

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Oct. 4, 2012

---

*In attendance:*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*Ami Comeford (AC)*

*Robert Carlson (RCa)*

*Rob Cowan (RCo)*

*John Goldhardt (JG)*

*Jerry Harris (secretary)*

*Lish Harris (LH)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Scott Lindsey (SL)*

*Rick Rodrick (RiR)*

*Russ Ross (RuR)*

AC: Let's go ahead and get started. MSL and BS are out today and send their regrets. We have only five items today so I hope we can get through it and finish the agenda. First, a summary of the Academic Council meeting: RC and I attended and I wanted to give you a rundown. There was a ratification of an e-mail vote for the History B.A. and B.S. and minor, which will be at the January Board of Regents meeting, and that will be a benchmark for university status.

RCa: Wasn't the B.A. supposed to go up in November?

AC: I think they were waiting to see. The Social Science Composite would be on the November Board of Regents meeting, with no concerns. E-marketing is a certain approval, if not in November then not until the March agenda. The B.S. in Aviation Management was suspended at the urging of the Commissioner because of low enrollment, so they put it on hiatus.

RCa: Suspension is actually more severe than "on hiatus."

AC: True, but they just didn't see a future to it. But current students are allowed to finish; they just won't enroll anyone new. Dance was already approved, but they made a few alterations. Textbook policy was addressed: there was a question about the language discussing faculty receiving textbooks on behalf of the college; the faculty would be able to retain and use those materials. And the concept of considering them gifts, especially the unsolicited ones—we are not allowed to accept gifts with values over \$50.

RCa: We did make a recommendation that language about receiving such books on behalf of the college be stricken, but we were overridden.

RCo: The books are out of date in 2 years, so aren't they chasing their tails anyway?

AC: Well, yes, but it's a matter of practice about retaining and using them.

RCa: Just not selling them back.

SL: So what about those people coming in to my office and offering to buy books?

AC: We're not allowed to do that.

SL: So why are they allowed to come in?

AC: They're free to come into public buildings.

RiR: Why is this an issue?

AC: Because people might be requesting them just to turn around sell them and make money.

RiR: So what? Isn't that only the publisher's problem?

AC: Well, it's still the gift issue.

JC: I don't see how they're gifts.

AC: They are going to take all of these questions to the Attorney General and ask him. Another question posed by a faculty member is on the Federal case law that covers this issue, which could overrule that aspect of our policy—it wouldn't apply. That too will be asked to the AG.

RCa: If that's the case, the language doesn't belong there.

AC: The policy is up until the end of the month, so let your faculty know to read and be aware of this.

RCa: It may already be illegal to sell books back, regardless of this policy.

RR: So this makes the books fall under the existing campus property rules? We had this problem trying to sell old RAM chips—the process of doing that was really long and arduous.

AC: This came up in the last section—what do we do with all these books? If a faculty member leaves, does the department chair just collect them all? So the suggestion is that the books belong to the faculty member even if you are accepting it as a member of DSC.

RR: So we sometimes give away textbooks as prizes, but we couldn't do that with school property.

AC: RR, will you pose that issue directly to Pam via the Academic Council web site? Click on the policy link and it'll take you to the comments section. That would be good for them to have before going to the AG. Anything else on that? OK, the next issue: the degree proposals. Recreational Studies was tabled; it would have been the most progressive degree in terms of the portal concept. Instead, they made it an Integrated Studies program. The Earth Studies INTS emphasis was to come up, and it too was tabled because INTS is looking for a replacement for a recently retired faculty. Digital Forensics—basic certification was passed because it was part of grant program that had to go through—it was written into the grant before getting approved. But that passed. There was also a Career Day clarification: on our official calendar, it suggests that classes before 4 PM are cancelled. But there's variation in that among classes, and Career Day is over by 1 PM. So the solution was to say exactly what it is in the calendar: lectures between 8–1 are cancelled on Career Day. Deans are supposed to send out e-mails to their faculty to abide by that so students aren't confused.

RCa: What about buildings that aren't affected by Career Day?

AC: No resolution about that—it's being worked on.

RIR: They're going to change the actual wording?

AC: Yes.

DH: Will they indicate which buildings.?

AC: It will be all classes, regardless of building.

SL: Who owns Career Day?

AC: The college, but it's mostly for high-school students. But it's sponsored by the college—our Career Office organizes it. I don't know that they own it, but they organize it. Our students are the ones that staff the information tables. It's on November 13. Next issue: workload recommendations. There's a proposal to have the FYE Coordinator go to full time and have six hours of release time for that. If you didn't take a look at that, please do so because there are some really important things there. A dean brought up that this shifts release time in different direction than the existing Department Chair model—the coordinator would get *more* release than a Department Chair, so we need to be aware of that. This was new business. Be aware that that's a move to have that position have release time under a new model. A second issue: independent study. Again, please take a look at that and make sure your faculty are aware of it. That issue is to adjust the language: right now, the model suggests that faculty cannot count overseeing independent study as part of their regular workload, and they want to strike that language out to create more flexibility to assign those classes. Pam also was there and indicated that the language was just put there just last November, so there's a concern about why it now needs to come out. Make sure your faculty look at that. You may also want to get in touch with people in your areas that are on the Faculty Workload committee, talk to them, and get a sense of what they are thinking. OK, the Institute for Business Integrity: they want to have the individual in Business Department that oversees that get release time. In 2006, the policy suggested a release of 4 hours/semester at the Dean's discretion, but now they want it codified.

