

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

WORKING MEETING

January 22, 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)

Erin O'Brien (EO; President-Elect)

Helen Saar (HS)

Nate Staheli (NS; President)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

Don Warner (DoW)

Drew Wilcox (DrW)

NS: Let's call the meeting to order, and we'll begin. First of all, any corrections to the minutes from December and January? (None; TF moves to approve; RC seconds.) Any discussion or corrections? No further discussion? All in favor? (All ayes.) A few items—the main portion of what we need to get done today is reports from the subcommittees on the Rights and Responsibilities Policy. But in the meantime, some updates on what's going on on campus and across the state on various campuses. First, Christine Olsen is the chair of the New Employee Committee—this is a formal committee for all employees on campus to make sure new faculty are functioning. She sent an e-mail to Will (Craver) and I requesting funds to help her committee do a social/get-together for new faculty and staff and all employees on campus (reads e-mail). This is similar to what we did early on; it's a great way for the Faculty Senate to empower this New Employee Committee. Any problems if we use some of our Faculty Senate resources to help fund that?

RC: If it's for all employees, she can ask the Staff to pitch in, too.

NS: That's what I thought, too. I told her I thought we could give a portion based on a vote from Faculty Senate for the faculty portion of it. If it's both faculty and staff, she should get money from Will, who e-mailed back and said he might have some funds available. Any objection to using our resources for this?

JH: What's our budget look like right now?

NS: Good question. Any motion or suggestions of amounts to give? I was thinking \$400-500.

EO: Our budget can easily handle that.

NS: Our budget is \$12,000/year, and we've only used about \$3500 of it so far.

RC: I move we authorize no more than \$500 for their social.

NS: Second? (XX seconds.) All in favor? (All ayes). Next: we've been meeting regularly with other Faculty Senate presidencies via Skype about guns on campus. Today, Doug Jackson from Utah State University is presenting to the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) a proposal for a survey to all the campuses in the state. I have a copy of it here, but it's for information only; that's being presented, and if the CAOs approve it...

EO: He builds surveys professionally. Of all the campuses to decide to do this, and have a Faculty Senate President that decides to put one together, this is probably the best-case scenario in terms of designing a good survey.

CL: What is the purpose of the survey?

EO: To figure out what support there might be on USHE campuses to create a legislative option to create safe zones on campuses, *not* to ban guns on campus. This past fall, a scheduled speaker had a death threat made against her, and they wouldn't schedule a space where they could prevent guns from being brought in, so she canceled her appearance. That's perceived as infringing on free speech and honest and open academic discourse. They don't want to move forward on legislation; they want a feel of how people view the current laws and if there's sufficient support for establishing temporary zones that are gun-free—a building or portion of a building where these kinds of threats are an issue.

RC: There's also a question on there about if you've had experiences with guns on campus—if you've seen guns in a classroom, or know of students that have had issues like that, so there are factual questions along with opinion questions.

EO: They also want to know about faculty with conceal-carry permits on campus. They designed it to get at whether or not faculty that are carrying are in favor of this idea—is it a gun vs. no gun thing or is it a free speech thing? The survey separates those out.

CB: Don't they grant exceptions for athletic events? I thought that when the whole thing happened, they talked about the law carved that exception out.

EO: It doesn't say it in the language, but if there's a precedent, this should be a no-brainer.

NS: We're just letting you know that Doug Jackson is presenting a request to the CAOs for authorization for the survey to go out to all faculty on all campuses to inform legislators of our opinions. After that, we can discuss the appropriateness of legislation.

EO: So you know, based on our last communication, (Academic Vice-President) Bill (Christiansen) has said he'll support it if we support it.

DoW: What does campus security say about this?

NS: They'll be asked. Again, we're not being asked to create policy, just gather information per se that might help inform policy later. At that point, security would be asked, along with students, etc. That's the intent of this move, which is supported by the Faculty Senate presidencies.

RC: They're just getting permission to have the survey.

