FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 6, 2014

In attendance:

Robert Carlson (RC)   *Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)*

Ami Comeford (AC)   *LJ Jones (LJ)*

Ross Decker (RD)   *Scott Lindsey (SL)*

Rebecca DiVerniero (RD)   *Nate Staheli (NS)*

Timothy Francis (TF)   *Samuel Tobler (ST)*

RC: Our first item of business is the approval of the minutes from the last meeting, which we didn't hold, so that should be easy. We have a list of policies under consider today. The last thing I did for Faculty Senate before the break was meet with Bill Christiansen (BC) about a couple of things. I proposed a change to the current curriculum process that I think he's going to propose a policy change to accommodate. The proposal will go something like this: when there's any policy about curriculum or curriculum decision about courses and programs, it will come to this body *before* it goes to Academic Council. So although we won't have the right to dictate what the changes would be, we'll have veto ability to hold something up, not by stalling, but if we have actual objections. Right now, we've tried to explain to BC that when there are substantive changes, like for example the portal concept that was going to significantly change how we do things in a curricular way, the President eventually did listen to us, but only because he chose to—there was no process to allow faculty voices to be anything more than spoken words because on all the committees that discussed it, the two Faculty Senate representatives were outvoted. If this policy, change occurs, it will drastically change the purpose of these meetings; instead of talking about things that we will pass on, we'll be making decisions about some fairly significant things on campus, which is something this body hasn't done in past. I think this is a change for the better; it will mimic my experience at a different institution—things went through them, were vigorously discussed, and eventually reached a compromise, so faculty we very much involved in process. This will increase feeling of involvement, so your roles on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will become more and more important. That's the hope! I want to make you aware of that. BC should be preparing those changes now; I don't know how long it will take.

SL: This will be an approval process, not just a discussion process?

RC: Yes.

NS: Does that fit into Curriculum Council meetings now in each college?

RC: Right, I don't remember if we discussed that; I think it will be after that level of discussion. So things that might go through a curriculum council, whether at the school level or not, it will then come to us.

NS: But our focus would be how those proposed changes would affect *overall* education process on campus...?

RC: Yes. We see a wider range of campus, and hopefully we'll see a slightly different perspective. My guess is that for the smaller, school changes, we'll hardly touch those—they would be fairly cursory. Maybe the current proposal won't even affect those. But the things that affect the broader campus we will have some say. It won't be just curricular decisions; it will also be policies, like the ones going through now—future things like those would have to be approved by this committee before they go on. That would add an extra level beyond the 30-day, open-discussion period. I don't know if you realize, but some of these policies that we're going to talk about are almost ready to go to Academic Council because they've been posted—this posting process is fairly inefficient in gathering faculty feedback. That will lead to our goals for the rest of this semester. Questions about that?

SL: So this necessitates another policy—will it be subject to another 30-day review?

RC: Yes, you won't see it until the beginning of next year.

NS: However, it's been said in various meetings that we *could* put something into practice that won't be official until the Fall.

RC: That's possible; they seem to be amenable to that if there' no particular objection, they can make procedural changes. Like right now, if the Vice-President of Academic Affairs says "We should send it through Faculty Senate before it moves on," it could happen, and we could get this system in as a procedural protocol. That seems to be something that's fairly commonly done. OK, I took that as an encouraging sign...I think he's trying very hard to work with us in getting faculty involved. Now, various policies under consideration. Were you able to look up the list?

JDH: Yes, it's a very big list! (Reads from current list of policies up for review.)

RC: Personnel Definitions was separate from Faculty Categories?

JDH: I guess so...

