

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Dec. 1, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Kelly Bringham (KB; for Rob Cowan)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Ami Comeford (AC)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JL)

Russ Ross (RR)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Kyle Wells (KW)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

NOTE: These minutes were transcribed from a recording of the meeting; the secretary (Jerry Harris) was away at a conference. He has attempted to attribute material to the correct people, but there may be errors. Unidentified speakers are designated "XX" below.

PA: Let's get started. I appreciate everybody's input—I think the more we work on these projects, the more we get organized, hopefully. I'm hoping we can set up with this process a process for future issues that we address. As professors, we're constantly giving our students timelines to work on; I think it's important that we do the same with projects such as this; we could go on forever discussing things. I think our goal is to create content we're comfortable with. This is going to Academic Council for discussion; then it will go back to HR to work out grammar/technical aspects. But I see our objective as creating content that the faculty at large are comfortable with going forward. Having said that, we have this last meeting before going back to faculty for revote.

MS: It was a dead-even vote?

PA: It was.

MS: How many voted?

PA: Twenty-six.

MS: Big participation.

PA: But, the organizational component that I'm hoping to put into practice more with all this is that we, as Faculty Senate representatives, get the input and collect it; last week we received input from people not involved at any point in the last 18 months that we've been discussing this, and they're wondering why we're rushing this through and why all of a sudden there's a timeline when we've been discussing this in meetings and e-mails. I think, for myself representing Music, I've requested a line item in the agenda so I can bring up Faculty Senate issues and I think the more we can do that, and bring that input to these meetings, we can better coordinate. As we're trying to expand and bring things to a point, we can be more efficient if we create a timeline and bring issues to a close. Having said that, we have a couple of items that I think need to be addressed in this meeting before we send it out for a general Faculty vote again. These are: the timeline, which I think was pretty clearly stated in the draft that we started from. At what point this starts: if someone has tenure and is going for rank advancement, we need to make it clear in what we send forward when *this* policy goes into effect so that we don't have someone going for rank advancement while going through post-tenure review. The other issue is what Dennis brought up about the monetary thing. My sense is that we, as a Faculty at large, are interested in keeping that in the policy—some are not comfortable with that, but the majority are and my sense was that we had moved forward and that would remain. I'm hoping that we can flesh this out during the time we have in this meeting—make some minor adjustments before sending it back to the Faculty at large. And again, as we send that out tomorrow, I'd like to ask for a vote so they can look at it and think about it over the weekend and cast a vote by Monday at 6. If you can communicate this—I liked how BB dealt with this, sending out an e-mail to his constituents saying "This is where we are; this is what we need," and that's efficient and clear. If you can reiterate that if your constituents' last

name begins with A–L, the votes got to AC, and the last half go to me, just to streamline things going into the last week of classes!

XX: You just want a “yes” or “no”?

PA: Yes.

XX: What if the majority of votes are “no”? Does it come back to review?

PA: Well, all the discussion is an attempt to ensure that the faculty have a draft they’re comfortable with.

XX: But if it’s “no”?

PA: The reality is that the administration has to go forward, and we’ve had an opportunity to give our content and tweaking to get Faculty input. So I’m hopeful that it won’t be, and our discussion has created a draft that rep’s the majority opinion.

XX: But if it’s “no,” will we just not send anything in?

PA: I don’t know. We’ll have to reconvene either by e-mail or call a meeting and decide what to do.

MS: Do we have a meeting next week?

PA: No. We have one scheduled for...

MS: I have it written down for the 8th.

XX: So do I.

PA: Well, maybe we do.

AC: I think we moved it so we wouldn’t have a meeting during finals week.

PA: Oh, OK, so we do have a meeting on the 8th. I guess we’ll cross that bridge when we get to it. With that, I’ll turn the time over to VD, DW, and DH to lead the discussion. I e-mailed a draft of what the committee came up with incorporating the faculty input when we sent it out for a vote last week. The subcommittee has attempted to incorporate that, and we’ll use that as our springboard for today.

