

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

WORKING MEETING

November 7, 2014

In attendance:

Brent Albrecht (BA)

Clint Buhler (CB)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Alex Chamberlain (AC)

Cynthia Kimball Davis (CKD)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Jim Haendiges (JH)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

LJ Jones (LJ)

Matt Morin (MM)

Sandy Peterson (SP)

Helen Saar (HS)

Nate Staheli (NS; President)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

DH Warner (DoW)

Drew Wilcox (DrW)

NS: I don't have minutes from the last meeting because I haven't gotten them from Curtis Larsen; JDH wasn't here—that's the meeting where we worked on the document. We'll get those mailed to you so you can move on them and make them official. I think we can be quick on this agenda today, but there are some important informational and discussion items. Erin (O'Brien; President-Elect—*EO hereinafter*) won't be here. First, we do need to introduce CKD (describes herself—new on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a representative for adjuncts). We're pleased to have you; let us know what we can do to facilitate adjuncts. You'll find it interesting to note on our Constitution and By-Laws that will go before the faculty about having a permanent voting member on this body for adjuncts. We'd talked about having two non-voting members, but decided to have one voting member. We'll get through that. All right: the last meeting we had was to review the Constitution and By-Laws and vote on it—it's important we have that as a matter of record, and we'll have an e-mail vote to approve it and get it into the record. Items #2-3 on the agenda: report on meetings with the Academic Vice-President and the University President. I'll take those as part of the informational items we'll discuss today. If there's items that we talked at those meetings that aren't on here, I'll bring them up later. The first issue I need to bring up and explain is something that came up in the Academic Council meeting. Here's some history: the Udvar-Hazy School of Business has proposed a MW and TR bell schedule for its classes. Kyle Wells (*Dean of the School of Business—KW hereinafter*) vetted it through the process and talked about it with a few administrators, etc. It got brought up in Dean's Council as an aside about a month ago. EO made sure it was discussed at length there. I talked to KW about the importance of bringing it up at Academic Council because I believe that it affects the whole campus community. RC and I discussed concerns that some departments on campus may have with this. In Academic Council, I pushed that a vote be made on this issue so we could support it or not as an institution academically. I was informed that it was neither the place nor time to vote on this particular issue. I was concerned and asked if that meant that the deans all support it, and Don Hinton (*Dean of Humanities—DH hereinafter*) said no. But it's been decided. I asked if I could tell Faculty Senate; DH said you can't say that we all support it and that he has reservations about it, but that we've been made aware of it. So I'm letting you know that the deans are aware that the School of Business is on a different bell schedule. I followed up with DH about it...what the School of Business and its dean does with their schedule and the logistics behind it, I support the administration in trying to work through it, and I'm not critical of the decision, but I am critical of the *process* of the decision—let me make sure that is clear. The deans gave me the impression that they were confused why I was bringing it up, and I said it's because I believe it's my responsibility as Faculty leadership, and it is of academic importance and faculty may have concerns. There wasn't a vote, but the decision has been made, and it'll be implemented next semester. Bill Christiansen (*Academic Vice-President—BC hereinafter*) wants to run it as an experiment and see what issues will arise and all said issues will go through KW. I want to be clear that, at this point, creating turmoil over this will cause more problems than necessary. We can't change the schedule at this point. BC felt he could do this as Academic Vice-President. But I believe we can make enough of a discussion that the *process* needs to be clear and transparent.

RC: I can tell you some of the ramifications of this decision: Psychology now has no classes from 11–2 MWF because this decision doesn't affect just the School of Business. The English Department obviously doesn't have all their classrooms in here; they also teach in Udvar-Hazy; Psychology also does, as do other programs. So this decision *completely* undermines the policy bell schedule. It's a campus-wide decision that should never have been even *considered* at a school level, and that fact that one school thought they could unilaterally do this is baffling. I understand that BC wants to emphasize school autonomy, but you can't do that when it impacts other schools.

NS: I and EO have been extremely vocal about this in our meetings regarding this. I have a tremendous relationship with KW and I think he's frustrated with me for having this discussion with him, but I told him that the reality was that the process needed to be transparent.

RC: It's not just transparency—that just means informing others. There had to be *involvement* of all other involved programs, and the School of Business didn't even attempt to reach out to them. They didn't reach out to the Registrar or whatever, and as I understand it, as soon as they learned about it, the Registrar brought up objections, and Student Services raised objections—these are things they didn't even attempt to do in making a unilateral decision.

