

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Sept. 20, 2012

---

*In attendance:*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*Ami Comeford (AC)*

*Robert Carlson (RCa)*

*Rob Cowan (RCo)*

*John Goldhardt (JG)*

*Jerry Harris (secretary)*

*Lish Harris (LH)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Scott Lindsey (SL)*

*Del Parsons (DP)*

*Matt Smith-Lahrman (MSL)*

*Betty Stokes (BS)*

*Rick Rodrick (RiR)*

*Russ Ross (RuR)*

AC: OK, let's get started—we have enough people here to conduct business. I want to make, if it's OK, a quick change to the agenda I sent out and put the building emergency issue first because that's a quick issue to cover. This one is simple: this issue came up from some faculty members after Don Reid's emergency preparedness talk that it might be helpful to have someone come and talk to each department about evacuation plans for their respective buildings. So please go back and talk to your departments to see if they're interested in that. I had a short conversation with Frank Lojko informally about this, and he indicated that he'd be in favor of having this happen, and so we should be able to arrange it.

SL: Who's in charge of that?

AC: Sherry Ruesch, I think.

MSL: This needs to go through the Faculty Senate?

AC: No, but it might be useful to know what a consensus is among faculty around campus so they can plan and arrange something. It's just a way for us to disseminate the ideas. OK, next: the Policy Subcommittee feedback vote. I talked to Donna about this, and she's perfectly open to having this committee every year as a regular committee assignment. Those that volunteered will pilot this and see how it works; if the Faculty Senate wants to keep it as a standing committee, they can, and the current volunteer members can write up a charter.

MSL: What about this year—does this count toward our committee assignment load?

AC: It would be an additional assignment for those volunteers. It's unlikely at this point that people can be reassigned to replace you on a committee you'd leave to be on this one.

SL: I'm confused...so this was going to be under Faculty Senate, but now it will be an institutional committee? Wasn't one of its purposes to interface with the Faculty Senate?

AC: If we write its charter, we can decide who will be on it and how to fill it. We can say, for example, that it needs to have 5–7 members, half of which are from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, if we want. Did anyone get feedback from their departments on this?

MSL: No one responded to my email about it...

RCo: I had a volunteer to serve on one of the committees!

AC: Has anyone received any feedback or concerns?

SL: I got from my department that if the intent of having the committee is to shorten the process and streamline it, that it will actually be the addition of another step(s)—we need to ensure that having this committee won't prolong the process.

RCa: The advantage we have is that this committee will facilitate *earlier starting* in the process, and hopefully that will compensate for any additional time it takes for a policy to go through the committee.

MSL: I'm not sure that shortening is a part of the intent behind forming the committee—just getting faculty involved earlier.

RCa: Yes...now we can say "hold on" before it goes public if we need to.

SL: Another concern I heard was that sometimes policies are created with really close deadlines—is this committee going to obviate those kinds of situations?

AC: It should because we'll be aware of what's coming very early. With those kinds of policies, the problem was that we just didn't know they were happening until the final stages, just before they would go to Academic Council. But Paul (Abegg) worked hard to get a system in place where it comes to us first—this subcommittee gets us one step even further ahead of that, to a point where we can also bring *up* policies we want to see addressed. So what MSL said is true—sometimes, it might lengthen the process, but it gives us a voice, which we need.

SL: One more thing: I had a request from my department that in new or revised policies, if there could be a standing section indicating the origin of the policy—what was impetus for the policy or its revision. Was it from administration? faculty? the community?, the Board of Trustees?, etc. They want to see that.

AC: We can certainly bring that up, and that's an excellent point.

RCa: For complex policies, there won't be a single source, though.

BS: In Nursing, and Health Care, you develop policies and reference policies/procedures with citations of sources, and those policies are reviewed on an annual basis because health care moves so fast that sources can be outdated in a few years.

RCa: Providing sources will be easy because Martha researches what other campuses do.

BS: But we need to cite those sources.

RCa: When she borrows heavily from a source, she indicates that.

BS: I'm just saying in addition to the origin thing.

RuR: This would be useful to help determine when a policy should be reviewed and changed. I know we've had some that were noticeably out of date.

BS: So when you were talking about setting up this committee, you mentioned that Martha is writing these and has a "to-do" list, and we'd get access to that so we see what's coming. I believe she's been doing that...?

