

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (FSEC) MEETING SEPTEMBER 16, 2009

---

In attendance:

*Paul Abegg (PA)*  
*Georgine Bills (GB)*  
*Gary Cooper (GC)*  
*Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)*  
*Costel Ionita (CI)*  
*Chizu Jaret (CJ)*

*Randy Jasmine (RJ)*  
*Munir Mahmud (MM)*  
*Tom McNeilis (TM)*  
*Shane Prine (SP)*  
*Ed Reber (ER)*  
*Dennis Wignall (DW)*

## AGENDA:

- (1) Approve minutes from 9/2/2009 meeting (General) – ER: p. 2, line 8-9ish, should be “Association,” not “Senate.” (JH – changed.) Approve minutes: ER 1<sup>st</sup>, RJ 2<sup>nd</sup>; approved.
- (2) Three new faulty positions/rank/pay scale (Dennis) – Dean Hinton discussion with DW and expressed concern that people teaching at DSC under 0.5-0.74 have no benefits and slightly reduced teaching load, but are considered faculty (not adjuncts or part-time); his concern is can they participate in professional development funds? PA: do they serve on committees & are they evaluated the same? DW: they are evaluated same as faculty (as are adjuncts; same form). GC: are they eligible for rank and tenure? TM: rank, not tenure. DW: I have a draft of the RTP policy (2009 Apr), that I do not know if it passed, that says full-time, part-time, & “at will” (latter = designation from institution to employee, e.g., coaches, vice-presidents, deans, etc.) without checks & balances. Part-time defined as 74% or less of regular workload, whose employment is expected to be <9 months & is of intermittent nature, classified as “at will”; part-time regular faculty = 0.5-0.74 of normal academic workload (30 credits) but whose employment expected to continue. RJ: this was one of the last things we talked about last year, but we never voted on it. ER: I never heard it went through Academic Council. TM: Martha was going to send it to Pam. MM: we should first find out whether or not it’s been passed. DW: motion to form committee to work on this draft & definitions, chair from Executive Committee but made of Senate at large; committee to review & monitor development of any new policies & procedures from this date forward. PA 2<sup>nd</sup>; approved. DW: poll: any volunteers to chair this committee? PA: nominate ER. ER: I could do it, but if we have different policies, may want different committees. RJ: but we’re not the ones dictating that (except RTP), so we’re reacting, not being proactive, but we could be more proactive. DW: rather than one committee trying to do it all, maybe chair forms subcommittees to look at specific policies, get back to chair, filter their information back to the Executive Committee. ER: accepts PA’s nomination to chair.

- (3) Dues: mandatory, how much, how to implement, etc. (General) – DW: we had some talk last time about “mandatory,” but people tend to be resistant to that; my feeling is to not bribe them with lunch. We’d still have to raise dues even if item (4) (below) passes. ER: what if we forego lunches? TM: if we did that 3-4 times, we could recoup. SP: we would also be able to tell who’s paying & who’s coming to meetings! DW & TM: still need list of registered Senators from Pam. DW: my sense is we’re not really well populated. GC: if we had 75 people, we only spend \$300/mo. RJ: from a practical standpoint, I think the lunch meetings are rushed to get through full agendas, leaving people time to only eat? DW: Martha & TM treated the full Senate lunch meetings as informational, not heavy with lots of need for faculty action. Boils down to: do we want to have monthly meetings & just send info to all Senate via e-mail? RJ: I think we need monthly meetings & no lunch to show who’s really interested. TM: we need people from other departments to be together to discuss stuff. ER: (passed out *Journal of Economic Theory* page about how collections of people perform better than individuals.) DW: is it everyone’s sense that we hold lunch-free meetings ‘til our coffers catch up? I think what’s holding us up is that a Faculty Association would be a mandatory deduction, but Senate is not; maybe we should commit dues money to a keynote speaker and/or end-of-semester summary meetings for faculty. ER: if we intend to move rapidly on formation of large Association & smaller Senate, the first thing that would have to go would be Senators having lunches while the rest of a dues-paying Association does not. GB: maybe just a couple of full Senate lunches per semester (or year?). ER: if we do that, we might be able to make up our debt. DW: I’d like to pursue PA’s idea (item (4), below) first. GB: have lunches always been the model? ER: no, just popular in last 3-4 yrs. GB: before we take away something from the people that are using it now, we need to see who is using it – having something to entice people to come is better than nothing! SP: if we increase dues & axe lunches, what else do our funds go for? DW: Senate president meets with other State university/college Senate presidents biannually. PA: would it be good idea to appoint a treasurer that could log who’s a member, who’s paying dues, what are needs for any money that is in the coffers, etc. TM: ...and I would assume from last time that the reason we got in the hole was the paintings we bought for Caldwell upon his departure. PA: that may be something on which we could meet Donna halfway. DW: if we also tell her we’re suspending lunches, showing fiscal responsibility, she might be more amenable to helping us eliminate the negative balance. Many: ideas about having cafeteria cashiers police & check list or IDs; or post \$4 maximum on food that is paid for (remainder to come from individual faculty buying the food). SP: I still like idea of temporary lunch freeze ‘til the budget is balanced & so we see who’s really interested. GB: if we take lunch away, no one would come. RJ: we should have some, but fewer, chances to socialize, but other times needed to go over issues with full Senate without passing judgment on attendees vs. non-attendees – occasional lunches, regular meetings. PA & ER: perhaps opening & closing socials, with regular meetings in between, each semester. DW: at luncheon meetings, people leave when done eating. GC: at other institutions I’ve been at, most people tend to show up anyway without lunches – they’re interested enough. CI: if meeting is at lunch, everyone knows it’s