BA: This is the first I've heard of this—where do I go to see this new bell schedule? I want to try to understand how it might be impactful.

RC: Normal MWF classes will no longer fit into the Udvar-Hazy schedule. That will be impossible because they'll be on 75 minutes classes instead of 50 minutes classes. As soon as they reschedule the rooms, there will no longer be any 50 minute blocks available. Friday is available if you want a Friday-only class, but that's not going to happen.

DrW: Is that the purpose of this, to control the building?

RC: I think it was to give them Fridays off, so they could have meetings and such. But this is a result that has significant consequences for everyone else.

CB: It'll negatively affect Business students, too—they'll have a harder time scheduling classes.

BA: What happens when other schools decide to invent their own bell schedules?

RC: Some programs have to, like nursing and Health Sciences because of clinicals. Education sometimes does—there are times when odd schedules are necessary, but this was not necessary, but voluntary.

NS: The evolution of it again was—I believe it's been discussed during the summer with KW, DH, Sharon Lee, Stella (Callaghee), etc. Ultimately, BC gave KW permission to continue. In Dean's Council, where it first went as an information item, questions were asked and it was discussed heavily, and there it was noted by BC that we're going to try this on a temporary basis and see what happens. After receiving that information, I then informed KW that he needed to put it on Academic Council agenda, or I would, because I felt it needed to have a vote. I went to the meeting, and I hope this is on the record (I'll check to make sure): I asked to suspend the rules to make it an action item and vote on it, and they informed me that it was too late, that the decision had been made.

RC: That's the problem: the decision was made before involving the rest of campus.

AC: Some clarification for my sake: our purpose in debating this, given we can't do anything about it, is our purpose to come up with a better process for making such decisions, or just to get everyone informed?

NS: My purpose for bringing it up is to inform you that this has happened, and that faculty leadership has been in the middle of trying to make sure that in the future, such decisions are made in a transparent way, and should come through Faculty Senate and Academic Council—they should be vetted.

RC: It's a violation of the bell policy.

DrW: Because the decision has already been made, obviously we're not going to learn anything from one school trying it—the trial basis is kind of ridiculous. However, maybe it's worthwhile to ask the faculty what they think about putting our weight behind everyone adhering to the same bell schedule. There's been a lot of talk about coming up with, as many universities do, a day in which you can have all your service meetings and know there won't be any class conflicts—it might be worthwhile if we all taught Monday through Thursday and had Friday for those sorts of things. But because it's already a reality, and I highly doubt that Business will go back on it, maybe we can step into the future here...

NS: I believe that's what BC's thinking. But rather than go through thus long, drawn-out process of trying to vet this and examine all the hypotheticals, let's try it with one school and see what happens. I don't know that that's the best way to do it, but that's what our Academic Vice-President has done.

RC: Why shouldn't we create a hornet's nest and go over his head? This was not a decision he should have made unilaterally, and it's a violation of policy. Policies are useless if individual administrators can choose to violate them on a whim.

NS: I'm very comfortable making that statement. Part of my suggestion is that we make a statement on behalf of the Faculty Senate to state that. I don't think we can change what they've done—that's not going to help as far as *this* semester because the catalog is out there.

RC: We can still change our schedules now—we're having a heckuva time scheduling classes! So many students are suddenly finding out that classes that used to be taught at 11 or 1 have to be taught at 3 and 4 in the afternoon, which conflicts with their work schedules. It *is* impacting our students. They're aware of the plan, and it's causing a nightmare.

AC: Is any part of the process for making this decision centered around “will or will this not improve the student experience?” Or was it just a “let’s get Fridays off” thing?

NS: I don’t believe that KW and the administration of the School of Business intended this to get Fridays off—I really believe that. It was for committee meetings, training, short-term seminar classes, etc. That’s what I believe.

AC: But was the student experience considered? It seems to me that it will be a net negative as far as scheduling, etc.

NS: I don’t know...as I’ve had discussion with them about the process, KW believes it will be a net positive. He and BC have talked about it. DH has been clear with me that it’s been decided, and he knows its contrary to the bell-schedule policy. I think there are other schools that have done similar schedules not unilaterally, as far as the whole school, and all of classes, I know there’s been some freedom and flexibility in getting off the bell schedule in certain situations.

