

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Feb. 2, 2012

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Ami Comeford (AC)

Rob Cowan (RC)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

John Goldhardt (JG)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JiL)

Munir Mahmud (MM; for Kyle Wells)

Russ Ross (RR)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

PA: I have handed out an agenda of policies so we can put them on a timeline of what to tackle. Please look that over and bring it back to our next meeting. Please also take it back to your departments and discuss these with them for what they see as priorities.

MS: That's the part under "Issues—Prioritize" ...?

PA: Yes.

JC: This is the first time I've seen anything about e-portfolio on the agenda...

PA: No, it's under that; the rest is today's agenda. A couple of informational items. Re: SurveyMonkey—Dennis, we talked last time about the reimbursement for Dennis; some there was some concern about the cost, and I'll send that info out in our budget to discuss more on our meeting on the 16th. We'll start today with the Constitution revision—RC, BB, and MS have been working on that, so please bring us up to speed.

MS: I e-mailed this to everyone yesterday—does anyone have comments? The first part (IV.5) is on how the Faculty Senate President is elected (reads from policy).

JC: So, why is it a five year time span between when a person can run for President?

BB: It was a recommendation from a colleague—it was casual, not voted on.

MS: It risks becoming like a popularity contest, so there should be *some* kind of lag time so that different departments can be represented.

JC: I would think three years would be good enough because it means there would also be a representative from the preceding time period.

PA: I like the idea of rotating it.

BB: Wouldn't three years be harder to keep track of than five? The issue when this was implemented was the popularity thing in larger departments, making more departments more likely to have a president from within them.

JC: But if the President, Past-President, and President-Elect are all from, say, English, they'd all be voting members, wouldn't they?

BB: But wouldn't five years create more variety?

PA: We'd discussed before that if President is from a given department, s/he wouldn't be a voting member.

DH: But that person could still give input.

JC: So I think it has to be three years.

RR: How many departments do we have?

PA: We have representatives from 13–14 areas on campus, and that's up from two years ago.

MS: Do we expect that to keep going up?

PA: Probably, as we grow.

RC: The first problem is the language—a department isn't always the same everywhere.

JC: I'd say even just "department" is fine.

DH: But are we talking "schools," "departments," " etc.?

PA: Ideally it'd be from every department/program. But in those areas that have programs, the representatives come from the larger group it's under. For example, music is a department in Fine Arts, but all other groups under Fine Arts are programs. Issues are brought up in Fine Arts meetings, not department meetings.

DW: Eventually, we're going to go to schools or divisions; otherwise, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would be huge and hamper making progress because of individualized issues. We'll have to revisit the model down the line. That may be 2–5 years down the road.

MS: How many are in Faculty Senate Executive Committees at other schools?

DW: In my experience, the larger the school, the more they go with division representation, not departmental. If there are five divisions in a school, then there's a subcommittee for each, and the FSEC representative is winnowed from that—there's another bureaucratic layer, but it means there aren't 25–30 people in a meeting trying to get something done. We just need to give it some thought.

MS: So do we want to keep it “department”?

VD: Would it be worthwhile to say “major” departments and programs?

AC: That's a good point—how many programs are equivalent to departments and need representation?

RC: I don't know—I don't know how Business is organized, or Humanities.

JC: The thing, though, is that this isn't looking at representation, just where the Faculty Senate President comes from.

RR: It should match to whatever the representatives come from.

MS: So should it say “from represented areas”? And when we put out a call for a President-Elect, we say “these areas aren't eligible.”

JC: But you have to let them know that the, say the library, for example, is with this group, not that one.

DH: But we'd let PA know...

MS: Can we agree on “represented areas?” (Yes from many.) But the original debate is still whether the gap should be five years—is that too many?

DW: I like it because there's a 2 year process that allows for some flexibility. If a person is President-Elect in one year, President in next, and Past-President in the third, wouldn't that make them eligible right after the end of that tenure to run for President-Elect again?

PA: Let's take a vote. (Unanimous for five years).

