

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

WORKING MEETING

January 12, 2015

In attendance:

Brent Albrecht (BA)

Clint Buhler (CB)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Alex Chamberlain (AC)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Jim Haendiges (JH)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Matt Morin (MM)

Sandy Peterson (SP)

Helen Saar (HS)

Nate Staheli (NS; President)

Don Warner (DoW)

NS: The primary purpose today—I have an agenda; we’ll wait to approve minutes until the next meeting and we’ll send those out again—the most important thing today is to discuss the schedule for the rest of the semester. When I went to the Doodle poll, it looked like Mondays were best, but Thursdays and Fridays might work for some. Erin has a conflict Mondays from 1-2. So right now, the way it works, Monday at 1 is best for everyone except for Rebecca, Drew, Sam, and Erin. Thursday at noon is the next best except for Rebecca and Don; after that, Friday at 1 is good except for Becca, Sam, and Don. Here’s what may work again: we go Monday and Thursday. Monday at 1 and Thursday at noon, a lunch/working meeting—that way we accommodate everyone. Does Thursday at noon work? I know that may conflict with some people getting ready for classes...

RC: That’s true of any time.

NS: We need Erin, so maybe Thursday wins out.

RC: If you have them at the same time each time, it’s easier to remember.

DoW: If Erin can be there, she can fill in for Biology.

JH: Things creep into the lunchtime hour—taking candidates out, etc., but that’s true for any time.

NS: And we’ll miss some presentations. I’ll entertain a motion...?

CL: I move for Thursdays from 12-1, two meetings per month. (?? seconds.)

CB: Are we doing both the working and the business meetings?

NS: Yes. The motion’s been made and seconded. I guess we should clarify: how about the second and fourth Thursdays?

CL: Spring Break is on a second week.

NS: The first and third Thursdays?

CB: I second that.

NS: All in favor of the first and third Thursdays at noon for our meetings? (All ayes.) Next: General Faculty meetings—when’s best for that? It’s always tough. Should we keep it at lunchtime (noon)? Are you good with that or is there a different suggestion? I don’t know what faculty want.

RC: We should start a movement to free up noons for meetings and things, like it used to be.

CB: My department no longer has noons off...

LJ: The FYE classes are all at noon, too.

CL: Will we be meeting here (for the FSEC meetings)?

NS: Yes. For the General Faculty meetings: typically, they’ve been Monday at noon, on the third Monday.

LJ: The issue we have this time is holidays on the third Mondays during Spring.

NS: How about the fourth Monday? That’d be after we’ve met and could report to faculty. Are Monday’s OK? They seem to be one of the better times.

SP: People anticipate Monday for that; I’d hate to change it.

NS: Do I have a motion for the fourth Monday of each month at noon? (LJ moves; BA seconds.) Approved? (All ayes.)

That’ll give us time before the first meeting; maybe we’ll provide a box lunch or something. Assignments for Rights and Responsibilities: here’s what we have: I’ve sent this to you electronically, too. (Passes packets around). We have two sections for which we’ve promised to get reviews done and back to Martha’s office by January 25. I’ll send this

electronically again, too. There's about eight pages per section. The first is Rights; the second is Responsibilities. All I need today is one person to champion each section. Then we're going to divide the rest of the group into halves for each section.

RC: The first section is really easy because most of it is pulled from other Faculty Rights policies, such as the University of Utah's. The part of part 1 that is really going to be helpful but that's never been implemented is the part on staffing the Advisory Committee. This group play role in which departments get hires, rather than based on arbitrary decisions by someone higher up. The rest is pretty standard. Part 2 is more complicated: Responsibilities includes conflicts of interest, ethical stuff, property rights, and patents and things like that that we have to start anticipating.

CL: So instead of four sections like we had before, we now have two sections...?

NS: Yes, I didn't follow through well enough with the four sections, but I'm glad I didn't because this came out this way, with what we need to do. So we need to divide in half, with half doing part 1 and half doing part 2. Just put a little insight into reviewing it. I want two people from this group to be the lead on each section.

RC: I'll lead one; if someone feels strongly about one section, I'll take the other one.

CL: I'll do section 2.

NS: You just make sure things get done. We also need an ad hoc committee to review a new policy on copyrights and intellectual property. We have the two leads, and we have a couple of other assignments to make, and then we can divide up. So, we've been asked—and this was suggested from our office; Erin and I met with Julie Beck, Gail Smith, and Christina Durham from the Board of Trustees regarding some sort of oversight of policy creation and governance. They wanted to form a group, but I said that they don't want to be involved in the day-to-day activities of the Senate. They have their Policy Review Committee, but I proposed a Policy Steering Committee to liaise between the policy office and the campus stakeholders on changes in policy (reads formal charge of the committee). They need from our group two faculty members from this group to sit on that steering committee. I don't know what time commitment this has. I'd like to recommend JDH for that, if you'll accept.

JDH: Sure.