AC: Yes, and that's an important part of this process. One thing that's been good in the last few months is that this door is now open to us to get information, and administration can see that we're motivated and interested in participating in this process. We need to establish ourselves as a strong voice while that door is open.

RCa: It's partly building credibility, that we're going to be proactive.

BS: But you discussed before that one of the purposes of the Policy Committee would be to do reviews and summaries of proposed policies and send those to faculty so they know the pertinent points and can comment on them without having to read through long documents.

DH: Yes, but *with* the proposed policies. Most faculty don't have time to nit-pick important details out of a longer policy...sometimes, it's just a matter of noting specific language that creates particular implications. The summaries will help the focus on the significant things.

RCo: So some people read it in detail, and others just gloss over it.

AC: Are we ready to move forward on this?

MSL: Are members of the committee volunteers or assigned?

AC: Well, for the ones that come out of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we can make that determination in the charter. Right now, we just need to say that this new committee is what we want to do, and then work on the charter before it goes into effect in April.

JC: I'll move.

XX: Second. (Vote: all ayes; no nays or abstentions.)

AC: OK, a Board of Trustees update: RCa and I went to their meeting, and the only faculty issue that came up is the smoke-free campus initiative. The students asked the Board of Trustees for permissions to go forward with this issue that they have been pursuing, and they'll be conducting cessation classes and talking to other students and gathering information, meaning that they're starting to implement some aspects of it and starting the classes.

MSL: Where is this coming from?

AC: Student government.

SL: This is a big departure from last Spring...!

AC: And we need to have a discussion about that. Student government is making this an important part of their plan.

RCa: What is the formal process for this becoming policy?

AC: They're starting with what President Nadauld is calling an "initiative," and proceeding with continued research and classes for students, and at some point, they'll propose it becomes a policy. But that will have to go through the normal process.

Commented [JDH1]: I didn't catch who seconded this...? Sorry!

SL: That we're a smoke-free campus or that people have to take the cessation classes?

AC: The smoke-free thing.

RCa: On the student side, Del Beatty sent me list of considerations that student government went through, and they did consider expensive "smoking huts," but not other possible solutions, such as increasing mandatory distances from buildings, etc.

DH: You said that they're going to continue their research...about student opinion? Who's supervising this?

AC: Del Beatty—he's over student government, so he's their advisor. They're going to look at what other schools are doing and what are campus trends.

DH: Are they polling our students?

AC: Yes, they did that last year.

RCa: But it wasn't very methodological.

DH: And that's why I'm concerned—how trustworthy will their results be? They're working from the wrong direction—they're starting from what they *want* to see happen and therefore risk interpreting the results of their polls in the ways that will be most beneficial to their initiative. They may not be drawing their conclusions and establishing their directions based on what the students actually want.

MSL: How are they planning on enforcing it? Don Reid is bound by state law, and state law allows smoking on campuses more than 25 ft. from buildings...!

DH: I spoke to Ron Isaacson (Assistant Director of Security and Campus Police) and asked what will happen if they banned it—how could it be enforced? He said the only thing it will do is give them a reason to approach people smoking on campus and ask them to stop. If they refuse, the police could run their information, but they can't take them to jail or anything...just start a dialog.

MSL: To start harassing people!

RCa: There is some antagonism between administration and campus police, and this would have some interesting results. There are some legitimate issues—some people do have respiratory issues, and smoke does get into the vents.

DH: Smokers outside my window makes my office smell like smoke.

RCa: For people that get asthma attacks from smoke, it's a legitimate concern, but I don't think student government has effectively looked at this.

JC: Can they even smoke on a balcony of a building?

DH: I don't know—the law is just 25 ft. from an entrance/exit...but it doesn't say anything about vents into buildings.

AC: Here's what I'd like to do: everyone take this back to your respective departments and tell them that the students are going forward with this steadily, and the Board of Trustees has given permission for them to do so as an initiative. If we can get a list of faculty concerns, we can talk more about them and send them on to student government.

SL: Are students providing us with an executive summary of the initiative?

AC: I haven't seen anything. Once we have our list of concerns, we can send them to Del Beatty and say "This is what we want to see considered and addressed," and maybe have them address us directly about them.

RCa: I recommend that we also not engage in a biased perspective.

RiR: If there's some thoughtfulness in this...they're not saying that they want to bring a hammer down on anyone; just encourage people to stop smoking.