DW: First of all, I wasn’t privy to some of the comments because I was off at a conference in New Orleans. The comments that I have listed are in conflict with some of those comments from the general meeting. I don’t know the most efficient way to do this: this is just my response to this PTR that PA sent out. I find that there are some conceptual comments here; others are formatting or language. I’m more concerned with the former. That will streamline this process; we can fine-tune language later as long as concepts are clearly outlined. Otherwise, we’re going to have an infinitely long commentary period. Everyone has what they feel are viable comments. This is a controversial policy that affects all of us. I don’t know for sure—I’ll need your assistance on this, if you want to take a few minutes to read the comments in the margin...

PA: Can you point out which ones are conceptual? What the main concepts are that you...

DW: Well, the primary one is what BB pointed out last time: Levels 1 and 2. It seems to me in this document there’s some confusion between these two—this other document conflates the two. What happened in the general meeting about these levels?

VD: Level 2 evaluation will only happen *if* a faculty member gets a negative response on their Level 1. It won’t be an annual event

DW: Our colleagues don’t want an annual review?

MANY: No.

KB: They already have an annual review: self-evaluations, etc.

PA: It’s covered in the administrative evaluations.

VD: But we did discuss expanding that so that it could incorporate scholarship, service, whatever other elements more formally.

MS: I recommend we run the meeting differently—we’ve already looked at this; can’t we just make our concerns to you three?

DW: Fine with me!

MS: The main one is, of course, did you address the 5 and 6 year thing?

DW: The Regent’s language says 5 years.

PA: Well, it did at one point, but it doesn’t anymore.

DH: It’s not in the final version.

MS: So we’ll change 6 to 5 in this definition?

PA: Is everyone comfortable with that? (Many yeses).

DW: Part of the thinking behind that is that it reduces the likelihood that someone might have both a probationary review at the same time as a PTR review if you already have tenure. That’s helpful.

PA: My understanding was that in the original draft that we started with, there *wouldn't* be duplication—that if someone, after receiving tenure, opts to go for rank advancement, this policy would kick in only *after* that.

DW: Yes, that's in here. I think I addressed that with my marginal comments here.

PA: Is that everyone's understanding?

JC: So, how often can you go up for rank advancement? If you go up for Full Professor and you don't get it, can you go up again next year?

DW: I'm not clear on the policy, but I think you have another year to perform.

PA: DO you know, BB?

BB: I don't.

KB: There's a policy, but I didn't bring it with me.

PA: We'll have to look that up. I think it's silly to create redundancy—if someone is up for promotion, they're already going through a review, and we don't need to duplicate it. We just need to be clear that it happens *after* a rank advancement review application has been finished.

MS: So you can only do one or the other every five years?

PA: I think it was clear in the original draft...?

DH: Isn't rank advancement every six years?

PA: It is now, but if someone goes up after six years for rank advancement is denied, we don't know...

JC: So if you're denied rank advancement, you're not done with stuff forever...

KB: No, sometimes you're denied rank advancement it's because you haven't met the criteria for rank advancement, but you might have by the next year. That's a scenario.

BSC(?): Are you required to apply for rank advancement? (Many no's).

JC: I think we just put that if someone applies for rank advancement, they don't go through PTR that year.

PA: Right.

JC: Although it's the same portfolio, so it shouldn't really matter.

AC: That seems to be a very easy change that isn't complicated.

KB: It says in here that people select who goes up for PTR—just have their selection criteria. The more recently they've gone for rank advancement or tenure, they're put farther back on the list so they don't go for PTR review until five years after that.

VD: My understanding was that it was actually *this* committee that would determine what the rotation is?

MS: Just for the first five years; after that, the rotation should kick in on its own. (Many yeses).

PA: Are we all in agreement? (Many yeses.) OK, what else?

BB: I'm wondering if we could give someone more than 9 months to prove they've corrected any problem—it seems like 9 months is pretty short.

DH: Where is that?

