

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 17, 2011

---

*In attendance:*

*Paul Abegg (PA)*

*Brad Barry (BB)*

*Gary Cooper (GC)*

*Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Jack Lounsbury (JaL)*

*Jie Liu (JiL)*

*Ed Reber (ER)*

*Dennis Wignall (DW)*

DW: I've uploaded a SurveyMonkey survey on H.B. 485 and three other things. BB, you were going to send me an updated version of your document...?

BB: I forgot; sorry; I'll get that to you.

DW: The last minutes were posted; I assume any changes you had you got to JH, so we don't need to approve those... We've had a number of interactions with Martha on policy 3-10 that have been very fruitful; I can post another survey on this later, because the items in the current one aren't really questions! Anyway, did everyone get a copy of this?—I asked Martha to copy over her reactions to our commentary, and she responded. Our purpose today is to go over the commentary version and her comments to that. She's closer to these policies and their intents than anyone else on campus, so she's a very valuable resource, and she's supportive of faculty, which is great. (DW brings up comments on screen.)

GC: I just got tenure; what I'm nervous about is not getting the equity part of my increase. I think for people that are expecting that rank increase *plus* the equity increase that follows it normally, that's quite worrying because without that "average" in there, we could be left without it.

ER: At least, certain departments could be.

DW: If you get a rank increase, it's supposed to be 90% of equity, but in that same year, you *don't* get a cost-of-living increase or anything 'til the following year.

GC: But you might not see that increase.

ER: We haven't seen equity increases in a while! They tried to fund it.

DW: There's another step: you get a rank advancement, and get that increase, but whatever percent increase there is for cost-of-living and the like you *don't* get that year. That's reserved for people already *in* a rank but that are *not* at equity—it's on a per-faculty basis from Human Resources. Whether or not it happens is dependent on individual faculty reporting that they're not at equity. The idea of equity is that you're promoted into that rank and as such achieve 90% equity; the assumption is that over next 2-3 years, equity may be rising on a national scale; I don't know what Pam's formula is, but you should get bumped up. Some people have gotten one-time increases to get them up to equity because nothing was done for several years.

DH: The CUPA data that Pam use aren't for all types of institutions; they're specific to other institutions of our size. She's not using Princeton, Harvard, etc. as a basis for comparison.

JH: Is that institutions of the same size *and type*? There are institutions out there about the same size as us but that have both graduate and undergraduate students...

DH: I don't know.

ER: Martha says that Pam looks at lots of different sources to get her numbers.

DH: Yesterday it was announced to staff that President Nadauld refused to include any equity in the staff policy being put forth and told them—and this is secondary info—it's because all the money goes to faculty. To me, that's a huge problem.

PA: We need to get that kind of information from the source on that—I've heard him say otherwise!

DW: Doesn't policy say that staff salaries are connected to faculty salaries—as one goes up, the other does, too...?

ER: When they did the initial survey, staff were tied to other staff in state—equity for staff was determined by assignments of similar salaries in state.

PA: In the meetings earlier in this semester, when President Nadauld went to individual departments, that question came up in Fine Arts, and he's well aware that staff are well below where they should be. So before we act, we need to confirm what we hear!

ER: To eliminate one problem that we're getting at: it would be important for us to say on record that with regards to 3.10-Ilc that we *do not* accept that "average" should be in the policy, and that we want it done the way Pam has been doing it. That way, what we're talking about concerning possible interdepartmental disparity doesn't happen. The differences are there and built in—for example, Business makes more money, etc. in the CUPA data, and that's just the way it is, but we still don't want to have some people at equity and others not, so we just need to say that we want *all* faculty within 10% equity, and *then* the policy on workload would kick in.

DW: We should poll faculty to see where people are with regard to equity.

GC: We don't have time to figure that out.

BB: Isn't this a future issue as well as current issue? (Yes.) So regardless of what a survey might find, ER's suggestion is still valid.

PA: Have you heard from Donna about a meeting to discuss this?

DW: No, not yet.

PA: I think that, like Ed says, until we know why this is going on, we can't effectively say anything.

DW: I'm still struggling with what "equity" means objectively—if it's subjective, that's the problem. If it's an absolute, objective dollar figure...

ER: With the CUPA charts Pam looks at, which probably vary from year to year, it says "This is the average for an English professor, this is the average for an Business professor, etc."

DW: But if we're within 10% of a subjective "equity"—if I know what it is for *my* discipline, then I can look at my report and see where I am.

ER: But Pam and Human Resources do.

GC: When I interviewed here, I used CUPA data as a negotiating tool for my salary. Because they break it down regionally, I used a regional value that happened to be similar to the national value. When they made the offer, it was acceptable to me and within that 90% average.

PA: I think they have a good grasp of what the salaries should be.