only 1 hour, so many won't come (or just come to eat) – larger meetings (somewhere in the 2-5 PM time slot) could be later in afternoon to avoid that. DW: 3-5 is when other committees meet, e.g., Academic Council.

DW: Dean Hinton talked about upcoming faculty challenges, that things will not be “business as usual.” ER & MM: may be referring to the fact that the State is \$850 million in the hole, so more budget cuts are coming. DW: untenured faculty, new faculty, etc. will be threatened by more cuts... SP: ...programs viewed as “unimportant” societally, too. DW: this will go into PA's period as president. RJ: in all of this discussion, pressure will be on all faculty: do we continue in our current model? Do we do everything we can to increase enrollment? That will have repercussions – there are talks about increasing class sizes, etc. CI: that's already happening in our department. DW: any faculty member can come to the Executive Committee if that they are being forced to teach an inappropriate number of students for a particular class &/or facility, if too large an enrollment in a class makes it impossible for them to achieve the course's pedagogical goals. SP: do we (Executive Committee) need to meet more frequently so we can get through our agendas? DW: maybe, at least temporarily. SP: will we accomplish anything by meeting just once per month? GB: maybe we need to impose time limits on agenda issues and deal with some issues by e-mail. DW: if we do this, PLEASE cc everyone...! RJ: my item on agenda (item (9), below): I'll send it to everyone by e-mail for feedback. TM: you could forward Pat Allen's letter (item (11), below). MM: could we meet one evening per month? Many: (doesn't seem likely.) TM & DW: we will table the dues issue until we talk to Donna & Pam. RJ: will there be a lunch, full Senate meeting next week? DW: we'll have the general meeting, but NO lunch – I'll send out note informing faculty of this, and we'll do an internal Executive Committee poll for agenda items.

- (4) Should we ask Donna to forgive our indebtedness from last year? (Paul) – [see above \(item \(3\)\)](#).
- (5) Video recording of full Senate meetings & post tapes/digital files in the library and on a web site (General) – [because some people teaching and can't come to Senate meetings](#). DW: I suggest files in library and on web. TM: maybe just minutes on web that can be read. (General agreement). GB: moves to post minutes. Rex Frisbey is web manager (in library).
- (6) Letter to Pam regarding policy revisions & faculty involvement throughout the process (Dennis) – [no discussion](#).
- (7) Letter to be sent to all RTP Chairs asking that everyone meet to agree on & publish specific criteria for RTP decisions (Dennis and Ed) – [no discussion](#).
- (8) Any comments on Orientation Week survey results? – [no discussion](#).

- (9) Document/memo of understanding outlining hiring committees & who populates them as well as conditions and procedures (Randy Jasmine) – will e-mail this to Executive Committee for comment
- (10) Review draft of April 2009 Employment Categories Personnel Definitions (General) – no discussion
- (11) Share Pat Allen's e-mail (Dennis) – DW will send to Executive Committee by e-mail (see item (3), above).
- (12) Hand out accreditation document; everyone review and insert changes/comments before 9/30/2009 (Dennis) – handed out. RJ: we do not have a model of governance. GB: when I talked to Donna when I was hired here, Faculty Senate structure was said to be different than at Weber; my sense is that they're waiting for Senate to step up & take governance role. DW: I'm asking Executive Committee to give input on NWCCU draft – comment on anything about Dixie, any adjustments that need to be made so that DSC isn't put in awkward/bad positions, etc. Need comments before next meeting date (two weeks from today) because NWCCU making decisions by Oct. 1!
- (13) Reports from Academic & College Councils – no discussion.