FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
April 7, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)   *Munir Mahmud (MM)*

Jen Ciaccio (JC)   *Shane Prine (SP)*

Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)   *Matt Smith-Lahrman (MSL)*

Jack Lounsbury (JL)   *Dennis Wignall (DW)*

PA: I would first like to welcome everyone! I talked to Ami and she's finishing another committee today but will be at our next meeting. The first thing I'd like to do today is cement who's coming in, who's going out, and which departments need to be represented on the FSEC.

SP: Curtis may be the representative for CIT.

MM: Kyle Wells is replacing me for Business.

PA: I'm representing music, Brad Barry is representing English, Georgine Bills will represent Health Science I think, and JC will continue to represent Biology for another year.

JC: Rob Cowan replaces Gary Cooper for Physical Science.

PA: Jie Liu will represent Math, Varlo Davenport Theater, JL Developmental Education for another year; Ed Reber is out and MSL is in for Humanities. DW continues as Communication representative. Any other departments not represented? From Ed's list, some people represent larger groups and others smaller.

DW: As long as the campus is represented, I don't know that that matters.

MM: How many members are there now?

PA: Fourteen.

MM: That's a good size; any bigger and it would become problematic.

PA: My main concern is that we're missing someone from a particular group. If you're aware of anything, let me know and I'll make a composite list. Another thing I wanted to cover was the Self-Evaluation form from the Faculty Excellence Committee (puts it up on the screen).

MSL: Why do we need this?

JC: It's been very vague before.

DW: It's to avoid the potential for a rubber-stamp process.

MSL: Where is this coming from?

JC: I did things on my self-evaluation for my tenure review, but was told what I'd put in it wasn't enough.

DW: There was inconsistency across departments in terms of format; the Faculty Excellence Committee was asked to standardize it.

MSL: I'm on the tenure review committee, and we like the "respond to students" thing. We're now going to start looking in self-evaluations for reaction to critiques of past reviews.

DW: This gives faculty opportunity to provide detail for RTP decisions.

PA: It's intended as a tool for building to a tenure application.

SP: And build your CV.

MM: It's a short way to link everything together. All the items on the list might not apply to everyone all the time.

MSL: We need to put that not all these items are required.

DW: Can we get this individually, take it to our respective departments, and get feedback?

JH: Sure.

PA: MM, you've been managing the web site, right? Could you continue with that, even though you won't be a representative anymore?

MM: Sure, as long as JH sends me the minutes.

SP: On the self-evaluation thing, under format, should there be a sub-section on "expected things to update" plus one for "additional things"? That is, required vs. suggested/additional?

JH: Sure, we can do that.

MSL: Do the items on this list need to be in both the portfolio *and* the self-evaluation?

DW: Yes.

JH: This is intended to show that faculty are responding to and aware of criticisms from other reviews and demonstrate that they're evolving to address them.

JC: But many of these items don't address that; a lot of these are just lists of things that are in the portfolio anyway, like committees.

PA: MSL, you're on RTP, so you're best suited to determine how valuable this is…?

DW: This is also to demonstrate that faculty are engaged in lots of things; the accreditation people won't dig into portfolios to see details. This provides a short summary.

JC: Add in "what are my strengths as a teacher?".

DW: And "what does the college need to do to help me change this?". As more people document that kind of thing, there's more pressure on administration to take actions to address them. Donna and Dean Hinton have been very good about doing that.

MSL: Every semester seems too often for non-tenured faculty.

JC: Especially because non-tenures are supposed to get peer-reviewed every semester.

JH: I'll send this around and please make changes, additions, suggestions, etc.

DW: I sent everyone a copy of Martha Talman's reaction to our 3-10/3-18 statement. On Friday and Saturday, Donna and I exchanged e-mails concerning 3-10 (workload), part II.c, which is where the problem is (the word "average"). In a meeting, she told PA and I that she'd remove that sentence, thus removing mention of overload. There was mixed reaction to removal of the whole sentence, which is why I called the last FSEC meeting. From that, we decided that we need to revise 3-18 and *then* 3-10. In the background, the idea is that there's unfair application of overload in order to bring people up to a 90% benchmark; faculty would have to be overworked to be closer to equity.

JC: I thought the issue was that if the administration wanted to limit overload, they'd have to bring faculty up to equity.

DW: And in the process of doing that, they can apply overload.

JC: But overload doesn't apply to equity.

PA: What's the logic of associating the two?

JC: I thought it was to incentivize the administration to bring faculty to equity and therefore limit overload.

PA: I think the motivation for overload should be based on the needs of each individual department, not on what we're making—they need to be separated. That doesn't change the needs of faculty to be at equity.

JC: Agreed.

PA: So I think everyone's on the same page that both of these (3-10 and 3-18) need to be revised at the same time.

DW: I sent an e-mail to the FSEC with that in mind, to hold back 3-10 until we look at 3-18, and *then* put *both* to Academic Council simultaneously later. (General agreement.)

MM: In the revision on the web site, they revised this after our meeting…

DW: Well, after going back and forth with Donna, she said she would ask Pam to put this language in the revision, and that's what you're seeing in there now. It went to Martha to do the writing, and that's why we have this new language on overload limits.