MS: I think faculty should only nominate tenured colleagues.

JC: I disagree—as much as you say that any argument between that person and administration won't affect that person's tenure chances, it will.

PA: I think it's good to put that possibility on the radar of someone considering a nomination—it doesn't have to be a requirement, though.

DW: The RTP committee makes recommendations, but doesn't determine whether or not someone gets tenure—the administration at the highest levels does, and they can do it arbitrarily, so the annoyance factor is there.

PA: This paragraph is talking about the President, but this needs to be about the President-Elect.

RR: Don't we have non-probationary non-tenured faculty?

PA: As the Constitution presently is, it's only full-time faculty that are eligible.

DW: RR has a point, though: some were grandfathered in—some 0.74 are not full-time but they still qualify.

DH: In the library, we have some people have “de facto” tenure.

PA: Should we keep this a requirement? (That the President-Elect is tenured). (All but one “aye”).

RR: The whole document is put to a vote by the faculty later.

MS: (reads more).

DW: We need to be more specific about *which* March meeting is the one in which the President notifies the faculty of the candidates for President-Elect.

MS: (reads more).

PA: The vote is in March, so the transition is in effect by the first meeting in April.

MS: So we need to change the notification date to February.

JC: March needs to change in both sections.

DH: So it should say “Prior to the February general meeting...?”

JC: ...which is in two weeks!

DW: The paragraph that starts “In the April meeting...” I'd be more comfortable with articulating what constitutes a “secret ballot”—SurveyMonkey? Folded pieces of paper?

PA: Last year, it was paper, and that seemed to work.

DW: This is a Constitution—it should have clear, articulate language.

RR: But it says “those in attendance will vote,” which precludes anyone not present from voting.

MM: We have discussed this before—SurveyMonkey is not really tailored for groups. The paper is fine.

DW: But the problem with that is that a certain number of faculty will attend to the exclusion of everyone else that doesn't have the opportunity to vote.

PA: But they *do* have the opportunity! My impression is that our past method is working.

VD: Just looking at the departmental representation—what if we just generated a form and the representative turns that in?

DH: Then it's not secret.

JC: Why does it have to be secret?

MS: What if I vote against my own department and they find out?

BSC: You can do secret votes within departments.

BB: Last year worked, so let's use that.

MM: Why not have the representative bring in votes from people that aren't in attendance to vote themselves.

MS: So those not in attendance must give their votes in a signed, sealed envelope to their representatives to bring to the meeting.

PA: Last year we had to do a re-vote because it wasn't in the percentage required. But I agree with VD that they *have* the opportunity to come to the meeting and vote.

RR: This seems like a *lot* of detail for the Constitution—shouldn't it be a simple statement?

AC: So we're not having to change it when situations or this body change.

MS: The other solution is that if you don't go to the meeting, you don't vote.

JC: But there are people that teach during the meeting and literally cannot come to vote.

DH: I think it's great that our representatives can take the sealed envelope votes, and the envelopes are discarded when opened, so it's still secret. That way the teaching people still have a vote. But I don't know if this level of detail needs to be in the Constitution—it's a policy matter.

MS: So: (reads proposed change).

RR: Did we change the above paragraph from “President” to “President-Elect”?

BB: Got it.

PA: And we've changed March to February.

MS: All the months moved up by one.

BB: The sentence in parentheses: (reads proposed change about signed envelope). (Much talk of leaving it as is.) So we'll let individual departments figure out what a “secret ballot” is for them...

MS: They send the secret ballot by way of their representatives. (Reads more)—change April in last paragraph to March. (Reads more.)

?: Does it need to say both “majority” and “more than 50% of the total votes”?

DW: A simple majority *is* 50% or more.

RC: Question: How do we carry out the second ballot for the people that aren't there?

JC: You could put ranks on the secret ballot...

RC: No, that's too much effort.

MS: If they're not there to vote, they're not there.

DH: Do we want to make ballots with check boxes ahead of time? (Several yeses.)

PA: Didn't it work last year writing it on a piece of paper?