ER: OK, I'm making a motion that what matters is whether the *entire* faculty is there or if it's *average* faculty—the word "average" allows an imbalance in the institution. So I move that we eliminate the idea of an average faculty base and say *all* faculty.

BB: I second.

DW: Any more discussion? All in favor? (Passes unanimously.) That will be public information in the minutes. By the way, when I send something out to the whole list, Donna gets a copy, too.

PA: Then let's be more specific and state that we've requested an audience, though she's out of town this week.

GC: Academic Council meets to vote on this policy on the first Tuesday of March (= Mar. 1), so we'll want to have that out by that time.

DW: OK, projected up there is Martha's response to the commentary version of the policy, so let's look at her comments quickly. In the first paragraph, she stresses "increasing faculty control over faculty issues and policies." In the past, when we were a community college, faculty didn't have that control, and I think we need to pursue this at every opportunity.

PA: But that isn't the issue; we *have* the opportunity to do seven policies this semester.

DW: Well, the situation is this: let's say President Nadauld retires. The Faculty sits in on interview committees for a new president, but we have no final say or vote—we can have commentary, but no final say when the Trustees and Board appoint a candidate.

PA: But let's talk about a current issue—what's giving you the sense that we've put something in front of them that they've turned away?

DW: Well, we sit in on Trustees meetings and committees, but we have just one faculty vote—basically, it's a statement of "Yeah they're involved, but have only one vote and so can't change a majority in many situations."

PA: I think we're talking theoreticals here—the policies that we've been given to develop, we develop. With the "average" issue, all we've done is talk at this point, not gone to Donna yet.

ER: I think we do need to let faculty as a whole know our vote on this—if we need to have a meeting before this goes to Martha, then let's do it. But I don't think we can say we *all* should get a 20% increase and expect that go through! In the past, we've had committees on class size, and Martha's suggesting that that's the kind of thing we should take back as our decision. In my experience, when faculty speaks, they tend to listen. The policy we're supposed to develop for post-tenure decisions, they told us to come up with one, and they'll probably accept what we come up with.

DW: Yes, that's something they want. To change the topic slightly: I'm just hesitant that if we've got something that looks good, what's going on below the surface? With regard to post-tenure review, if administration wants a lever they can use to oust faculty they feel are undesirable...

ER: It's simple: accreditation & Board of Regents policies require a five-year period—we're deficient in that; that's why administration wants the policy because we're not compliant with those policies.

DW: Yes, but at same time, there's a hope in administration that they'll get an additional lever—I get this from conversations with people. My concept is that the post-tenure review is to *support* faculty *by* faculty, but in a non-threatening way.

ER: And that's why it's great that we write it!

DW: I should have a draft to you by the end of the month.

ER: I accidentally gathered some data on that—should I forward that to you?

DW: Yes, please! What else? OK, the second paragraph: no administrators on the Faculty Workload Committee. I'd proposed that if there's a dean on that committee, s/he can chair the committee but not vote. I'm certainly open on this; I like that the faculty should determine workload within the bounds of state policy from the Board of Regents, but I don't know that we need administrators or deans to oversee that process. That committee could choose a chair from amongst its own members. How do you feel?

BB: I can envision scenarios where deans might support faculty in ways and at times for which faculty can't have the same perspective, so I'm hesitant to keep deans out of loop...

DW: You're right; deans often have better visions of a greater picture, but sometimes that vision can limit directions that faculty might see—I'm not explaining that well.

GC: If it's an advisory role, it's best left to faculty. There are too many committees at this institution that are too top-down, so people on the bottom have no real say. If we're in an advisory committee that makes recommendations to, say, a dean's committee, it really *should* be us faculty making the comments.

DW: That gets back to what ER said—we vote and present results; Fac Sen represents that. But there's still no clear guarantee that any councils that what we say will be accepted and moved on.

PA: There's no guarantee of that anyway—we don't need to go into this in an adversarial way—there's no need to stir up emotion if there's no need. Historically, I think they have supported us and there's no reason to believe that they'll change that in the future.

DW: OK; I'm just a bit more skeptical.

ER: How many deans do we have?

DW: I'm not sure...

BB: (counting) Five or six...?

ER: We need to clarify whether associate deans are included in this. The way this is written presently, this body can determine how many faculty members there would be on the committee and how representative a faculty the body could be. We could have a substantial margin of vote; if it's ex officio, that'd be better, but it sounds like it's up to us to determine it. If we had, say, 15 departments and could cycle on and off...

DH: Does it say that this will be one of the committees that they just put people on each year?

ER: No, it's a committee people get voted onto. And we set up the ground rules for it.

DH: So Martha already has it written; we just need to take control of it.

ER: I don't think that's an addition, though I might be wrong.

DW: Deans represent different programs, schools, etc. and if they sit on a Workload Committee, they may represent their division, which will be different than in some other divisions. For example, Music faculty have a heckuva workload.