BB: B-1-a.

KB: A lot of the improvement could happen over the summer.

MS: I think it's saying that 9 months is the contractual year—you're not contracted for the summer months, so if you were denied in April, you still really have until next April because the summer months don't count.

BB: Yes, but even that might not be enough time. Let's say someone is found deficient, and the deficiency is tied to a course that is only taught every Spring or every other Spring.

DH: Well, it goes through a series of 4–5 years of that Level 2. So at the end of the first year, if they receive an evaluation of "below expectations," they'll have a committee to assist in professional development—there's nothing negative going forward at that point. They're still getting the professional development from their department.

BB: Help me understand this. Say I've been found deficient: when do I find that out, and what's my timeline for improving? Let's use MS's example...

MS: It says Mar. 1.

BB: OK, so Mar. 1, 2012 I find out that I've been found deficient. What happens?

DW: I'm guessing it would be a deficiency from the Fall semester, or the first half of the Spring semester, but it triggers the events in March. From that point, I think MS is correct and you have until next March to improve.

MS: Well, you have 10 days to respond, first. You could say "I only teach this course I was found deficient in every Spring"—you could claim you need more than one year.

JC: You guys are making me really nervous that you could get denied whatever for teaching *one* class badly? (Many: "No.") It would hopefully be a skill...

PA: ...or *general* deficiency.

DW: Part of the problem is that the language is being conflated between a Level 1 and a Level 2 review. When the deficiency is noted, there's no denial attached to it.

JC: It would have to be something *major*, like you show up late every day or just sit facing the board so the students can't hear you.

BB: So let's say that's the issue. I take 2–3 months to talk to colleagues about how to improve the issue, and then implement it over the next 6 months...to *prove* that the corrections are manifesting themselves might take another 6 months.

DH: I think I see what you're saying—in the Level 2 review, there's no specific date range, like from what period to what period, like there is for the Level 1. It could be construed differently.

MS: It says "A 1 year period is established from the date of the review"...

AC: Could we include something here that allows it to be negotiable, so that you and whomever is conducting the review can negotiate the time period, so there's some flexibility?

JC: Can't we just make it 2 years?

VD: The intent was: a deficiency has been noted and asked to be addressed, so we'll check with you in a year to see if it's been addressed, and here's the tools you'll have; if it hasn't, we'll check with you in another year to see if it's been addressed.

DH: Giving more opportunity for training, etc.

BB: So the *communication* happens yearly.

AC: It's addressed but not necessarily entirely corrected.

VD: Yes.

MS: The chair could say "BB is addressing this."

PA: If you've gone to a conference, it shows you're going in that direction; if you've done nothing...

BB: Don't we have to show that the conference I attended actually manifested in an improvement?

MS: That's between you and your chair.

BB: So at the end of the second year, and everything's fine, do I get a clean slate?

MS: And do you get your 2%?

VD: When the issue's been addressed. Doesn't it say that?

MS: No, but it should say that after you've satisfactorily completed Level 2, you should get your 2%.

JC: Or at least that you should be eligible to go back to Level 1 again.

DH: To be re-reviewed at the larger level. I think that's the key—if we're not reviewed at a larger committee level, there's no 2% attached. So just by meeting the demands of Level 2—I think you're correct.

MS: So you should be allowed to *immediately* go back to Level 1. You shouldn't have to wait another 5 years. (Many: "Yes.").

KB: Can I point out that it's not that you've been found deficient for stuff done just in the Fall or early Spring; it's really the 5 years' worth of stuff—you're e-portfolio for the whole 5 years.

MS: So it'd be 5 years of being poor in your class.

JC: I'm still concerned—there are classes students hate because they're really hard! Your student evaluations might be poor in that one class because of the subject material, not your performance.

MS: We hope that, as other tenured faculty, we understand these issues.

JC: But that's what I'm saying—I'd hope it wasn't about *one* class but about teaching *ability* in general.

MS: And that'll be in your self-evaluations, etc.