JH: Why not do this in the Fall? Why does this have to happen in the Spring?

NS: I don’t know. It’s a great question.

CKD: You said that this was being done on an experimental, temporary basis?

NS: That’s what BC calls it. If it’s a net negative this semester, we won’t continue it.

DrW: If this is temporary, I don’t think we create a hornet’s nest right now; I think we issue a statement and prepare. If it’s temporary, we need to get all our ducks in a row for when it comes back around, so we can say “the process was bad, this was hastily put together, no one had any input in it, and now look what’s happened.”

LJ: And it’s against policy.

RC: Especially how it impacts students—it might have a financial impact. Unfortunately, that’s probably the only way it will get undone, is if enrollments go down.

NS: There was a discussion about that in Academic Council about being a “soft cap” if students can’t get classes and enrollments go down.

RC: As an *intentional* part of the process?

NS: No. Frank Lojko brought up that this could be a soft cap. I guess what I need you to tell me is, as I go forth to BC and President Williams, what would you like me to do? Do you want me to go at it, and try to make a change with some of the scheduling going on *now* and make it an issue immediately, or issue a statement that it’s what we consider against policy and we disagree, but respect the fact that KW and BC made this decision and we’ll revisit it?

DrW: I think that’s the way to go. These guys are smart enough; let’s give them the benefit of the doubt, but we monitor them. Let’s see what really does happen. Maybe they’re right and everybody else is wrong.

BA: Can we include in that statement that if they wish to make this into a permanent schedule, that they will now go about the process correctly, since they’ve declared that this is temporary? Can that expectation be part of that?

RC: The problem is that to be implemented by next Fall, I don’t know that there’s enough time to start the process of getting it to the proper committees and get the policy process through. There’d need to have a 30-day window for policy change, which this would necessitate, and it’d have to go through all the steps all the way through University Council and the Board of Trustees, and I don’t think they could even get it through for Fall. Ramming it through for Spring was a lot of hubris. A broader issue: now that BC is pushing this sense of school autonomy, which overall I think is good, we need to establish boundaries where school autonomy ends and campus-wide input is necessary. This is just *one* issue that could be like that. At first blush, I’m positive that the School of Business expected this only to impact them, and they really didn’t anticipate the wide-ranging effects—that was short-sighted, in my opinion, that they didn’t reach out to Student Services and other departments that taught in that building. But there will be other issues that will come up along with this autonomy movement, where anything that impacts other teaching schedules has to go through a formal process, even if the main intent is just to affect your own school. But I don’t know what those guidelines would be.

SP: What’s the role of policy in all this—you just get to ignore policy on a departmental level? I think *that’s* the issue here.

RC: At the very minimum!

??: Is this the entire School of Business *and* Communications, or just Business?

MM: It’s all of Communications.

RC: That’s a policy that should never be violated, but there will be others things where policy will be absent where there will still be impacts on other schools that they shouldn’t allow.

NS: What’s the consensus—what are our options? I’ll do whatever you tell me to do.

CB: I think we all want to make a statement condemning the process. We need to outline something for the future, like RC said, so that on other issues that we’re not even thinking of, that school autonomy needs to think of the broad-ranging. On my point, I think it might be a positive direction. If they’d gone through the process and come to us, I really don’t think they would have had push-back. I’ve heard this from people around campus that it’s getting harder and harder to get committees to meet, and as the number of faculty grows, people might have been open to it. But this back-handed way violates trust between administration and schools. So while the deans are all putting on a brave face and saying “We’re aware of it,” I’m sure they’re all a little bit perturbed by how this happened.

NS: I don’t know, from the meetings I’ve been in, if the deans have any pull—it’s been “let them think about it.”

CKD: I say make a statement, to start with.

DrW: Would we want to put together a committee to monitor and look at all the data for when this temporary thing moves to the next stage?

NS: I think there's been enough discussion with the Registrar, and in the council meetings, that it already will be monitored greatly, but we can assign a couple of members of this group to monitor this and make sure that happens, sure.

RC: I'd trust Andrea Brown's office to collect data on student satisfaction with the new schedule and with the overall schedule, even with other, non-Business classes because of the ripple effects—is it a net positive or negative, and does it affect enrollment numbers...I think that's a way to gather those data objectively.

