to find the personnel to be present, or they voluntarily relinquish what is in essence their rightful representation when others aren't going to.

CB: We said "chaired departments" to deal with this problem.

EO: But in Allied Health, they have programs and Program Directors, which are the equivalent of chairs.

RC: No, they're not. We made that very clear. We said specifically "department chairs, and not program directors."

EO: Which means that the entire school would have no representation on Faculty Senate!

RC: We said they would get one, just like the library.

EO: So an entire school is going to get one representative?

NS: Let's have a quick vote to approve the last two sets of minutes. (LJ moves, TF seconds; passed). Next: Bowling for Kids' sake—R.C. Morris has probably been in touch with you about this. Please advertise that and push that in your areas—I think it'll be a fun opportunity.

JH: Did we discuss whether or not we could use Faculty Senate funds to sponsor a team for that?

NS: Not budget funds, but from the dues from before, we could. Just push it in your departments. I've given R.C. Morris some charge to keep pushing it. Next: a General Faculty Meeting agenda development: it sounds like the biggest item for the meeting would be the faculty evaluations.

EO: And Academic Integrity.

NS: Yes. I'll bring those two things up to discuss. The issue with the latter is the transcript notation—whether or not there should be an "XF" grade on a permanent record that will travel with the student (explains). Frank Lojko says "No, we don't want to mark a student for life." There's a middle ground of noting it within the institution and giving them an opportunity to expunge it if they meet certain criteria—maybe academic integrity courses or something.

EO: Except that would cost us money. We've talked about some sort of community service, such as participating in the freshmen orientation and talking about academic integrity, or something like that.

NS: I'm not sure what your feelings are on that, whether you think there should be a notation or not. We're getting a software package that will allow for casual reporting of infractions in your classes. If a student has an issue with cheating and you take care of it, but want it noted in their file, so if there's a continual problem it percolates to the top, then there could be more severe sanctions against the student.

CB: So if we casually report, it'll come back that the student has other infractions?

EO: It'll go to the dean, not back to you.

CB: I'm comfortable with that. We can then make case-by-case decisions.

NS: But if it's severe enough that a student gets kicked out of a class or a program, the request from some faculty was that the "XF" gets notated on their transcript. That travels with them for life.

EO: Some institutions do that; others have ways of expunging it.

NS: I'll bring those issues up at the General Faculty meeting Monday at noon. Administration is adamant about *not* having notations that travel for life.

EO: Their biggest concern was having potentially an adjunct faculty that's had no training about what constitutes appropriate levels of sanctioning having the power to permanently mark a transcript—that's their primary concern. The compromises are to make it not always permanent or taking the ability up levels in the hierarchy.

CB: So with this software, we'll be able to explain what the cheating was.

NS: Yes.

EO: There's drop-down menus, and a text box to fill in.

CB: Is there the option for deans to place a mark that will travel with them?

EO: If there's sufficient justification for it.

NS: If a student has five or six marks, the dean may say "This is the sixth time, and we're going to do something about that."

CB: And even if we vote that we're *not* going to put those marks on the transcripts at the faculty level, the deans can still make that decision, for something that travels with the student?

EO: It's all part and parcel of one policy. There are a couple of decisions that have to get made in the policy. One decision is about whether or not we allow a transcript mark to be made, and the faculty have repeatedly requested that. Another

is *who* gets the power to do that—is it faculty, which makes administration uncomfortable, or is it up the chain—a dean, the Academic Vice-President, etc.?

CB: I'm not concerned with who has the power as long as someone can see that it's been repeating.

EO: We have to have this conversation in a wider audience. The last decision is if we allow a mark at any level, do we create opportunities or abilities for it to be removed, or is it always on there? Different schools do this differently—marks that are permanent and defined, marks that are permanent and undefined, marks that are internal only, etc. There are examples everywhere.

NS: I'll make an announcement about that so faculty know this will be on the agenda for the General Faculty meeting. Assignments for our next meeting: propose how to spend the old dues money.

CB: Will the General Faculty meeting be recorded, or just be minutes made available?

NS: What do you want to do? Dave [*Mortensen*] will be there.

DoW: I think they should be recorded.

IJ: We don't usually take minutes at that meeting, so it has to be recorded or appoint someone to take minutes.

JH: Have we talked about if we can record them up until the dialog period?. Some people want to just get the general overview of what's being said, and then if it shuts off, and people can then feel comfortable making comments.

EO: That's a good standard policy.

JH: And then it could be an agenda that you can go through without interruption for a period of time, so that you can actually get through—sometimes, if you're interrupted, we don't get through the agenda. And then the conversations could be had.

CB: You could do the first agenda item, shut it off for discussion, then turn it on for the second item, then shut it off for discussion, etc.

EO: We could...we could try it both ways as an experiment and see which works better. But the other thing is that as part of the discussion: I know we talked about leaving it on so people who are not there for the discussion can see what was discussed. But that could be in the minutes—bullet points for discussion items that we all agree can be shared.

NS: So we'll record the first portion that is "this is what we're going to talk about." And then discussion is reduced to points that have been brought up by faculty but without any names.

EO: Yes. Then people won't feel like they missed everything that happened during the discussion.

NS: That's a great suggestion. We probably will have a fight on our hands as we push the Constitution and Bylaws through with the way we got the proportions set up...

IJ: Do we bring that up on Monday?

NS: The problem is we're going to re-open it...we've revisited it several times and voted on it as a Faculty Senate, and voted in good conscience of what the faculty want. My opinion is that we put it out there for a two-thirds vote, and if we don't get it, we go back to drawing board. Who else does it affect?

IJ: English? They're a bigger department that gets only one representative.

CB: We're going to make a two-thirds vote on the proportion thing?

NS: No; what happens is that the Constitution and Bylaws goes before the general faculty for a two-thirds vote—we have to have two-thirds of the faculty say "This is good."

JH: The sense I got from English, although proportional made sense, is that everyone is overbooked, just like in every other department, so it's a stretch to get just *one* representative...!

NS: I know that everyone on the senate was supposed to go to their constituents and ask what they want, and we came back with the answer.

CB: With an actual vote.

NS: Then the President said "Consider a proportional representation," and we did, and now we're getting comments about reconsidering it again. My answer is that we've addressed it. But we do have to be prepared in case a division says "Hey, this isn't fair."

CB: We discussed and understand the pros and cons, and advantages and disadvantages, of each system, and we felt in the balance, this system is more advantageous to get us the feedback we need.

NS: And we built into there a subcommittee that looks at proper proportions—not to change the Bylaws, necessarily, but if there's a group that isn't being represented, they could propose that another senator be involved in the group. I think at this point, Martha is pretty adamant that we should consider it, and the President says that we will at some point, which maybe we will in a few years. But I don't think we have pockets of people politicking one way or another to sway decisions that are being made. So I don't know that one or two more people is going to alter anything. Anything else we need to talk about? (No.) Thanks for your hard work.