RC: A few of these I haven't had a chance to look at; I know nothing about faculty salaries one; faculty reviews I know they're working on. Early retirement: given the discussion I've heard recently about it, it's mostly to make policy consistent with procedure—right now there are a lot of things procedurally that aren't in the policy. Most of what they allow are in the faculty members' favor, so I don't anticipate that those will be problematic. Regarding the list on the agenda: Student Accommodations: this was the policy that addresses accommodations that are already familiar, such as for students that are going on athletic trip, then we've added recently accommodations for students going on military exercises—we've discussed those, but there's also a section on accommodating "sincerely held beliefs." This has led to a number of discussions, and a significant modification has been proposed—this is the section on "Content Accommodations." The Vice-President of Academic Affairs has proposed changes that most faculty are quite comfortable with. We had a subcommittee on these, and the changes basically say that the university has no obligation to uphold anyone's "sincerely held belief," and that notification of potentially offensive content is merely provided as a courtesy to students. These changes satisfy all the complaints I've heard from faculty. Without being a lawyer, I'm quite sure that at some level in legal review, they're not going to be happy with this—it may not be consistent with the court case that precipitated this, which had to do with a theater assignment, participating in a theater production, and involved some foul language. One of the students that was an actor in the performance didn't want to use that language, and it led to a lawsuit that was settled out of court. We don't know the details because some of this was kept private, but to some extent, it made the university change its policies. Given that precedent, it's quite possible that we'll have to do something more than "courteously" provide information. We may have to address this, but for now, this is the current recommended changes, which are very good for respecting faculty rights and freedom of expression. I think we're on the right track. I just wanted to report on where that stands, and I don't know where it will go in the future. If you have concerns or specific issues that you've encountered, please let us know. Mostly we're trying to do is *prevent* lawsuits— that's why even though it's listed in the policy as a "courtesy" to highlight what might offend students and a courtesy to explain how their might be alternatives to achieve their degrees and get through certain requirements, it's probably a really, really good idea to include that information in your syllabi. It will help anticipate potential problem. If a problem comes up that's unanticipated in the middle of the semester and it's not in your syllabus, it's a mess that will just create headaches for everyone—the student, the faculty member, the department chair, the dean, everyone. It'll be hard to resolve—it's much easier to say up front "Hey, there's something in this course you may not like. For example, a film studies course: Brent Hanson, who is dean but still teaches that class and was at the meeting, said "I have some R-rated movies in this class; this one is going to be offensive—there will be children killed, and it'll be disturbing. If you are uncomfortable with this, here are some alternatives you can take." Providing that information ahead of time helps *students* make the decisions, before they get to the middle of a course and say "I don't want to lose all the time I've invested in this class." That might be a good thing to do.

NS: This will be action item at Academic Council tomorrow?

RC: Yes, and I anticipate it being approved.

NS: In this format?

RC: Yes. Potential problems may come back in the future, though, and it may come back; that's all I'm saying. But even though it says it's a courtesy and we're not obligated, I think it's wise to have faculty anticipate problems beforehand.

NS: I'm curious of the position of staff members. Obviously, this represents what the subcommittee met about; is there any comment about that?

RC: It came up in Academic Council that because this issue was potentially contentious, they wanted to get different camps constituencies from campus involved.

SL: It was an ad hoc committee?

RC: Yes.

NS: It was going to be voted on, but Brent Hanson recommended tabling it to get more discussion and faculty feedback to allow adequate representation of their feelings.

RC: And those are what led to the changes I just summarized briefly. The previous version had a lot more requirements, and provisions about when a student complains about his/her rights being violated; there was a process for making changes, and it was very unwieldy. We've eliminated that and provided more information about *preventing* problems. The current policy doesn't make a requirement that there must be alternatives, but in all practical situations, I think there will be. Even in a degree like English, where consistently material shows up that could be troublesome to some student, there's enough of a variety of classes for them to satisfy a requirement. The other part of the discussion, from the theater perspective, they're legally obligated to keep the words in the play—they can't change them. But you can't have rehearsals and get halfway into semester and then have a student decide s/he can't do this, and you lose a lead character. So focusing on "earlier" is the best in those situations.

SL: If you think that there may be legal issues with this, why not craft policy to obviate those?

RC: We did, in the ad hoc committee—we had our legal representative on the committee, but my guess is that if there are any legal challenges may come from even over his head—we've had issues come from the State Attorney General's office. But if there aren't any, then I think this policy is workable from our perspective.

SL: Will it pass legal muster?

RC: My personal opinion is no, but I'm not a lawyer, and our legal representative was OK with it—he wasn't happy, but I think he was OK with it.