NS: Yes. Any other questions on that? Watch for that. Strategic plan update: Strategic Planning Committee is separated into two subcommittees now: the Research Subcommittee and the Values and Mission Subcommittee. I'm involved with Andrea Brown's Research Subcommittee to gather data on our peer institutions and the aspirational institutions that we want to be measured against as we move forward. We've gone through that process, and narrowed down the lists. That will help us inform the dialog going forward about what we can become as an institution. We're presenting to the overall Strategic Planning Committee a content analysis we did so we can provide insight into our strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, etc. What's been said by the different constituencies on campus about the questions that have been asked.

EO: How often certain comments come up, so we can see what people see as important.

NS: The purpose of this brief report is to let you know that the process is moving along and is transparent. Everything is being looked at; hopefully, at the next public meetings, you'll see the progress.

EO: I ended up chairing the subcommittee responsible for drafting a revised Mission Statement and creating a Values Statement and a Vision Statement. That's what most schools have. In addition, the core themes in our mission: we have to keep those for accreditation purposes, but they don't have to be in the Mission Statement, and we'll probably pull them to make our mission maybe just a sentence long. It's our job to take what NS and Andrea's subcommittee is doing and work it into something that says something about our institution. We've been shockingly productive, and the messages we've gotten through comments fall into nice, neat categories with pretty clear messages. They're consistent across groups of individuals. We're not taking into account fundraising, instituting different practices for retention, etc. We're just looking at comments that get at what we hold important and how we identify that. I believe that our draft will go to the full Strategic Planning Committee the week before the next set of town halls. Things might get tweaked there. We'll present drafts to the community. In at least one case, there will be some voting involved.

CB: When is that?

EO: One on February 2 from 5-7 PM, and again February 3 from 12-2 PM, both in the Gardner Ballroom

NS: There were originally two meetings because the President wanted that to meet everyone's schedules. So pick one or the other or both.

EO: It's useful. I attended all but one of the previous open town-hall meetings, and it gave me a good sense of where people were coming from.

NS: We'll be more specific on stuff as it comes out.

EO: We're not going to share until the entire subcommittee approves something because it represents the entire committee. It's be premature without their feedback.

NS: Next: we've talked about getting together off campus for a Faculty Senate social. I don't know if there's interest in or time for that given all that we do...

EO: With spouses.

NS: I don't know if that's something you would consider—I can send out a Doodle poll.

CL: I think we should try it, and those that can make it make it.

NS: Are weekdays better than weekends?

CB: It depends.

NS: I'd hate to steal Friday nights—would Tuesday or Wednesday work?

CB: I'd prefer not Wednesday.

NS: General question—is there a preference for a weekend or a weekday? Or indifferent?

ST: Weekends for me.

CB: It's easier to get babysitters on weekends because it's not a school night.

NS: OK, we'll shoot something out there and see. I'll work on that. OK, my meeting with Martha: This was a fun meeting I had with her Wednesday. The Constitution and By-laws are out, on 30-day comment period. I don't know if anyone's looked at it—it's the same one you've seen.

RC: Did a notice of that go out that the 30 days has started?

NS: It was combined with a bunch of them; the comment period started on the 12th. I'd advise you to let your faculty know to make comments. She's provided me with two addenda. We don't need to discuss them at length today, but I'll send you copies for your perusal, and you can let me know of any concerns. The first is: faculty representation on university committees—this outlines every committee that faculty are part of. Not ones that we (Faculty Senate) have ownership over, but that faculty members are parts of, such as University Council. This lets us know where our shared governance as a faculty body is. If you have questions or concerns about that one, please let me know.

RC: Two of those are already mentioned in the Faculty Rights Policy. One comment made by Sandy Peterson was that we should make sure that these ones that were specifically included are in the actual university policy—the Faculty Rights one as opposed to an addendum to another policy.

NS: That's a great idea—that can be run past Martha to see how it has to be incorporated.

RC: Some of these wouldn't have to be in the formal policy one, so this is good information for the Constitution and By-laws, but some, like the Curriculum Committee and maybe a couple of others, could be explicitly mentioned.

NS: Benefits Committee, Academic Council.

EO: Workload Committee.

CB: Is that list completely comprehensive? Will it have to be updated every time there's a new committee?

