

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Nov. 15, 2012

---

*In attendance:*

*Robert Carlson (RCa)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*Scott Lindsey (SL)*

*Ani Comeford (AC)*

*Del Parson (DP)*

*Rob Cowan (RCo)*

*Russ Ross (RuR)*

*Jerry Harris (secretary)*

*Matt Smith-Lahrman (MSL)*

**NOTE: Someone at today's meeting left a pedometer in the conference room. It's currently with Tracey O'Kelly, the library secretary, at her desk outside the conference room.**

AC: Let's go ahead and start; I think we have a quorum and are expecting 13 people. First: we need to approve the minutes from last time—has everyone read them? (Approved.) Next: several meeting updates. Academic Council: we had requested to table the FYE instructor workload issue, to be sent back to the Workload Committee to address questions. It was not carried—not approved. RCa and I and one other person were the only ones that voted to table it. So it went through. The others issues on the docket did, too, but that was the only one we asked to be tabled for more discussion.

DH: They were aware of the implications of allowing it to go through?

AC: They didn't find our reason a viable one not to approve it.

RCa: But they have agreed to address workload concerns in general.

SL: A person in my department cited several places in the current policy where workload is spelled out in detail.

RCa: What we brought up was that several positions are *not* addressed *specifically* in policy, and they need to be systematized. It seems to be done in a "seat-of-the-pants" manner—there's no formal process.

SL: His response would be that it's for the Workload Committee to deal with and that there's already sufficient policy.

AC: Dean Hinton suggested that the process wasn't as structured as it could be and talked about how to go about doing it in a practical way to address issues. Oh, one other issue: I mentioned at that meeting that for Career Day, some of *our* academic programs were cut from the presentations and no reason or criterion was cited for doing so. So there's a sense that Donna & the academic deans need to find out why and if there's a set criterion for what *is* included and what *needs* to have a place. Especially because we cut *our* classes in lieu of them.

MS: You mean the baccalaureate programs?

AC: Yes. For example: the English degree—it was cut. We had an e-mail about a week beforehand and were told we were cut. And we're not the only one.

SL: Who runs Career Day?

AC: Our career office.

DH: I have an observation: were you in the building (the HCC) on that day?

AC: I heard about the ruckus. It was very loud, and visiting students were disrespectful.

DH: And not just to library-related people—they were disrespectful to our students! When you say "loud": I had to shut my door because they were in the lobby screaming at the tops of their lungs. Not just talking loud—screaming. It was pretty upsetting—we had lots of complaints from our students, so we canceled a day of *our* classes to host these students that didn't seem to care. They acted like it was party day and nothing productive.

DP: Was that a few bad apples?

DH: Huge groups on multiple levels.

RCa: When Career Day was brought up, it became obvious to me that its purpose has evolved: originally it was for recruiting; now it's not. I wonder if we should address whether or not it's worth losing classes and creating these disruptions. The ones they cut were *our* academic programs!

AC: The college committee needs to address that. Clearly this building (HCC) isn't where it should be done. Maybe we need to revisit that.

SL: I'd like to see it remain because it dilutes the Spring Academic Fair.

AC: The one in the Burns arena? For our students?

SL: It was in the Gardner Center last year, but with our growth & re-staffing of the Career Center, they're really trying to build it up and use it for recruiting for our graduates. It's confusing to have both.

AC: Maybe combine all the efforts...?

SL: No, they're very different.

AC: Ah, I was thinking of the one in the Burns Arena.

PA: That's for high schoolers.

SL: They're doing a good job of elevating recruiting in the Spring, so if we can eliminate the confusion...

RCa: It's disturbing because the high schoolers aren't even supervised—they're just dropped off.

RCo: That's not always the case; I had a chaperone who was a former student drop by and say "Hi."

AC: Has the library staff and faculty put something together to send to the Career Center?

DH: A couple of them.

MS: Has anyone else had the problem of them originally saying "No classes before 4" and then a week before Career Day say "No classes before 1"?

RCa: They're aware of this problem and will clear up confusion next year.

PA: So why are there three separate events? Why not coordinate them all?

AC: I think that's a good question. OK, RCa will do our College Council update.

RCa: The meeting went fast, and there were just two issues of concern to us. First, I got yelled at for commenting about the way the new accreditation process works. It's an ongoing, dynamic process—not just one big kill-yourself year. It's spread over 7 years, and we're in the first. We have to review our core themes, and one was to change our stated values to reflect the "Dixie spirit." I suggested that that was premature given that "Dixie" may not remain in the name, but they got annoyed with that. The other more substantive issue was that the Board of Regents policy requires us to have a 24-credit-hour workload when we become university—that doesn't need formal ratification; it literally comes with the label.

AC: And will go into effect in the Fall.

RCa: However, Donna is of the opinion that losing three credits means that we're supposed to give something back—whether that's research, or what we don't know. I observed that it's rare that a university that requires research requires even 15–18 hours, let alone 24, but she's using UVU as a model. I don't know how it works, but their Math Department requires 27 hours. So there will be a discussion about what 24 credit leaves. She thinks it means more than leaving campus an hour earlier.