AC: Part of the problem that I understood was that it's a fairly new territory for the legalities because there's just this one case settled out of court, so even he didn't know all the language because some of it was gagged. So some of it was about an institution going out into an area that's new.

SL: It's not *us*, is it?

AC: No, it was the University of Utah. I think that what BC seems to be doing is sending out something that's ideal, and if it has to come back with legal shifts, it's not as onerous as the previous version. In that version, it said "If the dean does this, it has to be done in 48 hours," etc., and how in the world is a dean going to assign a grade for something that a faculty member didn't approve, how does that calculate into the grades, how is it fair, etc. He was trying to simplify it, and if it has to come back, then at least we're starting from the simplified version and making it more complex rather than starting complex and not having much wiggle room. It sounded to me that's what came out of the meeting.

RC: That's a good summary.

AC: But there will probably be something in it about "You're required to notify students of X" in the class.

RC: But that could be as much change as "courteous to require."

SL: That addresses my concern—there's some legal oversight of it now.

RC: Yes, they did a good job of having legal representation and a diverse representation of campus constituencies at the meeting and we had a very productive discussion. I'm hopeful that this version is much more workable than the previous one. The other issue that will come up, which is a fundamental challenge in academia, is the concept of "offensiveness." You don't have a right not to be offended, but you *can* be offended by almost anything—that's too vague. So focusing on "sincerely held core beliefs," is still a vague concept, and how do we evaluate it? I don't know how we'll end up resolving that someday, but if it gets higher than that, we'll worry about that later. Any other questions? This is good...I would encourage anticipating and putting these things in your syllabus. For many faculty, it won't be an issue— I can't imagine it being an issue in Business, for example.

JDH: Does this mean that in my introductory geology classes I should put on the syllabus that "this class takes for granted that the Earth is 4.6 billion years old and that radiometric dating techniques are accurate, and we take evolution as a given?"

RC: It would be helpful to cover that.

AC: On this campus, where there are students that have that "sincerely held belief," it can't hurt.

RC: That's two lines, as opposed to the two pages of stuff in here. The way you said it, though, is good, too. You don't have to change someone's belief—that's never the purpose of our courses. But saying "this class takes for granted that..." is an appropriate way—this is what our curriculum is about, and you must learn that this is how this discipline talks about it. That's a reasonable, academic way of approaching it.

NS: As opposed to just a general statement that says "you may encounter something things in this class that are contrary to some beliefs you may have"...?

RC: Well, I think you need to be *somewhat* specific. For example, the "offensiveness" in that film studies class is a different type than that of religious beliefs or belief about the age of the world.

NS: But then what if you miss something that is someone else's belief?

RC: Well, that's why the wording says "may reasonably assume" may conflict. You can't anticipate everything, but if you *know* there's a belief like that that's held by more than a couple of students..."

RD: It won't take you long to figure out what some students will find offensive.

RC: If you teach about sexuality at all, that is something that you should address up front—things like that. OK, the next one: Faculty Categories. There are two things we're trying to accomplish with this, but they're not ready yet and it would be very helpful for people to look at this. The first is proposal to introduce a category of faculty who can eventually get something *equivalent* to tenure but that we won't *call* tenure and is for if they lack a terminal degree—this is that "professional track" we've been talking about. It's very clear that the kind of status is not tenure and will be called "non-probationary," but they'll have the equivalent rights to tenured faculty except the ability to vote in tenure decisions. It introduces this concept. I don't think it does this adequately, so I ask for your feedback as you look over this. It says that *before* you achieve that, you're probationary and have no rights and are not tenure track, but then at some point *some* people will magically be granted this status. It doesn't provide any details about criteria will be used to go through that transition, and it's overly vague, so we need to look at that in great detail. But introducing that category is helpful. This should be the beginning of the dialog about this new track. The second thing it does is make an attempt to identify more specifically what our different faculty categories are. We have a variety of categories—the term they use here is a problem