NS: Yes, it's an addendum and we can change it; I don't know what the process is for emending it, but it's simpler than doing a whole new Constitution and By-laws. It's intended to represent every university committee faculty have representation on. Going forward, without creating a lot of extra work, it's important that this group makes sure that we have faculty that are active and functioning and active on these committees. Maybe we formalize that with an invitation, or something like that. In the past, I think people are on committees because Sheila (Bastion) assigned them to those committees, and I don't know that there's ownership of those committees, if you will. As far as shared governance going forward, we can help to promote. The second is: the Faculty Senate standing committees—these we have ownership over and actually have lots of teeth in certain regards. (Reads list of committees and describes some of them.) We can appoint people to those committees—it doesn't come from this body, but those are *our* committees. The Faculty Staffing Committee—this is an interesting one. We have faculty that get hired in Spring at end of the hiring cycle. This committee forms a group of people to look at the new programs and see what the needs of the campus are and recommend to Faculty Senate who should get new hires—what are areas that need faculty? It's determined by data from the deans. It's more of getting the right faculty here at the right time. It's made up of 5-10 tenured faculty.

RC: It's in the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy.

EO: Lots of times, decisions about hires get made based on who asks first. This creates more infrastructure, so everyone's thinking about things at the same time, and they're submitting these things earlier. It's so whomever asks first doesn't get money first. It allows some strategic planning.

NS: A lot of these are here already (continues reading.) Undergraduate Research Committee: FYI for the Professional Development Committee: hopefully there's funding there for undergraduate research, so they don't go to the Professional Development Committee for that.

EO: I think the Board of Trustees has signed off on an Undergraduate Research Office, or Program—those mean different things so I have to be careful. That comes with some structural changes, so it's not just a committee.

RC: Did you say we have ownership of the University Curriculum Committee?

NS: David Wade is chairing it and doing a good job, but we believe that this should be Faculty Senate owned. The proposal is that the Faculty Senate Past-President will chair that committee, not to replace David, who's a fabulous administrator of the curriculum, but to make sure it's faculty driven. The Faculty Senate President and President-Elect sit on that committee. Plus, all department chairs.

RC: If we have ownership of it, can we change the structure? Does it have to be department chairs?

NS: I guess we could (reads). The representative *may* be a department chair. The person is selected, but it'll probably default to the department chair.

EO: If the department chair has too much to do, s/he can appoint someone.

NS: The University Transparency Committee (reads its purpose). I'm not promising all these will be there, and it sounds like we're asking for a lot of extra work—we're not. We just want to empower faculty important responsibilities to share in governance—we can feel engaged in governance of the institution. Questions or comments on that? I'll e-mail this to you, and let me know your comments or suggestions or changes.

RC: By the way, these are the first official documents on campus that say "shared governance with faculty." This is the first time this role has been taken seriously in policy.

NS: Is it going to create work for the Senate? Just in the organization of it and the distribution of those powers to those people. It will create extra work for the Executive Committee in terms of the appointments. There's a tremendous amount of quality faculty on campus, and we want reports on these committees and know that they're meeting and doing something that is worthwhile.

EO: Also, we met with Alan Hall. We received eight applications for the Alan Hall award by the deadline and used the rubric we had disseminated to evaluate them. There were applications from pretty much every school on campus and from staff in recruitment and retention, and we'll be working on letters early next week. The good news is that some awesome things are happening on campus. There was discussion required—there were many good proposals.

NS: Of the eight applications, two will go to Bill's office for approval to send to Alan to make a decision about which one of the two. Our institution will get one \$10,000 award—\$5000 to the school and \$5000 to the faculty. Alan will determine which one that is and will let us know in March or April.

EO: The current plan is that he'll sponsor this award every other year. It will be an opportunity again, so those not selected this time can reapply, and new programs that didn't apply are also welcome to submit.

NS: Two last things. I have a copy of the Evaluation of Faculty and Academic Administrators Policy; that will come out probably next week. My only purpose for mentioning this is to let you know it'll be coming to you for evaluation next week. This is for the supervisor evaluations.

EO: Please read these carefully—realize that there's been a lot of wordsmithing at each step along the way, and sometimes meanings change, and we don't want the Faculty Senate to be caught off guard. So if you want a policy to read a certain way and you discover that it doesn't, that's the kind of feedback that we need.

