

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Dec. 1, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Ami Comeford (AC)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Russ Ross (RR)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Kyle Wells (KW)

PA: The PTR policy vote passed; the vote was 22-13. In the future, rather than us being policy writers, we should come up with five items we want to address and then work with HR on writing them. We'd just address their general contents; HR would come up with a draft after an initial consultation, which they would then send to the FSEC for review. We would review it and then send it back to them for technical stuff; then it would get sent to the general faculty. Would that be more efficient than how we've been doing it? If we continue to do it as we have been, we'd never get anything done! How does that sound?

BSC: So first, we'd have HR rough draft it?

PA: I think it works to have a subcommittee from FSEC go meet with them and say "these are the things we'd like to see in this policy." That way it would include our input from its initiation. Once HR has something, we'd review it, and then post it for general commentary. That seems more efficient, and still gives us opportunity to contribute our thoughts without worrying about the technical aspects.

MS: It seems that we need to find a balance so that *our* concerns also get addressed. They have a pile of policies to deal with, but we may have things we want to see addressed that they aren't dealing with.

PA: We've talked to HR and Donna, and they're very open to having us suggest things, but there are other forces that make some policies have to come to the forefront. They want to include faculty. And again, I extend my appreciation to VD, DH, and DW for all the time they put in on the PTR policy. We've learned how to do this process more efficiently next time, too. Any other comments on policy revision?

MS: My constituents really liked the last general meeting, when VD and DH addressed everyone—they felt a lot got done, so future meetings should be more like that.

AC: We can do that on this new time-line, too, to have better drafts to put forward to them.

PA: I think we've accomplished a lot as a body on campus this semester at every level—administration has listened to our input, and things have changed as a result. More and more faculty are becoming involved as a result. For the next semester, I'm optimistic. We need to figure out who on this committee is continuing and who is finishing up their two years. If you're finishing up, start talking to people in your departments to find someone to take your place and whether or not they are available Thursdays at noon for these meetings. It's advantageous to be tenured, but not required, but especially so for anyone interested in becoming President-Elect. That's another item on which we need to start thinking—finding someone to become President-Elect from your areas. If you have someone that wants to be considered, let AC and I know so we can bring that up in March and set up elections. Next semester: we've talked about the degree-equivalency document that we got from USU and that was sent out; I want to talk about that at our first meeting next semester. This semester, BB, MS, and RC agreed to address the Constitution & By-laws, and we've done some of that, but that's something appropriate to send to College Council. When you've got things that need updating or revision, let us know. Ultimately, that will go to the Board of Trustees. There's no rush on the time-line, but I'd like to see something next year, maybe by the end of March or early April. There aren't a lot of issues there, but there are some outdated things in the documents. DH is looking into faculty recognition—there are college and departmental-level things already being done, but there's room if we want to create something for retiring faculty; DH is looking at coordinating that so we don't duplicate efforts already undertaken by others. I think it would be appropriate for us as a faculty body to do something, so be thinking about that. We'll talk about that at our first meeting in January. Also, our textbook policy is coming down the line—JC was looking into that...?

JC: Martha was working on that, so it's kind of done, right?

PA: It depends on who you talk to . It hasn't been posted for comments yet. It addresses textbook prices and professors pushing their own textbooks.

JC: If you have your own book or materials, you have to donate profits back to the department or bookstore, I don't recall which. Also, the ISBN numbers of the textbooks used in a class have to be posted before class starts, as well as if there's an on-line version that's cheaper or if it can be rented—all those options have to be available right after registration so students know exactly what it costs to be in the class.

PA: When that comes forward, let's be sure what you (JC) considered was included.

AC: Pam said it's already been drafted and she wants to post it in the Spring.

PA: Also, a grievance has been filed, and we need two tenured faculty to serve on a committee for that. HR creates that committee and needs two representatives from the Faculty Senate.

MS: I'll do it.

BSC: I'd be willing.

PA: I'll let Will Craver know, and he'll be in touch.

BSC: Before we move forward, do we need a motion and approval for the new timeline and procedure of dealing with policies?