PA: So does that address this issue?

BB: It does. Thank you.

MS: So we'll try to plug that in, about going back to Level 1 after completing Level 2?

VD: Sure.

KB: Can I bring up another issue? If you go to Level 2 review, there's no committee the first year—it's just you and your chair. That could go in two directions. Some people have conflict with their chair, and others are best friends with their chair. Why isn't it going to the committee right away?

DW: Let's say I don't get along with my chair, and he drags me in and points out something that is deficient that could be a personality clash, but there is a problem. What falls into place is that the PTR committee is formed and the chair butts out.

KB: No, that's in the second year—it's at the end of the *second* year that the committee gets formed.

PA: But that's coming from information from the *first* committee that the chair isn't involved with, right? This supposes that you've been through the Level 1. If the Level 1 committee finds something deficient, then it's made known to the department chair to work out with the person.

KB: But the chair can decide whether or not the deficiency has been met on their own.

PA: After that.

KB: So they could just say "You're fine."

MS: That sets it up for bribery.

DH: Wait wait wait—under the Level 2, it says in #6 that in the end of the second year, the the faculty member again receives a review of "below expectations" from the chair *or* if after they're initial meeting, they cannot mutually agreeable solution to address the weaknesses, the chair will convene a PTR committee. That's what we put in there in case there's a problem with the chair.

KB: What is the chair says you're meeting expectations—does it go to Level 2?

MANY: No.

KB: So the chair has fairly great power here in the first round.

MS: What if s/he is your drinking buddy?

VD: That may not be to your advantage because you still have to go back to Level 1 and show evidence that you've addressed the issue.

MS: Your chair is going to write you a letter that says you have.

PA: So what's a solution?

MS: KB is suggesting that the committee gets formed right away.

KB: Yes. I thought a small committee might be better able to helping someone than an individual.

PA: Could this be formed by the individual faculty?

KB: Well, what's this committee in the second year?

PA: And include the chair?

KB: I'm thinking that same committee—I just think that if there's a deficiency, one person might not be able to address it.

PA: If we just change that language, would that work?

VD: So there'd be a committee formed as soon as...?

KB: Yes. A small committee might be more efficient in helping than a single chair.

VD: That takes the weight off of the chair.

MS: Just put that line in that the chair convenes a PTR committee.

KB: My other question is: what if I become the department chair and I'm the one that's deficient? That needs to be addressed in here somehow, too. Does it go to the dean?

BB: So the language is that, in this process, we're agreeing on a solution plan. What about evaluation of the evidence that the plan worked? Do we need language in here clarifying when that's examined and by who?

VD: Or is that in the annual response to your efforts?

BB: Yes, but it doesn't say that in here.

MS: Wait, what are you asking?

BB: The analysis of the evidence that proves that someone has successfully changed.

MS: So after they've been found deficient, they go to this departmental committee. At the end of the year, the department chair writes something up that says it's been addressed that goes into their file, and they'll reapply to Level 1, and the Level 1 people will address that.

BB: But the language here (#6) says that at the end of the first year, the chair will agree to a plan for improving, not to agree that the improvement worked. I wonder if there should be *two* meetings: one to create a plan, and one to evaluate if it worked.

VD: Well, it doesn't say it in here, but I'd assume that this Level 2 PTR committee will have *ongoing* contact with the faculty member.

BB: I'd like to think that, but I don't think we can assume it unless we state it.

MS: Can it be left up to the department to make that determination on their own?

DH: At what point does it become a professional responsibility of the faculty member to ensure they're getting what they need to correct the deficiency?

PA: I don't think it hurts to state it; then we're covered either way.

BB: So back to KB's question: so I have all this evidence and that I feel that my problem has been solved—does the *chair* or a *committee* give me a thumbs up?

PA: Committee.

MS: And that goes into the file, and the faculty applies again for Level 1.

DH: And that would be with another year's worth of evaluations and other evidence—not just the committee's statement.

