

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 20, 2011

---

*In attendance:*

*Paul Abegg (PA)*

*Brad Barry (BB)*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*Gary Cooper (GC)*

*Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Jie Liu (JL)*

*Munir Mahmud (MM)*

*Dennis Wignall (DW)*

DW: The key thing on the table today is the terminal degree policy that BB has been working on; also, I'm distributing this Active Shooter thing (handout) — please review it before I post it to the faculty & adjunct e-mail lists. The idea is that this isn't a document meant to frighten anyone but it's information on what to do.

MM: In Utah, students can conceal weapons.

DW: If something like this happens in a classroom, the Gardner Center, etc., faculty will have some info on how to respond because students will look to faculty on how to respond. My hope is we never need it.

GC: Should we get input from Don Reid?

DW: I've put this past him and he likes it. I also gave it to the trustees and they were positive about it. So I'm just passing it by you to see if there's any hesitation about sharing it with colleagues. By and large, you can't predict where you might bump into a sociopath. Don has indicated in past presentations that he doesn't think there's a class on campus in which at least one person (student, faculty, etc.) isn't armed and certified to carry. That's not a statement of security, though — anyone rational knows this, but the people that become shooters aren't rational. The last page in the document is a wallet-sized version. Anyway, back to BB's document.

PA: Can we identify the meeting schedule for this semester?

DW: Yes. JH corrected this with Martin Peterson. We (FSEC) meet on the first and third Thursdays of each month, and the general meeting is on the fourth Thursday. This way the FSEC can deal immediately with any issues brought up at the general meeting. So this month, the general meeting is on the 27<sup>th</sup>. March 24<sup>th</sup> will be the election for a new Senate President-Elect; PA will take over as President.

PA: Along those lines, I'd request that we put feelers out to identify potential candidates. I don't think we made the change in policy to decide if these candidates can come from outside the FSEC.

DW: I'm going to do a vote on SurveyMonkey on BB's policy, and one on dues increase; then have a vote for whether or not service as Senate President should be a two-year term.

BB: Can we choose candidates beyond those in the FSEC?

DW: That's something else we need to decide, so I'll put that in the survey, too.

BB: So this committee is in favor of that?

DW: We'll find out.

PA: That was our sense. If you know anyone interested, please let me know so I can have a list and a ballot for March 24.

DW: The rationale for having the choice be from the Faculty in general is because of the six-year commitment — anyone coming in may not have FSEC experience but would have two years as President-Elect. I'd be more hesitant to go straight to President because there wouldn't be any transition time. Let's go through these with the members present. In terms of having a dues increase, is the majority in favor...?

MM: In Business, we want food.

PA: What kind of increase?

DW: From \$2 to \$4 per paycheck.

PA: If we add food, we talked about paying up to \$5 for food rather than leaving it open-ended.

DW: Next week, that's what we'll do for the general meeting as a trial and see what kinds of charges we incur. I just would hate to deplete our budget just for lunches.

PA: That seems to be a happy medium.

MM: I like not letting people stack food up.

DW: I don't like that there are people that don't participate and just show up for food. We have to have some way of policing for that.

JC: If there's a list of people that pay dues, they can get vouchers.

PA: I think it's set up with their swipe card.

DW: And the two-year service — in favor?

PA: We need to consider this personally — would we do it if it's a six-year commitment?

DW: Fundamentally, what I'm asking for is to *pose* it as a vote, conceptually. I'll write up a paragraph to precede the vote to make sure people know what they're voting on.

MM: Next year, someone else has to be selected from Business; when should we look for replacements?

DW: The vote has always been around April 1 in the past, so there's a month of service before summer.

MM: But the general membership is not extended more than two years...?

PA: It can be.

MM: This is my third year, but generally Senators serve for two years...?