PA: Any of the arts do—the hours actually spent doing the job don't reflect workload.

DW: So, for example, Brent Hanson would sit in a meeting and think about it and couldn't help represent that perspective.

PA: But then again, there are national standards that *do* reflect that—it's just the nature of the field.

DW: So the Workload Committee should be populated by people from *every* field across the faculty—it'd be huge, but fair.

VD: This may not be relevant, but: in my first few years of being here, I was told that this was a committee to stay away from because it's often kind of bloody...is that correct?

ER: I've been on it, and yes, it can be. Everyone feels rightfully that we do more than we're paid for. I teach Humanities, and when we set courses up, our courses were said to have to be big to meet demand, so the limits were based on the fire codes for each room. Martha mentioned that's happened in Science, too.

DW: Let's look at where it says "fire-code" determines class size. That's a business, not educational model!

VD: In Theater, we have guidelines for how big classes should be to be effective—do all fields have that?

DW: Yes. But in the back of everyone's mind is that at most institutions, graduate students can teach break-out/recitation sections, so lectures can be huge. We don't have that ability. So now what's happening, because of the fire-code model, we're increasing the sizes of classes for reasons that have nothing to do with educational effectiveness.

PA: Are caps decided on in Curriculum Committee?

ER: It used to be by the Workload Committee, but it's now slipped over to administration.

GC: My dean felt pressured to increase caps, so our got raised.

DW: Here's an observation: if that can happen here, then why can't someone teaching, say, ENGL 1010 also take the same number of students as in another class? Trying to grade 85 papers rather than fewer...!

ER: After a lot of Band-aids, we had to say that "Our faculty made this decision."

DH: It helps that there are accreditation standards for different fields—on a committee like that, everyone has the numbers that show what's standard for their fields, and that will help.

ER: Yes, we've tried to do that. If we can take back this power and make it a faculty power...

DW: Is that a suggestion that we should put into policy 3-10 something about the procedure used being up to individual departments to determine what is an appropriate course cap for effectiveness rather than an arbitrary room size!

VD: We may say to administration "here's your challenge." But as we go through this, if we all follow our accreditation models, then the college can't afford to do what it does. What happens then? Maybe that's a discussion for later...

ER: That's a reality for why some courses are seen as unfair—there are some courses that give Scan-tron based exams and therefore require less time than others that have to assign and grade papers, so they're not really comparable that way. But some people just accepted the raised caps.

DW: We have COMM 1020; over the course of a semester, students have to give oral presentations, and that's time consuming—where do we keep lecture sizes? National standards say they should be 15-16 students, but now ours are over 25/section, and instructors are frantic and know they're not doing as well as possible because there's not enough time to deal with it all! We'll have 80 majors graduating, so the point is that we're having to rearrange our curricula to address this huge workload increase! So I'll contact Martha and say that we think we need to have this additional language in the policy about each department determining what is an appropriate level for each course in that department. The argument is that as we move into graduate-student university status, some departments will be expected to develop classes for that, and *then* course caps can change, when we have TAs. The model is workable in that regard, but right now we're in limbo. What is the message sent to administration if we keep accepting increased caps? It tells administration that they don't have to hire more faculty to cover the increased enrollment—that's a good business model but a crappy education model.

DH: We had a similar conversation in the Library—we have increasing cap sizes but open positions in library, so if someone is absent for some reason, we're sunk!

VD: Eric Young once said "At a certain point, you become complicit in your own abuse."

DH: So the thing we voted on about the word "average": what do we need to do to make this officially communicated to administration rather than just a by-line in our meeting minute? Does it need to be an official letter? A conversation?

DW: What I'll do is talk to Martha about what we've said today; if she finds it acceptable, I'll put it to an all-faculty vote, and from there I can take it to Donna.

ER: It would be nice to have a way to make it clear to Donna what the voice of the whole Faculty is.

PA: What's in the survey you just posted?

DW: H.B. 485, two-year service for FSEC, increase in dues from \$2-\$4, and the issue of nominating candidates for FSEC President from the whole faculty.

PA: On that last item: is that full-time faculty, adjunct, etc.—is that specified in that question?

DW: No, but that's a good clarification. I wrote "general faculty," but that's too open. I can go fix that.

ER: In next week's general faculty meeting, maybe we need to be more concise by then.

DW: We have ~105 paying dues, leaving out 50 faculty that don't pay dues, if only the Senate votes. But this is a general faculty issue, so it should say "full-time, tenure-track" faculty or something like that instead of "general faculty."

ER: In response to that—could someone become President-Elect but not be a dues-paying member of the Faculty Senate?

DW: We can add a clause to our Constitution that specifies that the candidate must pay dues, but I'll make the other change now. (Brings up survey on screen.)

ER: I don't know that we need to change anything here as long as we amend the Constitution.

DH: We can mention it in next week's general meeting, too.