NS: They'll encourage when policy goes through and reflective of what our constituency wants and what the campus and stakeholders want. I need one more person to volunteer, or I'll appoint.

JH: I'll work with JDH on that.

NS: I'll get those names to Martha. I don't know who else will be on this committee; I assume some administrators. The next thing they're requesting is three faculty members to draft a Copyright and Intellectual Property policy. I don't know what the deadline is on that, and I don't know if it has to be a senator on this body or if it's OK to recommend someone on campus has more experience and insight.

AC: That ends up affecting the Art Department a lot, so I'll be on it.

RC: Someone from computers and business should be on it.

NS: Any problems going outside of this group? I don't.

RC: Anyone from English, for publishing?

IJ: Martha has that background on the publishing and the library end.

CB: What is the policy? I thought it was pretty self-evident that if you write it, it's your book.

RC: But the royalties...if you wrote it as a faculty member, and any of your faculty time went into it, then the university can have some claim on it. That's what has to be talked about.

NS: This is an ad hoc committee.

CB: So if you wrote it using release time...

RC: Not just release time; it's more complicated than that.

NS: This policy will address that.

DoW: Rico (Del Sesto) is writing a patent, so he might be good for that.

NS: I'll suggest those names.

RC: Anyone else from computers, for software and apps?

CL: I'd like Eric Pedersen on that. He'll be the strongest to fight for faculty on that one.

NS: He's not faculty, but that's OK.

RC: That'd be in addition to three faculty they requested.

NS: So we've got those agenda items addressed. Other things to be aware of: we need to be careful and watch and give good feedback on the Faculty Evaluations policy that's coming up. This is where we can address as a body the timing of the student evaluations, supervisor evaluations, etc. Rico's had good suggestions on supervisor evaluations; if you have suggestions, go ahead and let them know; I don't know that you need to bring them here. When that policy comes, we need to be sure our faculty are aware of it and they have contributed to the document when changes can be made. I didn't bring the big long list of policies that Martha's crunching through—Student Accommodations is being held up a little bit, the Workload Policy is also being held up. They're really pushing to get Academic Integrity done—there's a

student initiative on that one dealing with cheating and plagiarism, and it's been held up by legal; I don't know why. We just need to be aware of these.

??: What's the focus of the Student Accommodations one?

RC: I thought we addressed that one recently...?

NS: We did and it sat.

CB: Is that the religion one, with the University of Utah legacy?

NS: Yes. The biggest issue holding that up is the concept of "sincerely held beliefs." It'll resurface in a little bit.

RC: That's a legal term we can't do much about.

NS: Brent Hanson was there and made some really great comments on it.

BA: It sounds like a problem with Academic Freedom, which we can address in section 1 of the Rights and Responsibilities policy!

NS: I'm with you—if we craft this strongly enough, we can control some of these other issues. That's all I want to do today. I haven't seen or heard back from Martha, but our Constitution and By-laws that we discussed was supposed to be voted on on the 5th, but the vote has been pushed to the 12th; it will get done as long as everything goes the way it should, and be fully enacted July 1. I don't see any problems with it. It's really strong. Assignments for the Rights and Responsibilities sections: any volunteers? (Various people volunteer; NS assigns absent senators.) OK, our next meeting will be Thursday the 22nd. That'll give us time to report from your section groups. One more thing, and I'll e-mail you this: we need to contact all of the new faculty within your areas, either face-to-face or over-the-phone sessions with them, to see how they're doing, see about their mentoring, and their experiences at DSU, ask what you can do for them, and report back here. The benefit of this is that we want them to have some association with faculty and be able to express their concerns. Hopefully you have a relationship with them already. Most of this has been met, but this is to make them *continue* to feel comfortable. Most should have mentors—ask them about that. I've got a list of all the new faculty that came to the orientation that I'll send out. Next meeting, I'll devote a few minutes for you to express their concerns, to get a sense of what they're feeling and thinking. Anything else we need to cover? Anything else we can take back to administration that you need? Then just start working on your Rights and Responsibilities sections.

CB: The idea that there's a required final for every class—is that going to be addressed in the future?

RC: That's not in policy, by the way—it's in the faculty handbook. I left it in the current version because I didn't want to burn any bridges, but as far as I know, that's the only place where that requirement exists. We could take it out; I don't see why that's a problem.

NS: The faculty handbook was revamped substantially. We can create what we need to there.

CB: In my department, it seems silly to have a test in many classes, like an upper-division literature course, where a paper makes sense instead of an exam.

CL: For accreditation purposes, they used to need to meet that hour to meet some requirements.

CB: They play fast and loose with those hours...last semester I had a class that had a full week's worth of hours more than another just because of when holidays fall.

RC: I think we should have a rule that every class can be guaranteed to have a certain number of hours scheduled each semester.

MM: In the Communications cohort, we're knocking out a whole semester in, like, 3 weeks, meeting once/week, meeting for a lot of hours.