BB: But RC's point that there were people excluded from the second layer is a good one.

MS: We just make it clear that if they're not there, they lose out. Any other problems? (No.) The next policy: (IV.6; reads aloud).

DW: The last item of that last meeting will be the announcement of the new President-Elect.

MS: So the major change is that it currently says “President-Elect,” but the change is the handing over of the torch during the last meeting.

DH: Why not just change it to “last regular meeting of April”?

BB: In March we'll know who the new President-Elect will be; does that person want to run the last meeting?

PA: Last year, it was run in tandem, and that worked well. If April 1 is the effective date...

MS: But if stuff comes up in April, the President has to handle it!

PA: But the President and President-Elect both do all the business with the administration together anyway—our “seats” are equally “hot.” So business will be as usual; just the titles will change.

BB: So cross out the whole thing and make it April 1.

DW: Say it’s just the change in the leadership title and role.

BB: (Reads proposed change aloud.)

MS: Should we vote on that?

PA: All in favor of the President-Elect becoming President April 1...? (All ayes).

MS: (Reads more.)

RC: Do we say “represented area?”

PA: Same as before.

JC: So if it’s a three-year stint through to Past-President, do all three have to be listed there? Because if the President is a repeat...

MS: How’s it working right now?

BB: So how about including the Past-President *and* President-Elect?

DW: When there are two people from the same area, there’s the potential for a collegial alliance—that creates more weight to move the group in one direction. So me, for example, I have two roles: Past-President and representative for Communications. But AC and BB are in a different situation.

PA: MM needs to go, so I want to let him address the e-portfolio thing.

MM: This is the first time we tried the e-portfolio, and the committee on that has discussed how it worked. Mostly it worked well, but there were some inconsistencies in where stuff was put. We need to provide faulty more instruction at the beginning of the process. I can also provide a checklist of what information is needed and where it should be uploaded to.

DH: The checklist would be really helpful; the existing one is good, but adding “where to put stuff” would be better.

MM: Otherwise, it worked pretty well.

JC: Would it possible that people going up for rank or tenure have a meeting with a group before it’s due?

MM: Becky Smith does that. I’ll talk to her to make that a policy thing.

JC: Even if it’s all the faculty at once.

DH: We did do a training thing about what kinds of information were appropriate in which places because the categories were not clear. But a check-off list *after* the training would be very needed.

DW: From a general faculty perspective, *all* faculty will have a portfolio, so having that checklist will be very helpful.

MM: I have it on a web site.

DW: Then let’s issue an e-mail to all faculty to inform them about that.

MM: I’ll update it a bit, and then do that.

PA: Did you get feedback on the process?

MM: No, not really. One more thing: the intermediate review—retention can be denied even at the intermediate level.

DH: That wasn’t made clear.

MS: Not until halfway through the process!

MM: As we proceed, we also have to keep the deans informed, but we have to be very organized because if there are any denials along the way, it will create problems.

PA: Anyone have other comments they know of from people that went through the process this year?

BSC: Nursing faculty didn’t find it easy to use—it was difficult and time-intensive on top of teaching.

MM: Initially it will be hard, but as time goes on, it will be done a bit at a time.

PA: Reviewers also said it was hard to find information...

VD: Having gone through that, if we know *now* where to look, that will help in future reviews.

RR: It would also be helpful if the evaluations come in earlier, rather than at the end of the semester.

MM: That’s up to Becky and the people making those available. I have a few issues, though. We don’t want the same person to be the chair of a departmental RTP committee *and* be a school RTP committee member—just one representation. Also, we shouldn’t have a candidate serving on that committee. That can create a bias. The Senate can address that in the Constitution.

DW: We are about done and we still have a lot of issues to cover here...can we meet again next week?

MS: That will *always* be the case.

PA: These can’t wait for two more weeks?

DW: Well, we're going to attract other issues by then, so we're in a losing battle here, so we need another meeting to address these. (Lots of dissent—vote all nay.)

PA: Then I'll see everyone in two weeks.