RC: Has this been sent to department chairs? My department chair got something, and it caused her consternation because it looked like a lot of work regarding revisions to faculty evaluations. She was nervous about that.

EO: That's been discussed. Tuesday, the University Council met, it came up that some of the new policies are coming in and appear to create workload issues, especially among administrators. Those will be revisited and the workload likely reduced. Specification about time frames will likely change—more “a minimum of” language, and leeway will be built into some of these where some level of supervisors can create a system used for everyone—we don't spell out exactly how everyone's doing everything. Things will be simplified a bit to reduce these workload issues. That's been noticed and will be adjusted. This comes from President Williams.

NS: This will address HS's previous comment about student evaluations. Martha hasn't provided a live file yet, but watch for it. That'll be our next big one. Let's turn the time over to our subcommittees for reports of what activities took place. First, Faculty Rights; second, Faculty Responsibilities.

RC: I only received a couple of comments. One mentioned the two committees listed in this policy: the Academic Council and University Council, on which we need to make sure we have Faculty Senate representation. Is that sufficient, or should we specifically mention the other committees that Faculty Senate has representation on, such as the Curriculum Committee? But if we're going to have ownership over that, it might not be relevant; I don't know.

NS: Is your request that we reference the Constitution and By-laws, or put them in specifically?

RC: I hadn't considered a reference because this addendum is new; but we wanted something along those lines to make sure what was referenced. We didn't know if we needed specific mentions. The other question was: would it be appropriate to include in Faculty Rights the benefits that we're currently entitled to, such as tuition waivers?

NS: This has been briefly discussed in other venues, and the response to me was that it's a faculty benefit but it's also campus-wide and in another document—it's not just for faculty. So we can reference that in there, but not specifically carve out that it's just *our* benefit.

RC: Is it explicitly mentioned in another policy? Sometimes they just say “benefits are provided,” and if Human Resources decides to change those, they could do that quickly without a formal policy change. If it were in policy somewhere, I think it'd make faculty feel more comfortable.

NS: That's great—I do know that the comment would be that even if it's in policy, it's a budgetary issue, and if we can't afford to do it, the President will say we can't do it.

EO: We need to see if it's spelled out in policy, and if it's not, we need to meet with staff leadership to work on something like that.

RC: That may lead to a discussion of how that will play out with graduate-degree programs. Tuition waivers are not often given at other institutions for graduate degrees, so it should be addressed one way or another.

EO: Also, the concept of “dependent” has come up repeatedly in other meetings, too.

RC: They informally have said that they go with the federal government's definition for that.

EO: And people want that changed from using marriage as “emancipation.” It's less common here that “marriage” usually means “graduated from college.”

CB: So modify it for something like the definition that health insurance uses.

RC: The informal rule I understand is, right now, that the federal government definition says it doesn't even mean if they live in your house; if they're under 25, they qualify for insurance policies, and therefore they qualify for the tuition waiver. Under current policy, that requires a waiver, but they're willing to authorize that right now.

EO: I believe we were using the tax code, which has emancipation upon marriage—even if someone gets divorced, they're still considered emancipated if under 25. Maybe we could reference a different federal policy. The big point is that this comes up repeatedly and probably will be tweaked. It affects a relatively small percentage of employees and their dependents, and yet it creates hard feelings. Bill Christiansen and President Williams have all been part of this conversation. If we have to create a policy with staff leadership, then it'll be something we specifically address.

NS: Quick question: graduate degrees—should we push for tuition waivers for those? Is that worth the fight?

RC: No, because graduate programs are so small that they don't have the flexibility to have an empty slot that's not paid for.

NS: Right now, tuition waivers are for regular classes for a Bachelor's degree—is it worth asking the question even if we know that answer will be no?

EO: We might even be able to come up with a compromise position: if someone just finished a Bachelor's degree and they have an interest in a graduate degree, and there's a graduate-level class offered and there's space in it—waivers could be given on a class-by-class basis. This is worth potentially asking about. But for someone that is going to get mentored one-on-one by a faculty member, that's a lot of money!