and I need some suggestions for a better term: there's an official designation for "Part-Time Faculty" that doesn't mean *all* faculty that don't teach less than 100% of 24 credits/year--it's very specific to faculty that are on a kind of contract at the 0.5 and 0.74 levels—that's not appropriate, because they used "part-time faculty" [as a more general, non-specific, descriptive term] differently in other contexts. So we need another term. If you can come up with another term that will help work there and help avoid confusion, that would be very helpful! It's almost got to be "Part-Time Salaried," but that's cumbersome. This is a very important document that we haven't discussed previously because we haven't met in a while, but please look this over and encourage your faculty to look it over. There are very specific definitions that I've tried to summarize so that it makes sense to me, and I've got a list of questions that I'm going to bring up, but I really want more feedback on these definitions. We'll have Regular Faculty, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, Auxiliary Faculty, Tenure-Track Faculty, Continuing-Status Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, Adjunct Faculty (that are distinct from Part-Time—Adjunct Faculty not only have no rights, but they don't make any money. Part-Time Faculty at least make a decent wage because their salaries are based on 50% or 74% of our Tenure-Track Faculty—it's different in degree), Part-Time Clinical Faculty, Term-Appointed Faculty (where there are specific one-year contracts), and Faculty Emeriti. So there are many categories, each distinct, but will help us clarify as we begin to incorporate these terms.

NS: Is this a potential discussion item at the nest general Faculty Senate meeting on the 13th? This might be something good to discuss.

RC: Absolutely. I'll send that out...I can give my summary of the terms. Here's what I'll do: I'll send my summaries to you guys, and ask you to look at it and the original to make sure I didn't miss anything in defining the terms, and if you could get back to me in the next couple of days, and then I can make changes and send that out to all faculty.

NS: That's at 2:00?

RC: Yes, in the Zion Room...we're trying to have some consistency in meeting times. The first and third Mondays will be for the Executive Committee; the second Mondays will be for general meetings. The Executive Committee meetings will occasionally conflict with holidays, such as Martin Luther King's Day.

LJ: Since some of these deadlines are coming up, should we meet?

RC: We can discuss as many as we want to, but I thought this one was of particular relevance.

LJ: At the end of the month, will they vote?

RC: Yes, but what will happen is that if we have some serious concerns, and I haven't noticed any other than needing a new term for "Part-Time Faculty" and determine how faculty become Continuing-Status Faculty (the non-tenure track but essentially permanent faculty—the professional track)—if those are addressed, then I think this document is really well crafted.

RD: You said there's no overlap in any of the categories?

RC: They've done very well. I think these will finally encompass all faculty on campus and we'll know who belongs where. Before, we used "adjunct" for both salaried and ones that teach by credit hour. It will be some time before we start using these terms properly, but this is a good start.

SL: Just so I'm clear: you're having issues with Part-Time Faculty?

RC: Just the term for that one, and then there's no criteria for becoming a Continuing-Status Faculty. It may be specified in 3-7, which is Faculty Review, but I haven't looked at it yet.

SL: So two separate issues: Part-Time & Professional Track, and the process.

RC: Exactly. I'm positive a lot of time went into this, and it looks like it will accomplish a lot of what we want. Now, the Faculty Workload. I've already brought up a couple of concerns to BC about this, and I think he's amenable to making some changes, but this document explicitly says that faculty work 27 credit hours, but three are spent on non-curricular things. I think he's amenable to eliminating that 27, but saying that faculty are *also* expected to perform other duties, and list those duties, and not tie them to specific numbers of credit hours. By keeping it vague, if they still think that whole concept of what 74% is based on 27 credits, I think he'll go for that.

RD: Is that they're main motivation for going for 27, that 74% thing?

RC: Yes, because what it will do is that if they have to choose 74% of 24 credits, it changes a *lot*. Other things about this that I think will be helpful...I have a lot of comments on this one; I think that they're trying to pro-rate things, so this will be a place where we can incorporate things like office hours and the other responsibilities we have outside of teaching will be pro-rated to how much teaching you do. The expectations for things like the portfolios, assessment, etc. will be specified in the categories and considered proportional to your workload expectations—if you teach full time, you'll have more office hours, and that should be accommodated.

