

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Jan. 19, 2012

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Ami Comeford (AC)

Rob Cowan (RC)

John Goldhardt (JG)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JiL)

Russ Ross (RR)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Kyle Wells (KW)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

PA: Did everyone get the meeting schedule for the semester? I sent it out the first week.

BSC: I thought I saw a meeting scheduled in May after commencement...?

JC: And one during Spring Break...?

PA: No, neither of those—I just wanted to make sure I got everything. Next week we'll have a general meeting in the Cottam room and have Shannon McBride to talk about grants. We're meeting today because during the first week of the month, school wasn't in session. I'll try and send reminders about our meetings each week, but please program the schedule into your schedules.

MS: Will you send out a general e-mail to tell faculty she'll be at the gen mtg.?

PA: Yes, I'll do that. Thanks to all those that sent input about new representatives—I just need to hear from one more person to know what areas need representatives. I was looking at the Constitution and By-laws, and they say that there should be a vote by this body on incoming candidates. There wasn't a lot of information; we just have to be in agreement. The only requirement that incoming representatives have to have is that they're dues-paying members of the Faculty Senate. They can be made available during this meeting.

JC: If no one else wants to do it, can you renew?

PA: For a second term, yes. RC, BB, and MS: you'd agreed to look at what to adjust in the Constitution and By-laws...? Are there specific things we can target? I know one was candidacy for becoming an FSEC member, and BB addressed that. In my most recent review of those documents, I noticed that the list of departments isn't up to date, but that should be easy to do. I'm hoping that, before we get to March, we'll have something to review as a body and that we can agree on. It's an evolving document that will probably never be completely updated, but I want to get it to the century we're in now. So toward the end of the February meetings, if you could have some recommendations... Today's topic is the degree-equivalency issue. We're using USU's as a model. What I'm looking for are what are *our* concerns, what in it do we like, etc.? Our job isn't to get into the nitty-gritty of word placement, etc., but rather concepts we want to see in it and the direction it goes into, etc. The other item I have is: I got an e-mail from Christina Schultz of DocUtah, and they want to involve the academic side of the college. Some areas will be more conducive than others. For example, last year there was a conducting competition in Germany on which someone did a documentary—the filmmaker did a history/logistics story, and it was applicable to Music students. She has a list of films going into the Fall that you can browse. I expressed the concern last year that the directors came into classes during the day and were trying to get the classes to cancel and move to the event, which is inappropriate. Some of the events were going all day, which is problematic; evening events would be better. If there's a topic in a DocUtah film that applies to an individual class or department, we should mention it to students and encourage them to go—give them additional credit, etc. If you could give that information to your departments, that'd be great.

DH: We have a collection of all the films here in the library, but they're housed in Special Collections, so you'd need to make special arrangements to use them because of the performance rights or lack thereof.

RR: Even for classroom use?

DH: That depends on what the filmmaker suggested. The first year of DocUtah was the most problematic because the DocUtah group didn't have the filmmakers sign any releases, so we had to contact them. The second year was much better, and we know what rights we have with each film, and that's in the on-line catalog.

AC: The DocUtah committee is working to ensure that that's not a problem in the future and fix the legalities that go along with submitting films.

DH: The idea is that they *can* be used for education.

PA: Being in Special Collections, do they stay in the building?

DH: No, they just can't be checked out by students. But I'm not sure for faculty.

PA: They make an effort to get films to faculty and see if they'll be useful for faculty, and they'll contact specific faculty as appropriate.

AC: As soon as films are selected, they're posted on-line and you can see what's relevant. Most are very short, so students can just show their ID to get in and see loops of short films.

PA: OK, the next item: DW, when he was FSEC President, signed us up for SurveyMonkey—he used that several times but paid for it out of his own pocket, and he's been asked to be reimbursed for \$717.60 from Faculty Senate. Are there concerns about doing that?

JC: Isn't that a big part of the budget?

PA: Yes.

DH: Were we consulted about that? (Many nos.)

PA: Would it be appropriate to reimburse him partially?

JH: I'll check the past minutes to see what was said when he signed up initially and let PA know.

JC: Let's wait and see before deciding that.

RR: I think it's a monthly fee.

PA: It is, like \$89.70/2 months.

RR: Surveys could be done through Google Docs for free.

DH: There are other services that do the same thing, like Doodle.

PA: Three-and-a-half other items I have: along lines of representatives, we need candidates for President-Elect. In my discussions, I've talked with many people to see if there's interest, but we need to have an election at the end of March so the transition happens in May. So talk to your departments to see if there's interest. Last year there was significant response, so I think we'll have some interest. And please send the information to me.

MS: The only criterion is that the person has to be full time?