DW: Yes, and reappointment is possible, too. One thing we have to address in FSEC is that this body will get larger as the school adds more programs & departments, and everyone should be represented. So the population of this committee will increase by 3-5 members — PA will have to monitor this closely. It's the motivated people that are here that make changes, and that needs to represent all departments equally. Another thing I'd like to do is: I'm still interested in the Faculty Association concept, separate from the Senate & FSEC — it looks like it would be growing the bureaucracy, but we *are* getting bigger. This would help with equal representation. If "Senator" equals "representation," then having everyone be a Senator makes no sense. Other schools have Faculty Associations with union affiliation, but we don't have to have that — we just need the Association and from *there* the Senators are selected, and from *those* the FSEC is chosen. ...OK, let's talk about the terminal degree policy: I floated this past three people in our department that this affects, and they had no problems with it. This helped clarify some of their issues, too, so that's a few general faculty votes. I think we do need to address in it an objective criterion for what defines "professional experience" — in the arts, is it a portfolio? A candidate or faculty member doesn't need a MFA? For example, Eric Young in digital film spent 15 years in the field, but does that mean he swept floors?

MM: That's too big a task — shouldn't it be a department-level decision?

DH: Yes, I agree.

MM: We want to give them leverage in who they hire.

DW: That's workable to me — it reduces complexity in the policy.

BB: That'd be each department addressing what's on p. 3.

DW: Well, we'd have to put a statement on here that each department is required to support documentation of how they define "professional experience" for that department. Just add a box to the existing set.

BB: Well, we have "background" and "experience" on it already...

DW: OK, maybe just add a statement that says that it's departmental. It currently doesn't read as if a department is *required* to submit something.

MM: I think having three people decide is enough – it shouldn't be more complicated.

DW: Maybe it doesn't need to be in here.

DH: Does this open us to challenge if someone is voted as *not* qualified and administration says "Where's your documentation of how you arrived at that decision?" We just need a statement that says departments are responsible for creating policy on what they consider to be appropriate qualification to teach upper level class.

DW: That's kind of in here...is someone with Masters teaching digital film; there is a Ph.D. in that field, but that doesn't include a professional experience criterion. All I'm asking for is that departments will define what is acceptable.

BB: I think p. 3 does this.

GW: There has to be something that makes it not look arbitrary.

BB: What if on the final criterion we say "...attach sample documents to this form"? Would that solve it? We just need to be careful of not complicating it.

DW: I agree, but if we leave a loophole, administration can say that they weren't given sufficient guidelines to assess a decision.

GC: I like the suggestion of making departments define their criteria in writing. In Science, we don't perceive experience as that valuable without a degree. We're OK with documenting this in other departments, though, because of the general need on campus.

PA: Is there anything on campus that defines what a terminal degree is?

DW: I think so — it's a matter of agreement with certain standards, like a nursing certification. That's a criterion across academia.

PA: Does HR have that?

DW: Yes, maybe it's from an accrediting agency; I don't know.

PA: Is there somewhere to which our administration refers for each field?

BB: In past committee meetings, Donna has called the dean to have a discussion, so my understanding is that it's a phone call, not a document. It's been a bit loose in that sense. Does this document in any way alleviate administration from hiring more full-time people? If so, then we have a problem.

DW: Yes, accrediting agencies look at part time:full time ratios. This may leave it a bit open-ended in some areas for administration to hire or direct a department to hire adjuncts...

MM: And full-time people without degree.

DW: There might be a caveat in here that if there are qualified Ph.D. individuals, rather than non-terminal degreed individuals, that the Ph.D. is considered first – I'm not comfortable with that language, but something like that.

DH: BB has good point.

MM: It is harder to get people with higher degrees because of issues about higher salaries.

DW: Administration may decide to hire someone without a higher degree, but it comes back to faculty whether or not *they* think the person can teach upper-level courses.

PA: Well, this is two different things: a committee recommends, but the administration opens the position.

BB: This document only covers already-hired people.

DW: True – maybe we need to put in a statement at the beginning of the document that specifies that this policy is *only* for people hired prior to us becoming a four-year institution. And another

subparagraph that this is *not* intended to *hire* new people without terminal degrees. The policy would be OK to deal with who we have, but not new folks.