AC: Is that in the draft?

RC: I believe so—not office hours explicitly; it's pro-rated proportional for those other things; I don't remember how specific it was.

AC: Last year, some faculty wanted that addressed.

RC: Yes, and I mentioned it to BC, but I don't think it's explicitly in here. This is something you need to look at also; I've noticed many issues here that I'm concerned about besides that, some small, some big.

SL: If you have 27 hours, then you have discipline and accreditation issues—some won't swallow 27.

RD: Unless they know what's with those three credits.

RC: But those extra things are not extra—they're expected of any faculty on campus, and treating them as "extra" is disingenuous.

NS: As they look at it one way, 74% maxes out at 17 credits, and the other way at 20.

RC: That's a whole extra class! But, as we pointed out, because they're acknowledging the proportional issue, that has to be taken into account—they have other responsibilities also, so how can you give them more teaching without relieving them of those? If 100% is based on 27 credits and includes office hours, assessment, etc., either we don't expect those salaried, part-time faculty to do those things, or else it cuts into their 74%. Those are the things we're trying to work through. It will also be explicit about what adjuncts are expected to do with their workload. So please look this over—I think it needs a lot of work before it's ready to go, and we can do a lot to improve it. We just have to propose concrete ideas. When I sent some of those concerns to BC, he asked if we could rewrite those as a policy—he wants some specific wording. Professional Development: that will be up for review on the policy page soon. We approved that; I just need to get the copy from Jim Haendiges, and I'll pass it onto the policy office, which will start the policy process. So it's ready to go, and should be ready to implement next year. And we're implementing *some* of the procedures right now. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities: you'll notice that many of these issues that we're addressing have been in the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities, but we're not treating it as a single, big document now, but have broken it up into pieces. We're not abandoning the rest of it; we just have to move forward in a way that's manageable because it's been so big that most people don't have time to read it. So the subcommittee has finished their initial review, and we've got to address it somehow. Any suggestions?

SL: Just break it up, and prioritize.

RC: I think that'll be the next key—we don't have to go in order, but can identify the priorities. So please glance at its parts to see what topics and make suggestions about priority. And we'll take subsections at a time.

SL: So this approach—will it be a non-starter with the policy creation group? I understood that they were behind this approach.

RC: No, the fact that they've already done this suggests they're ready to go forward piecemeal. They were frustrated with it being held up, but also acknowledge that it's a big thing. Even if we approach it in small pieces, we can make some pieces wait on others if we want. If we find there's a part we want addressed sooner, we can pull it out. During the process of restructuring the policy manual, it has these categories—they're going to do away with that...I don't know exactly how, but there won't be separate sections for students, administration, etc. They're in the process of changing that structure. OK, so that's my policy update. I really need feedback on the Faculty Categories, Faculty Workload will be a big one because it has a lot of issues, and Faculty Review Process—we're in the process of assessing that from Faculty Excellence, the whole tenure and performance-review process, and I don't know how it plays into this, so we should look it over.

SL: Is part of all this going to be revising the Faculty Senate by-laws?

RC: Yes.

AC: With the Faculty Categories—I'm just mentioning this—inside of that, I've been recently reviewing faculty Termination Policies as part of the Faculty Excellence thing, and they are really problematic, particularly when it says "Full-Time Faculty termination policy," it refers you to the next one. And in the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty section, there's no distinction in that policy there between probationary tenure-track faculty and probationary, *non*-tenure-track—it lumps them all together, but in fact the process *is* different for them. Later in the policy, it suggests that probationary faculty have no appeals process, which is presumably for both tenure-track and non-tenure-track. But for tenure-track faculty, there's supposed to be an intermediate review process, while non-tenure-track faculty don't have that process. An yet, the policy doesn't make that designation anywhere. So with regards to the Faculty Categories, they have *got* to define those in the termination policies—so as they think of those categories, they need to be specific in the policy and make the distinctions between tenure-track, probationary faculty and non-tenure-track, probationary faculty. Otherwise, there's a real litigious issue inside the policy. Maybe ask them to remember to make those changes simultaneously as they move forward.