MM: But it now says "all faculty salaries not within 10% equity." That's not how we phrased it—now, the whole *school* has to be at 10%. Also, there's a totally new thing on restrictions in here.

PA: Do you think the revision is wise?

MM: I don't know.

DW: That's what we're here to decide.

PA: We need to keep tabs on these changes and updates.

MM: Is this going to be voted on today?

PA: No.

DW: I reported to Donna that 50% of the FSEC supported holding off on revising 3-10 until we can do both 3-10 and 3-18; she said "no one over here has any heartburn about holding it back," but in another e-mail said she'd like to see some of this next year.

PA: The next vote.

DW: I assume, yes; Academic Council doesn't meet again until September. What we have, then, is the summer to do this. I've always felt rushed with 3-10.

MM: In the first section, in your first e-mail you said to strike the whole sentence beginning with "Typically…" You and Dennis suggested giving more power to the departments, but this old language is back now (no longer crossed out).

(DW brings the on-line version up on the screen.) They didn't take out the sentence in section I.A. after the "Typically" sentence.

DW: This is meant to give departments more power; putting in "Typically…" makes it flexible. Why the other red sentence is back in there I don't know.

PA: For accreditation, maybe?

DW: I don't know. That red writing is a clarification for Payroll purposes that *entire departments* will do 12 credits in the Fall and 15 in the Spring, not individual faculty. Ideally, Payroll wants the whole school on the same schedule.

MSL: Why do they care?

DW: They do a single-digit entry for all faculty, and they don't have the staff to do things individually. For me, I'm less concerned about that because we have a whole year to change it. This is a workload, not compensation, statement, so we can revise it at any time.

SP: It seems crazy that this policy is driven by software.

PA: Yes it is!

DW: (scrolling down to II.C) Read this, and then read the same part in Martha's e-mail. Her part is newer.

MM: The green text is the newest additions.

DW: Yes, that's the language Donna has put forward, but what's on-line now doesn't jibe with what Martha sent around.

JC: So the crossed-out stuff is put back in.

DW: (reads Martha's e-mail aloud) Martha has "average" back in there.

JC: I think when she cut-and-pasted the text, all the crossed out stuff got un-crossed-out.

DW: But we don't have time to clarify that with Martha before the Academic Council meeting in 2 hours. I don't think this is a typo, I think this is brand-new language.

MSL: Is the rest the same?

DW: Well, with Donna we got rid of "average."

PA: She got rid of everything involving salary.

DW: …which shouldn't be in a workload statement anyway. Martha's suggested language, if it comes true, means it still allows just *some* faculty to define the "average" if they're below average.

JC: That's why I think it's a typo—does the rest of her letter continue with all the same other text?

MM: I don't think so; I think it's new: the "all" is new and not in the version on-line.

JC: Agreed, but what Dennis is reading is identical to this everywhere else, meaning it just didn't cut-and-paste properly.

PA: We just need to determine if we're all unified on this? As long as we're unified on saying we want to table this, that's all we need to decide for now.

DW: Yes, until September, to give us time to work with Martha on this.

MM: Will Martha be at Academic Council?

DW: No, Pam will represent this policy today.

MM: No matter what we discuss, this is what will become policy today?

DW: No, when we go to Academic Council this afternoon, we'll go armed with all of this.

MM: We need to find out why this other language came back in. The current workload model links back to this policy.

JC: They tried to put the workload model into the overload limits, but when it became tied to equity, it got limited?

MSL: What is the difference between the "model" and the "policy"? We follow the model and hope it's driven by policy? It seems like there should be just *one* document.

JC: Yes, instead of just inserting the model, they wanted to insert restrictions.

DW: OK, we're chewing on minutiae again…I have one other request from faculty that showed up in my in box (even though I'm not President any more): there are many faculty on campus—I don't know how many—who are concerned that graduation is taking on a religious tone because the LDS president is the speaker, and some faculty are opposed to this tone. I don't know what he will talk about, but there will probably be some LDS references because this college's origin is rooted there.

PA: Why is that an issue? Senator Matheson made the same references in his talk years ago.

SP: The issue is that if the LDS prophet is the speaker, how will people separate what he says as *speaker* from what he says as *prophet*?

MSL: The President wants the biggest crowd possible and this guy is a proverbial rock star. But it's a problem because the President keeps saying we need diversity at this school, but the school keeps naming buildings after only LDS people, etc.

DW: Yes, there's no representation of diverse spiritual views on this campus, and this is what annoys some people.

PA: How does this differ from a sitting (US) president coming to give a talk when some faculty don't agree with his policies?

SP: Other schools don't require attendance at a convocation, just at graduation.

MSL: Well, Monson has academic credentials, so I'm sure he'll use tact. I don't think it will be a religious service.

DW: I don't think it will, but the e-mails reflect that any reference to religion will infringe on their rights.

PA: At every institution, there will be faculty that will disagree with any speaker.

DW: Let's say that as everyone is in the hall, when Monson walks in, LDS people have to stand up to honor him. What do the non-LDS do?

JC: Is there anything we can do about it?

DW: Not really; this will benefit the college in a variety of ways, such as more support from the legislature, etc.