NS: So the first issue is: do we want to go to administration and say "Although they've made the decision, we want it changed to allow for MWF classes in these areas to alleviate tremendous logistical nightmares for students" ...? We have the ability to do that. Or is water under the bridge, and we're just "OK, the decision was made, let's now take the next best course" ...?

RC: Are you asking for a motion to vote on?

NS: If someone wants to put forth a motion, yes.

DrW: How much do we want to rock the boat on this? Can anything come out of it if we push them to the point where we're just butting heads?

RC: I don't know how far along scheduling is...it's a nightmare either way, I think.

NS: I think it's far enough along that if we rock the boat it'll majorly create logistical nightmares.

RC: Could I propose a different suggestion? Could we propose to President Williams that we look into whether that's feasible—re-changing the schedule, just ask them to consider it, but that if this is a temporary experiment, that we have a commitment that negative feedback from students as well as other programs would result in the rescission of this change and that if it'll be made permanent, it has to go through the proper policy channels.

NS: Absolutely, at a bare minimum that will happen.

LJ: Positive feedback, too.

NS: Absolutely...it could be a net gain.

CB: Which students do we monitor? Just Business students only?

NS: Everyone.

CB: If it's everyone else, is the actual issue the fact that they're on it and we're not? Would that negative feedback still be there if Psychology could still schedule classes at 11 but from 11-12:15 instead of 3-4? It'd be a very different situation—the feedback needs to be taken with a grain of salt.

NS: I think collective data and feedback—Andrea Brown's office can gather those data.

RC: She has the data on classroom availability; right now we don't have the ability for every school on campus to do that, and we don't have the classroom space without drastically changing when we offer classes.

MM: Did anyone look into whether or not it'd be feasible if every school did this in terms of classroom space? It sounds like there'd be such a ripple effect from just one school doing this that would it be possible?

RC: That should have been looked at *before* this happened, but Andrea Brown has those data.

MM: If it's a testing ground, even if it's successful, once you scale it—if there's no way to scale it without building another building—it's a silly experiment if it's not feasible.

NS: There could be a hybrid of it—there could be lower-division classes on a normal bell schedule and upper-division classes can be how each school wants it. I don't know that that's impossible. So, what I'm hearing is * that we really can't change what has been done, but we ask if we can change it; if they say no, we issue statement, if they say yes, we try to change it. And at that point ask for a commitment that if it results in a net negative, we go back to normal, or if it goes the other way, we go through proper channels in making the decision permanent.

RC: And whether it's a positive or a negative, ** it should be much more about students than faculty convenience. There are other ways of implementing a system so you can have meetings. For example, they used to have no classes at noon—we could reinstitute that much more easily across campus than something like this.

NS: As an aside, I'm a member of the School of Business—it affects me. BC is former dean of School of Business.

RC: Yes, there were lots of conflicts of interest involved.

NS: That's why I tried to take this to Academic Council—I don't want the perception to be, which I think it *is* on campus—that sometimes that building does what they want to do regardless of what others do. But for public disclosure, my dog in the fight is Faculty Senate. OK, so we'll move ahead that way—does someone want to make a motion?

RC: I intended mine to be a motion.

NS: OK. (Summarizes the motion, as per * above, with RC's ** addendum). All in favor? (All ayes.) OK, one item down. I do have in here an e-mail that I sent to RC basically outlining this; I can send you a copy if you want if for you your files, for transparency.

RC: If you never heard about this, that's troubling. I only heard about it because my department chair was having scheduling problems and my classes were getting changed.

NS: This all just came to my attention in the last month.

DrW: I didn't even know there was a bell schedule policy!

RC: It's for convenience for scheduling because when you have mixed schedules, then you have too many open gaps when classrooms aren't used.

LJ: And it's harder because we share buildings, it's harder to do individual bell schedules. If we all had our own buildings, it'd be a different story!

RC: Yes...Health Sciences has very unique bell schedules, but their own building, so it's no problem.

NS: We'll move forward, and my request is that we've addressed it here, and allow me to go forward and discuss this with administration, and I'll report back to you by e-mail the results of that. So please don't create issues about this on your own.

RC: Frank Lojko will probably have good ideas on data collection.

NS: OK, our next issue: BC has requested a statement from us by e-mail: can a sitting dean be eligible for rank advancement through the Faculty Review process? My understanding is that people with faculty appointments are eligible for rank advancement.