PA: And dues-paying, but the person doesn't have to come just from the FSEC. Also, I wanted to follow up on our talking about sending messages to retiring faculty. DH did some research...

DH: I have most of it. I spoke with Marilyn Lamoreaux, and she told me that every person, faculty or staff, that retires from the college gets a plaque; particular faculty are invited to sit on the commencement stage for that year. There's no one-year waiting period to be eligible for Emeritus status; that can be done right away. When you see the receptions announced via e-mail for retiring people, those are usually done by their departments, not anything college-wide. Her suggestion was that we have some sort of a letter or something we give to the retiring faculty, recognizing their service and expressing our appreciation. If there was a gift, we'd have to make sure we've discussed that with the department from which the person is retiring so we don't duplicate anything. The recognition, though, would be really meaningful to the retiree. I also sent a get-well card to Martha Talman for surgeries she's had in the last few weeks.

PA: But that shouldn't be out of your personal budget; we should pay for that. We should have a small budget for that, like \$25/yr. Any other thoughts on recognition for retiring faculty?

BSC: We could make a contribution to the gift that the department is giving and include a letter.

DH: But it depends on *if* the department is giving one—it's variable. Departments are likely to give something more substantial to someone that's been here 20 years than the minimum, which is 6 or 9 or something like that.

BSC: What about contributing a bouquet of flowers with the letter?

DH: Something would be nice.

PA: Does that sound appropriate? Are we all in favor of that if we're in the black? (All ayes.)

BSC: We'd need to draft a letter...

DH: I'll work on that and send it just to us for editing, suggestions, wording, etc.

PA: Any sense of how many people are retiring this year?

DH: No, but it's usually not a large number, like 3–4; last year I think it was 1–2.

PA: OK, thank you DH. Let's talk about the model we're reviewing for degree equivalency. I've looked over the USU model and it seems like it would fit us, with a few exceptions. Could we recommend that to administration?

KW: My only comment was that it should be simplified—cutting a few things and condensing some of the other areas...the list of different designations seemed overly long! But I like the direction it takes.

DH: I thought the first page, with the ranks of technical education, etc....we might want to consider condensing them—they're too wordy. But it's a needed concept.

PA: Great!

BB: It doesn't seem we have language in there to address possible abuses of the system. Should there be language there to discourage people from avoiding a national search in order to hire a friend?

PA: I think that's covered by another policy—whether it's enforced is another matter. It came up in College Council last year.

BB: So it assumes that an attempt has been made for a traditional search?

PA: A national search, yes.

AC: It wouldn't hurt to include a line or two here, even if it just references the other policy—that says that “this person is part of the regular search process, not someone hand-picked by the department.”

PA: I think the EOE policy covers it, but yes, we can mention it.

RC: With the categories—what about someone that does more than one thing? Like lecture *and* research?

JC: Well, that's there because USU is a research institution.

RC: But science undergraduates need to do research, so, for example, Biology could *use* someone to do that just does research.

JC: No, we need the *professors* to do the research and be compensated fairly for that time. But this policy labels someone that *just* does research, like a post-doc.

PA: It would depend on an individual's role statement, too. As we look at policies and protocol, we need to address the rule and then handle exceptions later; if we try to hit every possibility, it would be insurmountable.

RC: Eventually, faculty will have lecture and research percentages.

PA: But this is just a starting point that we can adapt as needed later. Any other concerns? (No.) I wanted to take a moment here: AC sent out a list of policies that are on the radar as far as HR is concerned. To see them, go on the college's web site, go to Faculty and Staff link, then the Policies & Procedures link, and then Policies Under Review. Some of these are on the list AC sent out, but I'm not sure all of them are. The one on the site that we spent time on (post-tenure review) doesn't reflect any of our changes. They're also creating a policy policy—I'd like to address that process. Last year, we talked to Donna about a proposal, but I'm not sure the whole isn't on the same page. Generally, HR is the starting point for any policy; we're proposing that once they have that first step, they consult with us (FSEC) and we make recommendations before giving it back. Then they tweak it before sending it out to the whole campus. If we put all the time in on all policies that we did on PTR, we'd never get anything else done! But we'd need to discuss concepts, not things like wording, etc. If we have our input *before* it goes to the general population, we have a significant role in the process without stalling it. We're working with Donna to ensure we're all on the same page. In the meantime, the one policy that's up that most directly affects us is the one on Faculty Termination. Our only avenue now for input is through this link—there's an e-mail link there for comments that go to Pam Montrallo. Martha works with her, but Pam's in charge of this. So I'd encourage us to use this venue while we work on streamlining this process. It may not happen this semester, but it's worth trying to get a system in place because there will be more policies up for revision and creation, and I don't think having all individuals respond to HR is efficient. DW, you worked on the faculty workload policy; anyone that thinks they should be compensated at a percentage of their rates should give their input.