RC: That suggests a course of action that until the Termination Policy is revised to incorporate these new terms...

AC: ...that it shouldn't go forward. Otherwise, it seems like that's where people could have attorneys! So that's important for continuity.

RC: That brings up another thing: if you hear from faculty in your disciplines and areas that are having potential grievance issues—here's another plug for ombuds office— please refer them to ombuds *before* things get worse! They can be much more helpful if involved in a conflict early. We're still getting used to this concept of an ombuds office, but whether it's related to your job or just to your work environment, supervisor, etc. They maintain confidentiality; they don't keep any records on purpose—even if they were subpoenaed, there are none. So you can speak openly and freely with them. They

also tend to have resources and know where to direct you. Sometimes there's misunderstanding because these policies are not well written. That's why there's such an emphasis to get through all of these. Resolving issues earlier is better.

AC: One more question about these: you'd indicated in a past meeting that if we have policies we'd like to see someone take a look at, I know a contentious policy is the Sexual Harassment Policy. Right now, it says that faculty members *must* notify Human Resources if they're aware of an issue. The question is: is that state law? There could be some situations where a student might come to us and want to confide in us, but *don't* want to report it; they just want it to go away. They don't want to go through the process because it disempowers them and drags them through; they just want to find another way to resolve the situation and know what their options are—they won't want *us* to go to Human Resources. That constrains me as a faculty member if a student comes to me with that problem, because then I have to tell them that I'm required to report it and you have to go through the process. I'm wondering if that's a state requirement to report it or part of other policies...?

RC: I will ask. The policy office has a close relationship with our legal counsel and can ask.

LJ: In California, it's the law.

AC: I know that reporting abuse is required; but I don't know about sexual harassment...it puts an odd situation if a student comes to you as a faculty member; especially female students may not want to go through the process because more people will know about it, and they just want it to go away.

RC: As the ombuds, what should a faculty member do? Should they refer students to your office before the student goes any farther?

AC: Absolutely. It's a little different...my ombuds training said that this is a nationwide issue being dealt with; many have gone out on a limb and said that they don't have to report, and they've chosen to take that legal risk, and their legal counsels have chosen to back them on that. Right now, as our charter is in place, it's controversial.

RC: Thank you for that. I don't think most faculty are even aware that they'd have to report that. Any other policies you'd like to see addressed? Right now, the policy office has and agenda and plenty to work on, but if there's something particular that's out of date, or something that's newly arisen, they will work with us on incorporating something else into their cue. OK, NS is our representative on the Presidential Search, and he's going to let us know how that's going.

NS: We've had meetings to set up to take place on January 15. There will be a committee meeting on that date, then, on January 30, they'll have constituents meetings at 2, 4, and 6 to meet with the committee members. Then there'll be a subsequent meeting on February 13. Other than that, there hasn't been much interaction.

RC: This is part of the transparency. We want to make sure everyone can follow the process as much as possible. We know that some things will be kept confidential, but just knowing that the meetings are going on and so forth is helpful. Some faculty have already expressed to me that having that policy I sent around was helpful.

SL: Is there an application period that closes at a specific date?

NS: I don't know...I was anticipating that they'll tell us at the first committee meeting.

AC: I know that there are people out there getting their applications together.

RC: My understanding is that they won't actually decide on final qualifications until *after* theseconstituency meetings—they want to hear what the community wants, and we're part of the community before they even make a formal announcement.

SL: Is it a national search?

RC: Yes. We can use the SUU one as the most recent precedent, and it was a national search with four finalists.

AC: They hired internally from Snow College.

RC: If you look at their hiring practice, every single President at a four-year institution in-state was hired from in-state.

AC: It seems like three of the last four have been from Snow College...

RC: But the finalists tend to come from different areas, but the final, chosen person always has Utah connections. I don't know why that is, but they've made it clear that "comfort in the community" is a criterion—knowing Board of Regents practices, so forth is an advantage and may have something to do with it. It may be coincidental depending who the candidates are. Now, with all of that, what do you want the Executive Committee to do this semester besides vote on our replacements? That will be coming sooner than you think! ... All these policies are coming, and in a way, we're *re*acting to those. Which is fine because these are important policies, but is there anything you think we should tackle?