RC: No, by policy, because while serving as a dean, faculty status is suspended. But at most places, when a dean is hired, as part of their hiring they can negotiate a rank advancement.

NS: But that's not under the Faculty Review committee. BC wants approval on this from Faculty Senate.

RC: Just ask them to follow policy, period.

NS: I just wanted to make you aware. What I'll do is write a letter that we simply follow policy on this, that if a dean is hypothetically up for rank advancement, then because their faculty status is on hiatus or dormant, they do not currently have a faculty appointment and would not be allowed a rank advancement. When they become faculty again, they go back to where they were—they retain their rank and tenure, and their years of service, and their clock starts ticking again. This only applies to deans, not department chairs—deans are academic administrators. I just wanted to bring that to your attention, and get a decision from the Faculty Senate. OK, next is the Policy Committee: Faculty leadership was approached by Chris Durham (Board of Trustees) to be involved with a Policy Committee, which would (this is my suggestion) (reads). Chair Durham has gone to President Williams and asked that this Committee functions; Julie Beck, one of the Trustees, would be involved with this. President Williams confirmed that this will be a Board of Trustees committee with faculty invited to participate. He and Chair Durham concur that it shouldn't be under the umbrella of the university process. I don't know what that means. I'll suggest that it should have 1-2 faculty and staff, too, on it. It's primarily to oversee the proper functioning of school policy on campus.

RC: Would that be helping to prioritize policy? Currently, that's been the domain of Human Resources. Is the Board of Trustees wanting bigger role in that?

NS: Yes. It'll create oversight for the Policy Office and make sure we're going about policy in the proper way.

RC: That's nice that we were invited to participate—in the past, they've kept their committees to themselves.

NS: EO and I have visited with Chris Durham quite a bit about this and that we need to be involved. They didn't bring up staff, but I feel that staff need to be involved, too. It won't be creating policy; it'll just be oversight, which I think is good. This was just an information item, that Faculty Senate will have more of a role in policy oversight through this committee. I'm asking if we're OK with that? Any reasons why we wouldn't want to be involved? (No.) Faculty Constitution and By-laws is done, and is on Martha's desk for wordsmithing. We've had feedback that she's great with how we've crafted it and what we have in it and she's making it more readable and legal. Here's what I'm going to do: I'm hoping to get a copy of the new, wordsmithed version, along with what we've approved a month ago, and I'll send it to you so you can see the versions side-by-side, and then we'll put it to Faculty for 3 weeks for comments, and then we can put it to bed. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities: we've been after Martha's office for a copy of what we've worked on previously; we don't know where it's at, evolutionarily.

RC: I have a copy and some comments.

LJ: I still have mine, too.

NS: We'll get this going...it's been dragging, but we've agreed with the Policy Office to parcel it out. You'll be seeing from me over the next few weeks pieces of that policy, and it's our opportunity to really stand up for our rights and what that document should communicate. We should enter into this with an open mind. I don't know if there will be a ton of changes, but it's an important part of where we're at in our faculty government, in my opinion. Watch for that, and I beg you to play a role in that—I don't know what yet, but as we go forward please be involved! Next: President Williams will come to the next General Faculty meeting, which is Nov. 17 at noon. Do we need to have two sessions? Here's why I ask: President Williams has been asked to discuss where we are in the strategic planning process. I've been invited to sit in with the committee involved with the selection of consultants for that process, and I believe that the consultant has been selected but not announced. That announcement will come out at some point, and as an FYI, I've been to the President's office often to "demand" faculty involvement in the strategic process—so that the strategic planning process has faculty input, and that a good percentage of the Strategic Planning Committee is faculty members. I don't know the numbers. A month ago, he had attempted to put together a committee with EO's and my suggestions, but he tabled that

to see what the consultants would want. How it will shape up is that the committee will work directly with the consultants in putting forth the strategic plan. I think it's important that faculty *must* have a huge role in this process. I don't know if the person(s) on that committee will be from this group or at large—EO and I will be in consultation with President Williams. If we need to come back to the Senate for suggestions on faculty members, we'll do that. But I'm not asking for suggestions yet because I don't know if we're at that point in the process—if we do, I'll send an e-mail later. But President Williams will come on the 17th. We have that General Faculty meeting, there'll be food there sponsored by the Student Alumni Association; do we need to have two sessions so more faculty can be involved in dialog if there is dialog? Or will just a video tape of the presentation sent to the faculty suffice?