MM: In marketing, we're not even getting applicants, so appointments have to be made. We don't even have enough adjuncts to cover lower-level classes.

DW: Then the department needs to go to HR and pressure them to hire someone. If you say you can't have classes because there are not enough people, that's good pressure.

MM: If you open it up to people with only certain levels of qualification, it becomes a problem later on.

DW: I don't see this as a reason to plug people where they don't belong, though.

MM: What if the person was hired last year?

DW: This policy wasn't in force then, so they're covered by this if we put in those caveats.

MM: We have a faculty member that used to be tenured elsewhere — he's doing a good job; what do we do with him?

DW: You take the department chair and that individual and sit down with Donna to negotiate something as an individual case. If she supports it, then that's final. This isn't an in-house promotion thing; it's an equal-employment opportunity for new people, and you might find someone more qualified. This is to put the best faculty in a department to teach students.

MM: Once existing faculty have gone through this process, do they have to do this every semester?

BB: No, just once for each course that they might teach.

DW: Where we'd get into a situation is when someone who has experience but not a degree could also do it, it becomes department shuffling thing: a department has to be able to defend any appointment of non-terminal-degree faculty in any content area.

MM: Even if you have a person with a terminal degree, that person still has to be *available* to teach a particular class.

DW: That's an internal logistics issue.

MM: But this policy won't stop them from doing that — it says "available and qualified."

DW: That's a chair's problem and issue.

MM: This wording is a good thing, it gives them leverage.

BB: So two changes, then: (1) the issue of a chair hiring someone just days before a class starts in an emergency situation — so this doesn't apply to adjuncts; and (2) adding a statement about the policy not applying to new hires after a certain date.

DW: Maybe rather than date, say "...people hired before this policy going into effect."

JC: So this may not start until April.

DW: This thing has to leave us, go to College Council, then Academic Council, then the Trustees — to get this enforced for next Fall, we have to move this fast. If it hits a log-jam along the way, it may not happen by Fall.

BB: I'll make changes and send it out, and then DW will own it.

DW: In other words, I'll take arrows from whomever has issues with it.

BB: Well, at least the master copy would be in your hands in terms of phrasing changes.

DW: OK, good! So what will happen at General Faculty meeting next week?

GC: Can I bring something up? Kelly Bringhurst just successfully defended his Ph.D. (Congratulations all around.)

PA: Did we come to a resolution on post-tenure review?

DW: Ah, good — we need to talk about that. It's becoming kind of an exercise in redundancy at this point, so I'll include that in the SurveyMonkey vote, too. Post-tenure review is, at virtually all schools, a very detailed, thick policy. At research universities, there are more criteria than we need here. It's an instrument to identify any weakness in tenured faculty. Faculty (a department) makes recommendations to address that, then Faculty Development provides funds to implement the

recommendation, then the faculty re-evaluate the person to make sure the changes have implemented. It's faculty assisting faculty.

PA: Essentially a peer review.

DW: Yes, a complex one — closely tied to Faculty Excellence and Faculty Development. Arguably, I'll be fielding from administration that they'd prefer to have a lever to get themselves *out* of post-tenure review. So if there's a tenured professor that they want to get rid of, they can get out of the process. This policy does not change or augment existing policy about that; it only provides a means of getting a professor to change. I hope to have something done by the middle of next month to float around. One more announcement: Martha Talman has been working on policy-writing, but in Academic Council the other day, there is a curriculum committee that is populated with deans & chairs. Martha is part of this, and what it is is a shared decision-making body. Daphne Selbert has been heading it up. So Martha will look at the nuts and bolts and mechanics of curriculum proposals. Too many curriculum decisions were being made by one person; this shares decisions over a larger body of people so more disciplines are involved and compared to ensure that there is no duplication. This takes some pressure off Martha, but it will affect how things work from now on.

PA: Don't forget that next week, the General Faculty meeting is in the Gardner Center.