PA: How are departments going to cover the necessary classes on the 24 credit-hour schedule?

RCa: That was most of the discussion, and they don't have a resolution. In the short term, we're expecting a major enrollment drop in the Spring, and we may be able to absorb the loss that way. I don't know exactly, though. There's too many unknowns. President Nadauld says the reduction could be up to 15%. It may be a big change for one semester, or longer; we don't know.

AC: It will be a recurring question for at least 2 years until the shift happens to balance out the missionary age change—we have to absorb it for 2 years, so we may have to revisit this issue again later.

PA: Does university status come with more funding?

RCa: They're negotiating that with the Board of Regents and the legislature.

RuR: They once said they weren't going to hire any new faculty until we became a university, now they're not even saying that.

AC: It seems unlikely we'll get a huge increase—the portal thing was a way to sustain university status without additional funding. The legislature has a mandate that 60% of Utah's population should have a college education, so there's some funding from that program, but not necessarily for us as a university specifically, just as a piece of the education pie.

RCa: They're pushing a political approach that Utah will have three open-enrollment, regional universities that get enrollment numbers up. We're the southern part of the state, so we can get money from that. That's their logic—it's starting to sink in with people. Hopefully, that raises our status.

AC: Just as a bit of information: this may not happen, but about 6 months ago, at the General Education Board of Regents Task Force meeting, there was discussion about non-open enrollment institutions raising their admission standards as a way of saying *everyone* should raise their standards. But the problem is that as they limit their enrollments—close their doors to students—if that gains traction, it could affect us.

PA: Steve Urquhart has been pushing that all along, though.

AC: Yes. There were some people on that task force from other institutions that were in support of it, too, but whether or not it would be implemented is outside the purview of this task force. But it could affect us.

MS: Hiring new faculty isn't just about accommodating growth—it's also about program growth, even if enrollment is down. We still have to offer more classes for the majors we have, and existing faculty cannot teach all the necessary classes!

RCa: Even though the economy is getting better, the enrollment drop is still a huge effect, so we don't know what our budget is like.

AC: We should have a better sense of that next semester.

RCa: OK, next: the Dean's Council. We had a faculty perspective—Donna has been a good advocate for us, when others feel threatened by us faculty, she defends us, but some deans have a different perspective.

AC: OK, next: we had a meeting with President Nadauld at which I had 10 issues that I brought up that came from this body or from the general Faculty Senate meetings, and I'll go through those. (1) In terms of the legislature funding, he said state revenues seem to be up, and as of this point, his #1 priority is compensation for faculty and staff, and money put toward the state's 60% goal would be in STEM programs. (2) An update on meetings with individual Regents about the university status—he had said previously that he'd go door-to-door to convince them, and he's confident about getting a 100% vote on it. (3) Obstacles to university status: he expects 28 of 29 votes in the Senate; he's not sure about the House. Some Representatives might not be supportive. He felt good overall, though. (4) Benchmarks: all that we are supposed to meet will be met by the time the Board of Regents has its meeting on this in January. (5) The name change: will the Board of Regents have an impact on votes? No, no impact at all—the Board of Regents would have no influence of naming or branding at all.

RCa: After we become a university, we'll have 2 months to decide on a name.

AC: Steve Johnson says ours will be finalized in January 6. As for the process of the name change—I'll talk about that in a moment. (7) Funding for undergraduate research: this was an issue that came up at the general meeting. We talked about this with Donna, and she's in favor of us putting in a budget request for that, so we need to decide how to go about that and make that formal request. She's very open to and supportive of this, and supports separating it from other faculty funds. (8) Our second-century goals: we do have a faculty representative on that. He said they'll be meeting in January on that, and the issues will be enrollment and Master's programs. We'll report back on that later. (9) The missionary task force—if you have questions about this, the chair of that committee is Frank Lojko about how they're going to absorb it. They want to increase international enrollment: it's up in the Spring, but he's concerned about next Fall. He believes we'll make up our tuition difference in 2 years, when the new missionaries come back, but the concern is that they won't come back at all—that they'll just go straight to BYU. He mentioned that our tuition/state funding ratio is 55/45—we rely more on tuition than state funding, hence the concern about enrollment.

MS: Is the task force thinking about targeting non-LDS populations?

RCa: Definitely.

AC: And how we do recruiting. I e-mailed Frank about setting up meetings with him about the task force, but I haven't gotten a response yet. I don't know what faculty are on it.

RCa: President Nadauld even offered a strategy for Nevada residents. Right now, with the "good neighbor" policy, southern Nevada residents get in-state tuition, but they pay an additional processing fee. He's offered scholarships for that, to make tuition identical to in-state. That was one attempt to try and increase enrollment from those areas. So they are trying to think creatively and broaden their reach.

AC: The last issue was a Curriculum Committee issue: the History degree will go through on Board of Regent's calendar at the same time as the university status vote, so we're not expecting any problems there. We have another meeting with President Nadauld at the end of this month, so if you have other issues, let us know. OK, back to the name change process: I met with Steve Johnson about how this will go forward. The end date of this is January 18 when the Board of Trustees meets on this. On January 10, there will be a town-hall-style meeting at which they will present the top three choices at that point. The three will be based on recommendations from the advertisement agency they hired (Sorensen). All of their information is being sent to the BYU ad lab for analysis—that's the one the ad agency uses anyway; this wasn't a choice from within DSC. Apparently, it's a nationally recognized lab.