PA: I don't think so; it's really just a recommendation. Donna seems fine with it. Just knowing we support it should suffice.

KW: I think it's good because it makes us more efficient.

MS: What's the plan with that? Are there some policies we want to get involved with in January so we get on top of them?

PA: We talked with HR and there are some under consideration:

AC: These are the ones that will be posted: Termination for Cause, Faculty Emeritus, and the Adjunct policy. Those are things that have been waiting for a long time for feedback, so those will be posted. At this point, we can't do anything more than post comments on those along with all the other faculty. For Spring, the faculty Rights & Responsibilities policy is coming up—that's a huge one. Previously, a draft of that went to the Board of Trustees and they didn't approve it...

PA: In 2003.

AC: ...so we have to take that one up. Pam has the electronic versions of the correspondences about its problems as discussed by the Board of Trustees. Intellectual Property & Copyright policy is also coming up, as are Faculty Evaluations (at all levels), Professional Development, Curriculum Review, and Degree Equivalency—these haven't been done yet, so these are the ones that we can meet with HR on and then take them to our areas for feedback. Then it would come back to the Faculty Senate, which would have representatives working on those policies with HR, saying "Here's what we want to see in this," etc. So if anyone's interested in those, be thinking about them, and in January we can start garnering a lot of evidence of what faculty want on those issues. What would be useful is that if there are policies *outside* of those that we want to address: we bring those up and see if we can get them in the priority list. We're working on getting administration's prioritized list. They want the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities and Intellectual Property & Copyright ones done by Spring. Once we have administrations priority list, we'll send it to this body so we can keep its contents on our radar so we won't be caught off-guard again.

PA: So we're preventing the reaction thing and have time for feedback and the process.

KW: That's great, but I'd also like to be pro-active as well. I get comments in my meetings: "what about this, that, etc....?"

AC: This is a place where we can say "Here are the policies," and we can make even a spreadsheet saying "Here's what Administration wants and when they want it; here's what faculty wants and when they want it," and see where they line up or conflict, and negotiate accordingly. But we need something solid that we can all see; right now, it's all nebulous.

MS: So you have a list of what administration wants—can't we, in January, come up with *our* list and send that to administration?

PA: Some of you have e-mailed me issues such as "What is the FSEC's purpose?", and part of that is, perhaps, policy revision and writing, but also we've talked about helping adjuncts and their levels of involvement and their pay scale—AC and I brought this up with our meetings with President Nadauld and he agrees it's high priority to address the pay. Some departments are better than others in involving them, but no department would function without them. Today, I want to discuss ideas on how to increase that inclusion. Also, we've addressed things from policies to

outdoor gyms this semester—I was reading over the SUU Faculty Senate president’s outline of accomplishments; it addressed parking, etc. So what do you see as *our* mission?

JC: I think it’s mainly to get the voice of the faculty to administration—we’re the go-between.

JG: And be a proactive, not reactive, voice.

BSC: Sometimes I think we need to waken faculty to issues they’re unaware of—we need to bring to them what’s happening in the institution to heighten their awareness.

PA: You’re talking about issues...

BSC: We need to get them off their butts and participating—they’re just in this fog! They just kind of hope that everything will be OK and make this a better institution. But they need to be more active.

VD: Who’s been here the longest? My impression is that previous administrations kind of neutered the Faculty Senate to the point where it was just there to rubber stamp things.

MS: Faculty see us that way, too.

BB: I think we’re seen as writers/revisers of policy, and it’s hard to be excited about that. I like JC’s idea—if we’re seen as a voice, all the better.

PA: Would it help for you to solicit input from your faculty and bring us three things that *they* would like us to do or bring to the administration?

MS: It’d be nice to go back to our constituents and say “Here’s something we accomplished” because they see administration as doing whatever they want and that the Faculty Senate Presidents are just buddies with the Presidents. We need to say “Here’s a way we influenced the administration.”

BSC: Maybe we need to initiate a report that the Faculty Senate President & President-Elect gives on what this body did this year.

MS: Maybe even in the last general meeting of each year.

BSC: But each Faculty Senate President has to do that before turning over reins to the President-Elect.