JC: So the workload one—the web site said it was approved...? Are they not revising it anymore?

PA: It's being approved next week, so no, it's not up for revision now.

DW: I think it's past that point now, but something we have to keep in mind is that the old policy isn't chiseled in stone.

PA: So there's room, but I'm trying to remember if it's in section 3-10 or 3-18.

AC: There's a separate one for faculty compensation.

DH: ...and one for staff compensation.

PA: OK. The last item: I wanted to continue the discussion on the library security issue in the new building. As I hear the President and Vice-President say that they're OK with losing books, I think it's deeper than that. I know of a private violin teacher that taught here, and he has students in every performing group in this area. I've talked with his widow about donating his library to ours to make it available to our community so that a wide audience could

benefit from his resources. But I don't want the responsibility of bringing it here if it could be lost. So anyone donating anything to the library will want to be assured that their donation will be protected, and that no one can just wander in and take it off the shelves. President Nadauld said collections like that would be behind locked doors, but I don't think they are accounting for everything.

JC: It's more than that—that they say they are *aware* of security issues, but that means that as soon as someone gets raped, etc., we'll lose the whole college!

DH: JH and I have not yet met with Don, but I did meet with Daphne and got updated on some of the security concerns. It sounds at present—and this is presently just second-hand information—as if they are hiring a security guard full-time for that building, working for Don Reid. But it doesn't sound like that person would carry a sidearm. Obviously, no one has yet seen the funding for that, but it is being discussed. As far as the safety of the collection: we've requested the staff elevator to be secure so that students can't ride down and go out the back door without going through a gate. The faculty and staff that work in the building could have a key, card, etc. for that elevator, but if you didn't have it, you could only go from floors 2–4, not 1–5. I'm not sure that's been approved, but it's been requested, and not just by the library: the business office obviously doesn't want students walking through their back halls where they carry private info, and IT won't want unauthorized people wandering around their servers, etc. This is just the rear, service elevator. There is a gate at the second floor, and in order for students to leave the building, there's also a gate on the first floor, so all the ways for them to get out via the elevators, etc. are inside that gate. It hasn't been resolved as to the level of security that will be provided to the collection when the library is closed and there's a function in the Zion room. This wasn't addressed in our most recent discussion, but the last time we discussed it, the comment that was relayed to us by administration was that the library would just be open—what if someone wanted to look at the library while they're there? So there's an element of concern there, and I'm curious how IT feels about the thousands of dollars of equipment they'll have in the Commons area being accessible to people just wandering around after hours. We haven't come to a conclusion about security of areas people shouldn't have access to when the library is closed. That won't be a lot of hours—we're open 'til midnight weekdays and are open at 7:30...at least, that's how it's intended.

PA: So, to finish up this meeting—we can give you some time next time if you can get more specific info. What I need from this body: is this concern shared? Their intent is to create a welcome, open environment for the community, so they want accessibility and lack of confinement, which is a good thing. This will be the biggest building on campus and one of the biggest in St. George, but if there are shared concerns among faculty across campus, I want to convey that to administration.

JC: By "gate," you mean the things that set off alarms?

DH: There are cameras, but there are serious, acknowledged blind spot. The camera feed is up on the computers in the security office, so they can look at it after the fact; there just aren't enough security staff for them to monitor anything in real time. That doesn't help a girl in a dark hallway with no camera coverage.

JC: Will the new guard monitor those screens?

DH: Possibly.

PA: Elsewhere they do something like that—have the night guard at a desk and facing screens that are fed by the cameras.

DH: He'd also do a sweep of the building at closing time, which we are currently responsible for doing.

DW: It seems like this should also be of concern to the Staff Association. Also, will we have historical documents?

DH: Locked up.

DW: Then holdings like music, too, should arguably also be locked up like that.

DH: We will have some glass cases that will house videos and some other expensive stuff, and it could definitely be argued that a collection of that nature should be secured in a similar environment.

PA: The challenge is for it to be useable but secure.

DH: Well, we have a locked glass case now that holds videos and DVDs that people can browse through, and they can also browse online.

DW: But how do you browse something that's visible but not accessible?

DH: Many large institutions have closed stacks accessible only to people doing research; either a librarian would pull material from there for the researchers or there would be special access granted to certain people.

DW: Do we have that here?

DH: No, but we haven't needed it yet. Things in Special Collections can't leave the Special Collections reading room.

DW: So there are potentially places in the Commons and the new library where a music library *could* be put to have security.

DH: Sure; we'd just have to construct that.

PA: We have the general meeting next week and Shannon McBride; we'll meet again the week after that.