PA: They have a new survey up.

AC: Yes, it's on-line, and please encourage your constituents to fill it out so they have as much data as possible. After these meetings, all data and the overall process will be transparent and on-line, and the ad lab will send back their analysis, and from that, the ad agency will give the three choices; after that, they'll collect new data, and then make a final recommendation to the President. This will *not* be a committee of three people locked away; it will be the Board of Trustees and the President. One other thing about it: there is a Naming Committee, and I have asked if there's a Faculty Senate representative on that. Steve said no, but he'd like one. We need to take that offer—would someone volunteer? It's not a group in charge of deciding the name; it's just to look at the data and check the research—watch the process. We do have some faculty on there, but not specifically from the Faculty Senate. The committee right now is made of people with experience in marketing and graphic design. I'd like to have a member from this body on it. It shouldn't be a high-workload committee—it's just to keep tabs on process and keep us in the loop, so when research comes in, they can let us know if there's anything faculty need to do.

JC: When do they meet? We have like 2 weeks of classes left!

AC: Presumably at the end of this month and in January, but I don't know specific dates. There were a few people added to it in October.

DH: I'll do it.

AC: I'll put you in touch with Steve Johnson.

DH: I already have a good working relationship with his office.

AC: I really think this will be helpful for us—we've been asking repeatedly to have a place at the table for things like this for past few years, and every time we have an opportunity, we need to take it to keep us informed and keep it transparent.

DH: Was it the Sorensen Group that created new survey?

AC: I assume so.

DH: There was some chatter amongst faculty that they were totally identifiable based on the questions the survey asked. I heard some people say they fudged the identifiable bits of information just to remain anonymous. I can't imagine any kind of backlash, but...

AC: I would imagine they were comfortable doing that because they're an outside entity—their numbers are not going through our administration, but I don't know. I asked if we can have a Sorensen person come address us at our Nov. 29 meeting, if this body agrees that's useful? (Many yeses.)

DP: The survey I took already had a list of names on it.

DH: But you could fill in your own.

RCa: Regardless of the skepticism of past processes, they are bending over backward to keep this open—the name has not already been chosen. President Nadauld is afraid of losing "Dixie," but has said that if that's what the data show, he will go with it. We already have one Trustee vote against keeping it.

PA: What made me suspicious was when they told us what to and what not to touch in that meeting in the Zion room—some things they said cannot be touched and weren't on the table. It made me wonder if all this was just lip service.

AC: My inclination is that it's not a done deal just because of the money being spent from the President's discretionary fund—the money is not from donations or anything; it's from interest generated by state funds. They're spending a lot of money to do this, so I think they're at least willing to look at the data...whether or not they think it will affect their decision I don't know. But the process seems to be transparent. OK, so I will ask them to pen us in to come to the Faculty Senate meeting. Also, we've had a request from our accreditation person (Debbie Bryant), who wants to talk to us about the on-site visit report at the general meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup>. She specifically asked to do this in order to keep us informed, so I need from you that that's OK to do...? (Yes.) I don't think she'll need more than 15 minutes, and we'll devote rest of the meeting to the Sorensen Gp. OK, last item: an update on the smoking initiative.

RCa: It's going to happen. The Board of Regents not only wants it here, but across state. Because it's been done so much elsewhere; it's just a matter of how it will be implemented.

MS: So it wasn't really student driven.

RCa: No, it was. But it's almost definite that we will be smoke-free.

AC: It's not just our student government pushing for this; this was addressed by all student groups from all state campuses, and they decided they wanted this for all campuses; the only push-back they got was from Westminster.

MS: Which is private.

AC: But still represented in the student organization. It's a larger issue than just our campus; our student-body government was following this.

RCa: Along with this, they're meeting with current-smoker students and get their concerns and account for them, so there are issues about how to implement it.

AC: Are there any other issues?

RCa: The Curriculum Committee agenda item we discussed previously: they will now hold fast to deadlines for issues to be submitted. Just so you know.

AC: So we had some impact!

RCo: We had an incident in Chemistry in which a parent called the department that her students weren't getting high enough grades to get into medical school—she initially called to complain about *me*, and the students weren't even in my class! The person that *is* involved had a 3-hour-long meeting yesterday to deal with this, but my question is: why doesn't the campus have a specific person to deal with this kind of thing, rather than bogging down the faculty?

AC: The Dean of Students said it's not his area of issue.

JC: They were high school students...?

RCa: Yes, but it doesn't matter—they're at college, they fall under FERPA, so faculty cannot discuss anything about them, even with their parents.

AC: What I can do is get clarification about what to do in such situations in the future.

RCo: It took the person involved a *lot* of time to justify the grades he assigned, etc.

RCa: I wonder if the teachers should just say "I gave fair grades, and here's the syllabus, and if the student wants to appeal, they can—we have a policy for that." Extra credit is not otherwise in the syllabus.