AC: So you're thinking that if a class is going to carry anyway, there might be a situation in which they could join up.

RC: Graduate classes always have more time per student.

DrW: I can see it from that perspective. If we twist it around, and look at the benefit to faculty, if they're in that situation where they have a child that may qualify, that's a pay raise.

EO: Yes, a huge one.

DrW: I think that's a huge benefit to faculty members if the option is there. Whether it should be or not, we need to get more information because it's cost prohibitive in a lot of ways, too.

RC: Yes and no...I don't know how many parents tend to pay for graduate degrees. Mostly they're paid for on their own.

CB: It'd be a benefit for a relative few—which that cost is going to be dispersed elsewhere in opportunity costs, probably. A lot of faculty and spouses and children—I don't know if graduate school comes up that often.

AW: Just asking question gives us some options—maybe not *full* waivers, but it might allow partial waivers.

NS: It'll be brought up somewhere, and we'll support some sort of benefit, even understanding that it might not be economically feasible.

AC: It doesn't need to be all or nothing. I'm thinking spouses more than children—I think one of the intangibles at play here—it'd be cool if there's a stepping stone toward getting a graduate degree. I think, probably, demographically, faculty have similarly minded spouses that would like that opportunity. And there are a lot of intangible benefits there.

RC: We could phrase it as a hiring and retention issue.

EO: And staff hiring issue, because we don't pay them very much.

NS: That's the general feeling, and we'll represent faculty interests there. Now, Faculty Responsibilities...?

CL: We had good discussion over the last couple of days—I appreciate all the people that contributed; all I did was consolidate, so thank you! There's been lots of good work. We have lots of typos and clarifications that I posted back. Some things I think we could use: role statements generated lots of discussion given that they're new and not clearly defined anywhere that we know of, so having a clear definition we can reference in here would be great. Even if it's defined that each school has their own.

DoW: We have defined one within our department

EO: We stole USU's.

CL: But we need *something* to refer to here.

EO: Maybe we could tweak those and use those formally...?

NS: You're not talking about the role statements themselves, but the definition of where and how to create one...?

EO: Maybe we need guidelines on how to structure one. USU's breaks things down by duties, and has what you're expected to do—this is “sufficient”; this is “exceptional.” It outlines where you fall based on your activities, and it places requirements for reaching exceptional levels in various categories, etc.

CL: Other things: there were several places where if there's a policy we could refer to, such as where the policy is that requires a syllabus—

RC: There is none—it's only in the Faculty Handbook.

CL: Also, a discussion on the limits of academic freedom—some reference of a definition of that would be helpful for clarification. The fact that mid-terms might only require a pass/fail—referring to a policy would be nice. And a definition of what an “official spokesperson” for the university is. There's a place where we enumerate all the faculty roles—maybe just reference where that's already defined rather than have to edit this all the time. A discussion of rewording the office-hours statement—I pulled, of all those that were referenced, the University of Utah's definition of office hours for supporting students, and reworded it slightly. There's also a requirement in it to interact with faculty and staff; I

dissociated that part from office hours (reads). Right now, it says we have to submit mid-term and final grades, but mid-term grades only have to be pass/fail when you submit them.

BA: It says that in the policy?

CL: Not in ours, but there is a policy somewhere that says something, and we need to reference it.

NS: Yes, you can put the actual grade, but Julie Stender just had a policy on that that's just been approved.

CL: This policy also has a requirement for a final exam, and we struck it out to see what happens. That was the consensus I was feeling from our discussion. Section 3.C sounds really cumbersome—it's about expecting us to apportion a sufficient amount of time and effort toward our primary employment here, and it's too unwieldy; I said it needs restructuring to be clearer. The dual-role policy states initially that we must not be in a dual role, but then section 4 of that says there's an exception to that, and it's better to recognize that up front. "Dual role" means having an external relationship with a student that isn't just student-teacher—your kid, your wife, etc.

LJ: And it's spelled out here.

EO: We don't have that here with regard to employees—between two employees. That's not anywhere in here. It's supposed to be in policy somewhere.

CB: It says "any close personal relationship"—it's vaguely in here.