JC: OK, so a bit off topic: who keeps track of the fact that I did not pass the PTR the first time when I go up again? So presumably it'll be three years before I go up again, or it could be—it'll be a completely different committee—will they know I went up before and failed? Do I have to tell them?

DW: That's a good point—you could go for PTR as associate professor with tenure; and you've applied for rank advancement, and the year prior to your RTP committee meeting on the rank advancement, you undergo the PTR—it's not addressed yet. That history goes into the RTP committee meetings—I think I'm addressing your point. A negative PTR review winds up in the hands of the PTR committee.

JC: How? So let's say I'm a full professor. I go up for PTR; people say I have weaknesses X, Y, and Z. Let's say I fail to address everything. And just 5 years later, because I haven't gone to those committee meetings, and I go up for PTR again. Is there any record that I failed the first one? Do I have to tell you? It's a completely different committee!

VD: I think the framework is there. In order for you to go up again, you *have* to have been given a thumbs-up from your department chair and original committee. But I agree with you that once you go up again, they should be evaluating you as neutrally as possible, so the fact that you didn't pass an earlier Level 1 review shouldn't be an issue; are you performing *now*?

DW: The language suggests that everything from this goes into your file.

JC: But you want to put something in there that each Level 1 addresses only *current* weaknesses, and past Level 1 passes or fails are irrelevant. Now, if you can only go up after your committee has given the thumbs up, is it possible that the committee *never* gives that so you never have to go through it again?

VD: No, and I believe it's in there that (a) if you don't do anything, at the end of 5 years, if you haven't been terminated in some other way, then the chair forwards that you didn't do anything to the dean. So you have some time.

DW: And there's no recommendation attached to it; just that nothing has happened after 5 years.

MS: But you can still go up again after 5 years, and the new committee still has no idea about that episode. If the dean likes you s/he can just file the letter away somewhere.

KB: But the policy statement—on the first page, #2 (reads aloud)—if you decide not to do any of your Level 2 stuff...

PA: That possibly creates cause...

JC: So who is keeping track?

VD: It would have to go to the department chair.

JC: I would think it would have to go *past* the chair.

KB: Yes, to HR somewhere.

VD: OK...

JC: To be available to the Level 1 committee—Level 2 doesn't have to be kept track of, but Level 1 does.

AC: Well that'd be the 2% raise, right? That would ultimately be HR, because they have to keep a record of having given the raise, indicating that you passed PTR.

JC: But then they also have to have a record of *not* giving the raise.

DH: Yes.

JC: Because you went *through* it—just didn't *pass* it.

AC: But if you didn't pass it, then it goes to the Level 2, where it's kept track of through that committee and then sent on to the dean.

MS: It's quite possible that many of us—if we're not told to do a PTR, we just won't do it, or forget about it.

DW: That's an interesting point. If I took a \$50,000 salary, then 2% increase is \$1000. Then you have 24 paychecks a year, you wind up with \$8/paycheck.

PA: Isn't that covered in policy statement item 2?

KB: Yes, but who would know or pay attention? I've had this discussion with a senior faculty who said "So what? What will they do?" Probably nothing for a long time, then that person will retire...

AC: Because this is a college-wide committee, someone has oversight over that...wouldn't the committee have a list of who's up? And they put a check-mark next to it, and they pass it on.

JC: But who gives them the list of who's up?

MS, PA, and DH: It has to be HR.

DH: Because aren't we determining that, as least to start off, by picking 20% starting with those that have had the longest time since their last review?

KB: What if it went through the Academic Vice-President rather than HR?

MS: She won't want to do that.

KB: Yes, but she's got Sheila or whomever to keep track.

MS: Is there a problem with HR doing it?

BB: Just they're tied to whether we get paid or not, so they make more sense.

VD: My only thing would be: can they check to see if it's been done without evaluating?

MS: That's supposedly what they're doing.

VD: Then they'd be the natural place, if we could ask them to keep track.

MS: Or let them figure it out for themselves. Does it have to be in here, JC?