RC: Is it going to be a dialog or a presentation?

NS: My understanding is that his intention is to present, but that he'll entertain discussion after his presentation. The president has been really good about that, I believe.

CKD: We might need two sessions if there's dialog.

NS: I need to confirm his schedule, and I'll send out a SurveyMonkey out to faculty if they'd prefer a morning or an evening.

IJ: Adjuncts would be more likely to come in the evening if they're not teaching.

NS: I'll see what the President's schedule is and if he can do two sessions, and if he feels that's the case. If not, we'll definitely do the noon session. Other questions surrounding that? I think his coming is just to tell us where we're at and what he expects to have out of it. Along the way, there will be opportunities for dialog in town-hall-style meetings as we go forward crafting the strategy of the institution. All the presenters had that crafted into their processes, that they would have meetings to openly discuss what's in the best interest. We need to think about it. I really think that we have a real opportunity in the next 3-4 months to collectively shape this institution; we just need to use our voice as faculty. I'll send a document to you later for review: it's a map by Steve Urquhart, who is proposing through potential legislation maps to encourage students to graduate in 4 years.

RC: To obligate us to *allow* them graduate in 4 years.

NS: Create a system to, yes. It would reward institutions for that are able to do that by improving their graduation rates—kind of a “pay for performance” kind of setting. I was in an informal meeting with his office and a few others as he explained the process a bit. My concerns that I expressed were that because of our open enrollment here, it's more difficult here than the University of Utah or Utah State University, or Southern Utah University to get our graduation rates to increase. But there was some interesting discussion about structured courses—Utah Valley University is doing this, and they feel there is some progress made toward that. Not for discussion here today because I don't think we'll solve it, but I'll send you a link to a blog that Senator Urquhart has prepared on this. At some point, the Faculty Senate will need to have a united front on what we will and won't support. The difficulty is the political responsibility with this. We need to protect what's important for our students, but there are others involved high up in the political process.

RC: From what I understand, he has provisions for providing exceptions for students who aren't entitled to the promise of graduation in 4 years, that have to do with working outside of school and their own success in courses. I think that's where we have the most chance for influence, that those exceptions are reasonable. This process might still work out well; it just ensures that we offer enough classes. It might require more evening and weekend classes, etc. But if it's done properly, it hopefully won't impact curriculum structure and integrity of what we do.

MM: It could be an absolute nightmare for registration and advising—the logistics of navigating thousands of students' individual curriculum maps, and ensuring that they're following them, will be crazy.

NS: I think the fact that he's considering some of these innovative changes in higher education is refreshing, as long as we have dialog providing that the innovative change is proper. I'm not critical of him trying to do something of this nature because it opens our eyes to what *could* happen; I just believe that we have an opportunity to help craft this. When I send you the link, please read it, do some research, talk to your constituencies, and gather input so we can comment from our faculty what we think.

ST: Just to make sure I'm understanding: this map is, to an extent, we're saying that a student who comes here with the adequate preparation necessary to start a program, could follow said map to graduate in 4 years.

NS: Yes.

RC: And that if we don't provide the classes, their education is free or something, and we get penalized.

ST: This is the first semester we're teaching a particular class in Physics that's required for a degree that we recently started with our Physical Education teaching composite. I have three students, one of which has dropped. As it's a required course for this major, this is basically stating that I'm guaranteed to teach this every other year so juniors and seniors can have it—regardless of the number of students enrolled in the class?

NS: Basically, yes. A lot of it is for “at-risk” students. So a student with low GPAs and ACT scores that is admitted to DSU, we can provide some structure with courses that they are going to take early on. We have some freedom with that, but we have to have an affordable path to graduation in four years.

BA: To follow up on that comment: that physics class couldn't then conflict with another upper-level class that the students would need to take! Our limited faculty for some upper-division classes makes it problematic to create a curriculum map—we could say that we're offering all the right classes in that semester, but the *times* of their scheduling could be problematic.

NS: I'm requesting that you research this information that I'll send to you. This has tried to be implemented elsewhere across the nation, and we need a list of pros and cons of this. I need your feedback, suggestions, comments...please!