EO: OK, but with students—this is all faculty-student, not faculty-faculty or faculty-staff. Somewhere in a policy is supposedly something about that.

CL: Those are the high points that are substantive. There are other things to clarify, but those are the substantive points.

NS: Am I OK to forward those to Martha?

CL: If everyone else is OK with it, then I'm OK with it.

DoW: The part about striking out the part about the final exam—I'm not OK with that. I've had some discussion in Biology, and they're not OK with that, either.

NS: OK. Comments or discussions about that? Rather than striking it, should we discuss that it's optional?

JH: Can you state it to delegate it so certain areas of departments can decide whether or not they're required?

CB: It already kind of lets you strike it out in policy—this isn't completely new. It says "unless compelling reasons exist for other evaluative measures."

EO: Oh, so that allows for non-final exams.

CB: SO if you're doing a Literature course, students should be doing a paper, not an exam. So people are coming in and taking syllabus exams for finals because they have nothing else to do. But you have to go to your chair and dean for approval. Either strike it out or reword it somehow that says that the department chair determines what is proper as far as final exams or other evaluative measures.

DrW: Can't you call that final paper the final exam, though?

EO: That's what the policy says currently, already—just that you have to get people signing off on stuff.

LJ: In the hours for faculty, I also looked at Utah Valley University, Utah State University, University of Utah, etc. and nowhere in any of their Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policies does it say anything about final exams. In the instructional part, you should include it in your class, yeah, but why do we need it in policy?

CB: By the time I got to junior and senior year, I never took another exam. I feel it doesn't make sense.

DoW: Our perception is that in the Faculty Handbook it says faculty are required to conduct a "meaningful graded activity."

CB: That's in here, too.

DoW: So I put out "what's your opinion on this issue," and of all my responses, all but one said that we should require a comprehensive final exam.

EO: Well, the conversation was that "except for classes where it wasn't appropriate."

DoW: Yes, except for a lab, or a writing class. But for regular science classes, it should be required.

LJ: Do you want to keep it in the handbook and take it out of policy, or have it in both?

CB: It should be consistent between the two.

TF: One of the things that was brought up was that this policy refers to the handbook as if it were policy, but the handbook isn't policy.

EO: In the absence of policy, the handbook becomes *de facto* policy.

DoW: Have other faculty here had conversations in their departments?

CB: My department is largely in favor of striking it. Some do have exams, but some don't. But they have meaningful activities. One of the problems with getting rid of it is that faculty become unavailable during finals week if you don't require them to come in and give an exam. This seems like a roundabout way to do that. Instead, we could require them to hold office hours during finals week, but not require an exam. One other thing is the "comprehensive" thing: that's a philosophical difference, and I don't think we should say anything about "comprehensive" because that depends from field to field and it induces strong feelings. Maybe say that each department chair can define what's appropriate for her/his department; I think that would be the most appropriate.

NS: If we go that route, say "department" rather than "chair."

CB: Maybe we need to restructure that last line that says “such exceptions must be approved by the appropriate department chair or dean” to “determined by the department as to what is appropriate within that field” or something like that.

DoW: I think that’s better than striking it.

IJ: I think we can leave it in the Faculty Handbook and strike it from the policy.

DoW: That’s confusing.

IJ: The problem is that a lot of people have their scheduled final times, or they move their scheduled finals time to a different time so that they don’t have to stick around.

CB: They can’t do that.

EO: But people do it, such as moving the final to the last week of classes—we do that with our lab classes that accompany lecture classes.

IJ: That’s the problem with the scheduled time, too.

EO: So “substantive activities,” if their exams can’t be bumped up to class time, to reduce the amount of class time the students get.

NS: If it were struck, would faculty not do it?

DoW: I think a lot would not, if they saw others not doing it.

CB: I think a lot would move it to the last week of class to get out early.

EO: I think that’s most likely.

CB: Maybe we could put in something about “what you will do should be clearly defined in the syllabus, and the syllabus must be approved by the department chair.” Something so they can see that you’re holding your exam in finals week.