JC: What about the Dixie Forum?

AC: The person overseeing that don't get as much. Our Business contact says that the Institute is more work intensive. They wanted to see the policy to make a better judgment about it.

SL: That's a good example of a release-time issue juxtaposed with the Department Chair model again. I think it would be hard to say that a Department Chair has less work than that job!

AC: A dean brought that up, too. So this is something our faculty and constituents need to be aware of.

RCa: Dean Hinton said they hadn't looked at these in paired comparisons—just independently.

AC: The Workload Committee is a working committee and Dean Hinton is the chair. So get with the members of that committee in your areas. This is a retroactive thing because the hours were already in the proposal that initially created it the Institute.

JC: How much say do we have in increasing release time for chairs?

AC: We need to make that argument to the Faculty Workload committee—that committee is now comprised by faculty, not just deans like before.

SL: Does that all have to be approved by administration?

AC: Academic Council, yes. These have already been approved by the Workload Committee, so that's why we need to get voices on this so if it needs to go back to Workload Committee, we can push for that.

RCa: Given that they haven't made the comparison to department chairs, that's a good reason to send it back.

DH: I'm on that committee. Given how much work Sarah Black has put into FYE, the number seemed appropriate, but we never even discussed the chairs in the consideration of it.

RCo: I'm hoping they're also considering that *starting* a program will require a lot more time than running it later. So is that number fixed and annual?

AC: Yes, it'd be built into the position.

RCo: Well, I was thinking that the number might dwindle over time, but I guess that's hard to do.

RCa: Well, and the programs grow over time, too, making more work.

AC: Maybe no faculty have concerns about this, but we want to be sure they're aware. That was it for Academic Council—any last-minute questions or concerns? OK, we have a College Council meeting this afternoon, and anything that comes up there, I'll let you know.

RCo: What is that meeting?

AC: College Council is everything that goes through Academic Council—it has representatives from all different areas of campus: Institutional Effectiveness, the grounds folks, security, etc. And the President is the head of that. OK, our next issue: the 0.68-and-up faculty—should they be on Faculty Senate? We now have lots of these people on campus—they're not technically adjunct, but not full time, either, so they're in a null space, and the question is whether or not we as the Faculty Senate should consider them more as the full-time. That would mean that they would have representatives and be able to vote on faculty issues, and I was asked to pose that question to this body and, through you, to your constituencies?.

RCa: They're becoming permanent-like members...they're not temps even though they're one-year appointments that get repeated every year.

AC: The ones in my department are very involved in things: department meetings, interdepartmental committees, they're advisors, etc. So we need to consider this.

JC: How many people are we talking about? What percentage of faculty?

AC: Good question—I'd have to get that information from Pam. Most departments have a lecture-advisor, so there's that many, plus a few others.

RCa: Some of those are only 0.5.

AC: Sure. But we're getting more all the time—they're announced frequently. I think we should consider this and get feedback from our constituents. Keep in mind that the concept of what is a "faculty" member is in a new policy that I have not yet seen from Martha. Nevertheless, these 0.68-and-up people may not be considered faculty in that policy.

RR: Maybe we could say "from their second year forward."

AC: Sure, to ensure that the people have a "permanent" position on campus. Would we want someone that represents that group? We're content based, but they're position based. Would we want someone to represent their interests, but not be voting?

JG: I'm not opposed to having them here, and I think they have a lot to offer.

AC: They tend to be more involved than adjunct faculty. So please take that back to your constituencies, get what they see as pros and cons, and we can have more discussion next time. News on the smoking initiative: I want to go around the table and get the feedback you've received from your constituents.

RCo: Physical Science was at the general Faculty Senate meeting, so you heard from them.

LH: No responses from my people.

SL: I have not had a department meeting yet at which to bring it up.

RcA: Only one person in my area had feedback, and they thought the ban was too extreme.

JC: I had three responses: they disagree with a ban and say what we have now is good enough.

RR: I had three too, all opposed.

RiR: No concerns from my area.

DH: I talked to three people, and they thought the ban sounded fine to them, but didn't see how it would be enforced or understand why it would go through when there's no enforceability. They also wanted to know how it would blend with state law.

JG: All in my area said they were in favor of it.

SL: We don't know what "it" is at this point—it's poorly defined as an initiative. So to say we're in favor of "it" is vague.

RCo: It's a smoke-free campus.

RiR: But if we're in favor, right now it's not to get involved in the student process.