JC: I guess not...but I know people that voted against it because they thought that they'd have to tell people they were up and that they failed it the last time and present evidence that they failed it last time.

PA: BB?

BB: If we look at the section on implementation, item 2: is it as simple as saying that each year HR will determine which 20% and will communicate that to whomever?

VD: Each year in consultation with the FSEC?

DH: Yes, we don't want it to be completely out of the hands of the faculty.

BB: Do we want to create more work for ourselves?

VD: We've already said that.

BB: Really?

MS: But it's only for the first 5 years—after that, it will be automatic. Maybe it needs to say that in here.

DH: It says "until all have undergone PTR." But it doesn't say we get the information from HR.

PA: So maybe the Faculty Senate in consultation with HR...?

VD: Yes, in point A under #2.

BB: Why do we want that in there?

VD: So they're keeping track annually of whether or not someone's making progress.

JC: Not "making progress"; just "up for review."

MS: And went through the review—a check mark.

KB: Will they keep track of if the person passed successfully or not?

MS: They'll know because of the 2%.

DH: Should it say to determine which faculty members which faculty members are eligible to be reviewed?

JC: Not "eligible"—that makes it sound like we have a choice.

DH: OK, "are to be reviewed."

PA: I think we're out of time...

KB: You'll fix the mention of the wrong committee in "Procedure, 1B"—you mean "PTR" there, don't you?

DH: The intent there was that the school level PTR as opposed to the department level.

XX: Just call them Level 1 and Level 2?

DH: Yes, thank you—that's perfect.

BB: If we have other editing changes, should we just send it to DH?

PA: To the subcommittee.

BB: We appreciate you guys doing this!

PA: Definitely! Thank you do much!

JC: You da bomb.

MS: So this will go out tomorrow?

PA: Yes, by 6 PM.

KW: And they'll have a number of days to look at it, right? That's been the primary complaint...!

PA: That's why we want it out by 6 PM tomorrow!

BSC: And the comment period is...?

PA: They can cast a vote by 6 PM Monday.

KB: There's no comment period; it's just a vote.

PA: Yes.

KW: Can you be clear in the e-mail what a “yes” or “no” vote means? That was confusing to a lot of faculty...they didn’t know what a “no” meant. They thought they were voting on whether or not they *want* a PTR process or not. They need to understand that that isn’t the question. They need to know that this isn’t the final version—this will go to Martha, or wherever—that this is the faculty input. I’d like to say one more thing on the record, and it’s not to discredit the hard work that’s gone into this document, but I personally have given up on this—this is simple, and simple tends to have more teeth, it tends to work, it tends to be easily understood, and I’m lost in all these changes that are going on.

PA: Is that the sentiment of your department?

KW: Yes.

PA: Um...OK. I think it’s significant that administration has asked for our input and has given us ample time to be involved; there are other policies coming forward into the next semester. I’d like then to discuss our role as a Faculty Senate. There are often times when there are issues I don’t agree with, but I see my position as representing the faculty at large; this whole body being organized is an attempt at democracy and incorporating the general sentiments of all of our faculty. Us as representatives of our areas have the same obligation to collect that majority and send it forward. Whether or not we agree personally, our job is to collect the democratic viewpoint and get a consensus. I don’t think our role is as policy revisers, but I think our role *is* to have a faculty voice in decisions made on campus. I’d like to see that improve, even to how our meetings are run and how we conduct business, and maybe specific issues that we should be aiming to take on. If we can think about that, the next thing on our agenda is to determine what experience is equivalent to degrees. I sent out a document from USU that we could use as a model. We’ll probably start with that in January. But in the meantime, if you could think of what are mission is as an organization, I’m hoping to always be improving and increasing our representation. I think our administration is open to that at every level, and we want to keep that going as administration personnel changes moving forward. Thanks again for your input and efforts.

AC: Also, really quickly: don’t forget to actually send your votes in...! We want a paper trail—don’t just tell us verbally, especially from this body.