MM: When you look at the blog, realize that it doesn't have a lot of detail, so there's not a lot of specifics there for questions you might have. I had an opportunity to talk with the Senator about this at a conference last week, and I asked about it, and there's a lot more to his vision than what's in the blog.

NS: It will be discussed later. He'd love, I believe, to visit with our faculty if they have questions or concerns.

CB: He could come to speak with us and we could talk through issues.

MM: He is eager to talk to us.

CB: If it's looking like it might actually happen, it can't be bad to air our concerns.

NS: Lastly: the Alan Hall Award—I'll send you information on this—do you know about this? We brought it up at the last General Faculty meeting. (Pulls up information on computer.) It's an award for student success (reads). This is an award given every other year, \$5000 to an institution or to faculty and staff—you can read more about this. Deans received this information, but advertise this with your faculty to receive an award for innovation and undergraduate student success. EO and I have talked with the Center for Teaching Excellence and the presidents of the two Staff Associations about this, to make a committee to formulate a rubric for the judging of these submissions—I don't know how many we'll have. I know David Roos has been doing a lot with retention—that might be something that is submitted. Are there things that faculty that are doing that would fit under this. Please read this and take it to your faculty, advertise it, and let them know that there's some money out there if they've got ideas that lead to undergraduate student success.

AC: So who does the nominations, the deans? Or is it a free-for-all? Can we nominate people we work with?

NS: Jan. 5—nominations due. We already have permission from BC to put together the committee to help select candidates. (reads schedule). By Feb. 2, the screening committee will select two and forward them up. I'm sure there are a bundle of ideas on campus that lead to student success. Someone from our campus will get it; we just have to make sure we have good stuff going forward.

CB: Is this a self-nomination thing?

RC: Your chair has to approve it. There's places on the form for both nominator and nominee signatures.

DrW: It includes "wish to implement," too. This is a plan to help get something implemented, too.

NS: Please take this to your constituents and get someone awarded. I just wanted to make you aware of it.

RC: Two quick things: I received feedback from my constituents that they don't like the information format of the General Faculty meetings; they want more discussion, and that collective discussion is helpful because sometimes someone says something that triggers thoughts, and they want more of that available. Also: since the new Constitution and By-laws is going through, we're going to have to start making plans for more Faculty Senate representatives, and we should start that process early so they'll be ready to go once it's approved.

NS: Do we start that process before it gets ratified by faculty?

RC: We should start contacting departments that will need more representatives *if* the Constitution and By-laws goes through.

NS: I'll go through and see who that would affect. I think having more discussion at General Senate meetings is a great idea.

CB: Back on the strategic planning thing: is recruitment part of that? I've heard faculty concern about the way that students are recruited. Anecdotally, I was talking to a student up north and they had all the state schools present at his high school, and the only one that didn't say anything at all about school was DSU. All they talked about was partying, how great it is, the weather, the national parks...they literally didn't say one word about school.

RC: They put on a good show.

CB: I've heard faculty be concerned about the school's promotions, commercials, etc., and we keep saying that we don't want to be a party school, but there's a disconnect there, and if we could work that into the strategic planning, that'd be nice.

NS: I'm on the Strategic Enrollment Committee, and I'll bring that to their attention. A couple of the student representatives on that committee have mentioned that that's why they're here—the great lifestyle.

RC: They don't have to *eliminate* it; just *add* to it!

NS: Anything else? One more FYI: I've conducted four interviews at CEC that haven't aired yet: Munir, Susan Ertel, Deann Larsen, and Rico Del Sesto—what schools have we missed? Fine Arts? These interviews will be archived so the community can get to know our faculty better. We want to do interview 1 per week, that will air on Baja and be archived. We want diversity and schools. We want faculty stories about their lives here. It's been enlightening to see. If you have suggestions, please let me know. (Lots of suggestions.) We'll have time for six more before the semester is over. Once they're cut, we'll ship them out. I've tried to avoid leadership—not that you're not interesting, but to spread

the wealth. Please make sure that if you have concerns about all our information items from today, don't hesitate to contact me and EO. I feel like President Williams and BC are listening to us; as I told President Williams, please make sure that we don't fall on a deaf ear, but faculty won't continue to participate if we're not listened to—that doesn't mean that what we want will necessarily happen! The big dialog now is on the great colleges to work for; the knock against us was transparency and communication.