RCa: Plenty of campuses in the state are smoke-free.

RiR: It's a conservative position to just protect entrances/exits—many states have gone much further. It seems like there's a subtext about this that is a religious argument in disguise.

RCa: Well, I'm not sure about that...I believe the students when they say that they're pursuing this because it's a health issue.

AC: I haven't seen their research, but they are reporting over 700 campuses across the US that are smoke and/or tobacco free. So I think it's important to share our concerns, and help them with their research.

LH: Is the Taylor Building smoke free?

BS: No, just the hospital.

AC: When you have a list of concerns from your department, please put them in a succinct list so we can combine/merge them from all the departments into a single list that can be dealt with effectively.

SL: Not to prolong this issue, but if I go to my faculty and say this...they're going to say that this is so ill-defined that why are we dealing with this at all?

RCa: It's not vague—they're saying they want our campus to be smoke free.

DH: It's state law that sets the 25-ft. rule. My question is just for Don Reid and administration about how they can make an initiative or policy for a smoke-free campus jibe with state law so there are teeth in it. If they ban smoking on campus, that's contra state law.

RCa: If someone is breaking campus rules, they can still be escorted off campus. Maybe not arrested or fined, but action can be taken.

AC: I would imagine that when students get further into this, they'll model the policy after ones from other campuses that have already become smoke-free. But defining the parameters is a good point. Maybe we should just say that the students are going forward with a movement to do this and starting the cessation classes, and that faculty and staff can be involved in those if they want. And that students would like to see this become policy. Is everyone OK with that? (Yes.) OK, great...next: Curriculum Committee update. They met yesterday, and a number of course changes and modifications were put forward—you can see those in the minutes from that meeting. But the big issue for us is the question of requiring a syllabus with a new-course proposal: a change will be made so that a new form will be made that will require you to give a general outline of the course, objective achieved, etc.

RCa: ...but much less specific than a syllabus—you don't have to specify a textbook, etc.

AC: This will be a PDF you fill out and send to Martha in lieu of creating a syllabus to keep things streamlined.

RCa: We tried to express our concerns about the syllabus thing to them, and they're trying to find a balance.

AC: It's a good form that they put together.

RCa: We should point out that they're going forward with the Recreation Management program within Integrated Studies—there was nothing about a degree program or being on-line with classes through other schools, but it will be an on-site program taught through Integrated Studies.

DP: What is Curriculum Committee's meeting schedule?

AC: It's the third Tuesday of every month.

DP: What's the deadline to submit issues to it?

AC: I will get that to you, but it's also on [the Curriculum Committee's web site](#). OK, then next: improving communication within departments. I just want ideas here on how to get information to faculty and keep them involved, or learn of strategies you're using that seem to be working.

BS: I've been sending e-mails to all Health Science individual faculty, and I've got mainly responses from Dental Hygiene and Nursing, but not been able to attend other programs' faculty meeting. I haven't been there, but I go to Nursing, and I have a standing component of the agenda to always discuss Faculty Senate issues. But some programs only have 1–2 people.

AC: Are your department chairs willing to similarly give you a few minutes at their meetings?

DP: I don't see my people a lot, so I'd summarize Faculty Senate stuff toward the ends of meetings. Otherwise, I just send items to everyone by e-mail.

RCa: But lots of people see bulk e-mails and delete them.

DP: But if you're chasing people around, and if someone has a concern, you can go to that person. I'm just thinking that an announcement thing is the minimum.

RC: Maybe if it listed their representatives and their contact information in the announcements so people know who to go to...

DP: That would help me!

AC: I think that, in that case, you represent different groups that don't all meet at same time.

BS: When I craft an e-mail about a Faculty Senate Executive Committee issue, I write that it's a Faculty issue in the subject line.

DP: But I understand the issue about people deleting e-mails. But in the general Faculty Senate meetings, maybe we should have starred items that are the Executive Committee issues.

AC: OK, then on that issue: if you do have department meetings, ask your chair for five minutes to talk about issues from here.

RuR: When I e-mail out, I will often say "I'm guessing this is how you'll respond, and if I don't hear anything, I'll assume I'm correct."

AC: That's a good idea.

JC: Next week is the general Faculty Senate meeting?

AC: Yes, and I'll send out the agenda for that.