PA: I think it’s significant that President Nadauld listened to our input on the gym in the middle of the space thing and it ended up being moved down by the pavilion. I was surprised how fast that changed!

MS: I think we showed with the PTR policy that if we get on it, they’ll listen to us. Before, they just thought we didn’t care and weren’t going to say anything, so they’d just go ahead. If this plan works, that’ll reflect nicely on us as a body.

PA: And give us credibility. I think VD was right that the Faculty Senate used to be just a lunch meeting, friendly get-together thing. But we’re becoming more organized and having a better vision of what the process is. The current administration is very willing to work with us, and we want to ensure that continues in the future, regardless of whomever is in the administration. I think there’s more communication in the FSEC leadership, and that has been wonderful—we have a great balance of viewpoints and disciplines, and I’ve enjoyed the association. I’m optimistic moving into next sem.

AC: I wonder if, in terms of getting our departments’ inputs, asking department chairs for line items in department meeting agendas to get this information. When we ask by e-mail, people deprioritize it, but when it’s one-on-one in a department, it’s different, and will ensure that the Faculty Senate is always a part of faculty thought, and that we want feedback constantly.

BSC: I’d like to see peer reviews between schools/colleges so that we get different viewpoints and inputs. I think I’ve been peer-reviewed by the same people all the time, and I want fresh eyes.

PA: Thoughts on including adjuncts more? Are they invited to graduation?

KW: No. We have a lot of adjuncts that don’t care—they’re here for one class, but we don’t want to say “You *have* to do these things”; just let them know that they’re welcome.

JG: I’d be open to that.

MS: The first thing to talk about is the pittance they are paid!

BB: I think that’s their primary concern, too.

PA: So we’ll address that in the administration’s policy list/agenda and in calculating the budget for next year. Does it go beyond that?

KW: We’ve talked a bit about how, when I bring in a new adjunct, I bring them to the secretarial staff to fill out forms, and only then do they learn that they get paid only so much, and won’t even get that for 60–90 days, and oh, by the way, we need \$20 from you right now for parking—it’s embarrassing!

BSC: I think faculty need to be given parking permits! We haven’t had raises for four years, so that’d be a little benefit.

PA: We’ve been addressing whether we’d rather have a raise or...

MS: It depends on how much the raise is!

JG: Where does our parking money go?

PA: I think they're pretty loose in who they give faculty permits to...

VD: We could include the adjuncts in the comp'd ticket policy for events—I think they have to pay full price.

BB: We could comp their parking permits, too, even if we have to pay for ours! Is that something we can change, the pay schedule? To go a month-and-a-half without pay is ridiculous!

KW: It's a Banner accounting issue. They tried to make it biweekly or bimonthly, and Accounting threw up their hands and said "We can't do it."

MS: Is it completely out of bounds to have one adjunct on this body?

PA: That'd have to be addressed in our Constitution & By-laws.

BSC: The other issue is the pay—a lot of adjuncts don't want to come to faculty meetings because they're not paid to do so, and they make more staying on at their other jobs.

PA: DW brought up their attendance at the in-service meeting, so there's been a little progress on that front. But if they know they're welcome, they can make that decision.

BSC: If we change that rule, they could be on this body.

PA: What do you all think about that? It could be tricky because there's a lot of duties.

VD: If it were someone willing to serve as a non-voting member but who could be here to address their concerns?

JC: What are the arguments against having an adjunct on this body?

PA: Continuity and consistency, and also compensation—it suggests that they're organized as a body of adjuncts, either as a campus or by individual departments. Let's continue thinking about that and get further ideas. Going into our next meeting: get input from your constituents on issues they want us to address with administration, and I'll send out our model for the degree equivalency. Would that be better now or prior to the meeting?

JC: Before next meeting.

MS: Also, you'll send the list of administration's policy agenda?

AC: I'll have that in a few days.

MS: Should we send that to our faculty?

PA: We need to prioritize them.

AC: We'll get administration's priority list so we won't get caught off-guard and be working on something when they spring on us a different thing.

PA: If there's nothing else, have a wonderful break!