AC: It's a student initiative, but we *do* have faculty and staff that smoke, so what the students are proposing impacts the people we represent.

RiR: But no support, or lack thereof, of what we do now impacts what the students are doing with their initiative right now. This is something on which the students can move forward, but no action we take can commit us to being for or against it.—not until it's more fully formed, until they have proposals on paper.

RCa: But we still have something to work with: the faculty seem to be against a ban. Other details, like enforcement—that's what we need to find out more about.

RiR: But I'm just saying that if my department is in favor of the *initiative*, it doesn't mean that they're in favor of the *ban* or whatever the students come out with.

AC: I understand that—we can approve the process, but withhold judgment on the final result.

JG: Last summer I stayed in a hotel on California State University Fullerton campus, right near where their student government works, so I went and asked how their ban worked there. They said that they didn't know of any other way—they knew of no problems with it, but they've had it for a while. But apparently no big issues ever arose there, which surprised me.

AC: It might just become part of the institutional philosophy.

LH: Well, by way of comparison, we're already alcohol-free, but no one goes around checking students' bottles—drinking is just something that isn't done.

RCa: It may not affect recruiting of students, but it might affect recruiting of staff.

AC: I'll see where the staff representative is on that.

RCa: Our smoking faculty tend to be discreet.

AC: OK, I'll try to meet with Dean Beatty and get something in written form from the students to address these issues. I just don't want them to go forward and assume that we don't have reservations because we haven't said anything yet, which they kind of already have done. I just don't want us to be left behind. They don't seem to want to consult us, so we have to insert ourselves into the process. I did hear from the English faculty concern about the diversity issue in the smoking ban—a ban might prevent some of the people we want here for diversity feeling welcome on campus. I'm going to skip the dues feedback issue on the agenda for time and move to the issue of our general Faculty Senate meeting times: in my original proposal—we had some people at our last 4 PM meeting that can't come to noon meetings, and that's what we wanted to see. The question is: can we come to a compromise of having at least one meeting during the semester at the different time? Does that seem feasible?

LH: I'm not opposed to it—in my mind, that's my purpose: if one of my faculty members can't attend the meeting, then they have to respond to my e-mails so I can voice their opinions. There's never going to be a mode of communication that everyone will be able to attend or be happy with. But when my department chair described this position to me, it was that I'll be the voice for the faculty members in my area. So if they can't attend, then that's what I'm here for. If they can attend, then great. But I think regardless of meeting time, *that* needs to be communicated to faculty members—just because you can't get to any meetings doesn't mean you don't have a voice. I try and communicate things from these meetings to my faculty in e-mails, and if they don't respond, then they've had their opportunity. We just need to better communicate to them that regardless of meeting time, they have an avenue to make their voices heard. So I don't think the time is a big deal.

RCa: Well, the reason we'd like attendance at the meetings is that although we like to hear the representatives' thoughts, it gives us more clout if we can say that we've heard from large numbers of people when we talk to administration.

LH: And there are ways to address attendance at those meetings. But at the end of the day, people that can't go still have a voice. The general meetings seem just to be rehashing issues from these Executive Committee meetings, so there's a disconnect between what the Executive Committee meetings are for and what the general meetings are for. If we say "Here's what FSEC is going forward with doing—are there problems with that?" That's when the general meetings are useful.

JC: From what I've heard in my area, half of the people like the 4 PM time, half like noon. When there's an important vote, maybe we could do both.

RR: When it comes to a noon meeting, most of my department usually elect to go to lunch instead. What if we accommodate it more like office hours—a general meeting could go from 11:30–1:30 and people can come in whenever in that span that they’re available, so they get face-to-face time.

RCa: My concern with that is that sometimes these meetings aren’t just people saying things, but they’re dynamic and inspire discussion, and those discussions sometimes produce new results that wouldn’t have happened otherwise.

RR: We can keep that part, but keep open longer access times.

JC: When it’s an issue people care about, they will try to get to a meeting.

DH: We don’t currently have any library faculty that have conflict with either time, but they generally liked the idea of having the opportunity available at least occasionally for those that do teach at noon to go to the meetings. I agree that we definitely should make sure that our constituents know that they have a voice even if they can’t be there, but there’s also value in feeling the connection you only get if you can attend. There will always be faculty that won’t care to ever attend, but there are others that will feel disconnected by never getting to attend.

AC: So we’re getting differing senses of this—if you think it would be useful, ask your faculty for feedback again on these other ideas, like a longer open-access period of time, or a varying schedule—they can decide, and I’ll send out agendas, and they can decide if they want to come.

RiR: It seems to me that there are two issues here: one is the meeting time, but the other is the issue of the exact relationship between someone on *this* body, someone in the Senate, who the Senate is speaking for, etc. On the thing you sent out, you talked about the representative body vs. the dues-paying body—some of these issues we’re talking about fall into that. It’s who speaks about these issues.

AC: We’ll take that up next time.