NS: I’ll take that thought and run it up the flagpole. I’ll take the document from CL and make the comment on this final requirement and see what kind of wordsmithing the Policy Office can do to get us what we want out of it. We don’t want faculty to move their finals up to get out early, but we don’t want them forced to do an exam if it’s not appropriate for the class, and that we feel that can be determined at the department level rather than at the upper level, and not individually. I’m concerned about the chairs making such decisions.

AW: But there’d still have to be some sort of activity.

NS: Yes. There might be accreditation issues with this, too.

IJ: But if other universities don’t have it in their policies, it’s not an accreditation issue.

EO: But are they at risk of having a bunch of faculty decide not to do it?

CB: When courses are created and designed, don’t they have to outline evaluative measures? We’d just have to have each program evaluate each course and decide what’s an appropriate evaluative measure for that course. If it’s a final exam, then it needs to happen during final exam week, but if it’s a final paper, it doesn’t need to happen that week.

EO: We’re being asked to restructure our syllabi to reflect the goals and outcomes that we report we’re trying to do in our programs; they’ll start requiring that by Fall.

NS: I’ll take that as part of our feedback, and we’ll see what ends up happening.

CB: I think we’re probably pretty close to just doing the on-the-board approve piece-by-piece, like we did with the handbook, and knocking this thing out, or do we want Martha to rewrite it first, and then do that?

NS: If we’re comfortable with what we’ve discussed, it’s going to her office for wordsmithing, and then it’ll be posted. We’ll still have the 30-day comment period; we just need to start the process to get that going. I’m going to give it to her so she knows we’re done with it. We can keep working on it as we feel necessary; if we feel strongly about something later, we can bring those up later—we basically have another 40 days to make decisions on it.

EO: Let her know there might be more Faculty Senate feedback.

NS: And general faculty feedback. We have scheduled our general faculty meeting next Monday—I haven’t announced that yet; it slipped my mind. I’ll get box lunches and do a general information meeting. What structure should it have—do you have a preference? Should we just invite them for lunch and tell them about things going on that they need to be aware of, and let them ask questions? Any general agenda items to include?

TF: They should know about this policy stuff—the Constitution and By-laws and Rights and Responsibilities.

CB: I wonder if you want to raise the role statement thing—I think most faculty are not aware that it exists.

EO: Maybe show some examples. If you have some, we could distribute some example for others to see that it’s not so scary.

HS: If it is a responsibility of faculty to write their own, it should be stated in the Faculty Responsibilities Policy.

CB: This wouldn’t be a terrible place to outline what it is...

EO: Good idea. Having definitions and directions on where to go, and clear ideas in the policy would be good. Maybe at our next meeting we can bring what we’ve been playing with to make role statements substantive. That seems to make the process easy and yet make the outcome substantive.

NS: There’s a page in the Evaluation of Faculty Policy, in subsection 2—that’s where the definition is. It’s not a policy you’ve seen yet, but that can be part of our definition and it probably ought to go into the Faculty Responsibilities. I’ll make sure you see it.

TF: If that outlines it clearly, our policy should just reference that.

EO: It's still vague in here. So it may be worthwhile floating the idea of spelling it out in our policy.

CB: Instead of referencing the Faculty Handbook, we need to spell out what's in the Faculty Handbook, because that's not actually policy. Let's get these definitions written, and then *this* can be the source that everything else references back to.

IJ: I think they want to leave the role statements kind of vague because mine would be very different from others.

EO: Let us show you with what we've been playing with—it leaves a lot of room for *lots* of different roles.

IJ: I think she wants to leave it vague on purpose, because every department will be different, and each level of faculty will be different.

EO: Sure. The system Biology is using, co-opted from USU, is so broad that it covers a lot of people—librarians, administrators, service, researchers, etc. It gives a little more guidance so you don't just say "my role is to teach."

CB: They would certainly make it easier to do self-evaluations at the end of the year.

NS: So we'll have brief discussion of that at the general faculty meeting. At our next Faculty Senate meeting, which is February 5, we'll invite the chair of the University Review (RTP) Committee to give us report on that process, so we can be aware of what happened with the process and what changes we can champion through. Would it be beneficial to have Andrea Brown present information on great colleges? I've also invited President Williams to attend any of our meetings, and he may show up at the occasional meeting. Motion to adjourn? (Moved, approved).