AC: I'm wondering if we should try to get ourselves onto our department meetings, so that we can bring up these topics rather than setting around e-mails all the time...? If people are at department meetings, I can get a sense of their thoughts from talking, if not actually have a vote.

LJ: The Library already does this.

RC: That's an excellent idea—if these changes we talked about are implemented, we're going to have more things to vote on and greater decision-making power. One of the concerns that administration had was about giving the two Executive Committee representatives *too* much power, because it's only two people but they were comfortable with this body *as a whole* having have more power and influence collectively. And I think that *you* will feel more comfortable having more feedback from your constituents.

NS: I don't know if that's a goal, but I'd feel more comfortable going to University Council and Academic Council with more specific information and consensuses from various departments, so that the senators represent accurate viewpoints. I think all of you want to make sure that you want your responsibility to be that each faculty member you've gone to has their views heard.

JDH: The only problem with that is that it's predicated on all departments actually *having* regular department meetings.

RC: I've been pleasantly surprised at the diversity of opinions within departments. Sometimes departments get stereotyped as voting in a certain way, but in some of the votes we've been having and collecting, there's a wide variety. So you may know a few people you hear from often, but the broader information you can get, the better we can represent all faculty.

NS: I know we have 170-190 faculty, or whatever, but an organizational chart that shows who represents what would be helpful for elections and for general business.

RC: That's important, and we'll make these things more explicit—part of the problem has been defining even "department" is problematic because of political use of terminology. "Departments" get more money than "programs." "Areas" get even less money—that's just how budgets work. Some of the things called "departments" aren't really. I'll try and get a list of who you are supposed to represent...it may be more than you realize. I will try.

AC: Did we ask the Executive Committee member that is actually representing IT to be our web-site person? So it's someone internal? I suspect that'd be an easy thing for that person. Someone that can go in quickly and make changes and additions, such as a list of all the members. I'm thinking of someone more like a webmaster, or someone attached to Faculty Senate that isn't necessarily a representative but...

LJ: The librarians could do that; we update ours.

AC: Someone that has the knowledge to do it quickly, but that's their primary responsibility, and they'd be attached to the Executive Committee. That person could put that chart up there, and when it changes, they can go right in and change it.

RC: Then it would be transparent—people could see who they're reporting to.

AC: Right. And there could be a link for "current Faculty Senate issues," and ones for "Policies X, Y, and Z." And we could have one for "suggestions for Faculty Senate issue"—it'd help us a lot to get information out there. And it would help us in our department meetings, we can just put the web site up and show faculty members and talk about what's going on, even if we can't get to everything.

SL: Could Canvas be used for that?

LJ: It could—the Education Committee uses a Canvas site for that that we upload stuff to.

RC: Do you want it public or restricted? A web site would be more public.

LJ: Martha is now the administrator for Sharepoint for policy, but probably could give us a site there, too, I don't know.

RC: If you know of a faculty member that likes to do this kind of thing, for whom web maintenance is easy—it won't take much time, but someone that likes organizing the information structurally...that's trickier. Someone that likes doing that would be great.

AC: We could also put the professional development form there eventually—it would be on a faculty page rather than on an Human Resources page.

RC: If it's a web site, it'll have to conform to our style guide, so whomever is doing this would have to be comfortable with those standards.

AC: Faculty resources would be there, and we could put up issues about tenure, interesting articles to read, etc.

RC: It's a great idea! A functional web site would be useful.

LJ: Curtis Larsen, as the IT person, would probably be ideal, but I could do it—I've been a webmaster.

RC: It's not a computer programming thing, just information organization more than graphic design. Someone that likes to think that way. LJ, if you have time to keep up with it, that'd be great!

NS: So you'll report back next meeting in a month on progress on that?

LJ: Yes. I'll talk to the IT people to see about getting access to that.

RC: Keep in touch with me and NS, and check the minutes, for kinds of information to go onto the page. But that sounds wonderful—thank you for that! Any other pressing goals or ideas?