

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 3, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Gary Cooper (GC)

John Goldhardt (JG)

Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JiL)

Jack Lounsbury (JL)

Munir Mahmud (MM)

Shane Prine (SP)

Ed Reber (ER)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

DW: I move that the Faculty Senate make \$100 donation to Arizona Smith-Lahrman (lots of nods of agreement). OK, to reiterate: the two things we need to go over today are the two things Martha sent around as e-mail attachments.

MM: What is "average" that they wanted to put in?

DW: That's the big things – we'll move in that direction, but I want to start with workload policy. I have several points to make on it if you want to annotate your copies. That way, each of you will have observations to make as well and we can compile them and either continue discussion by e-mail or have another meeting next week. I think both the policy and Martha's suggestions on salary equity issues require in-depth view and lots of feedback. In the first paragraph of workload policy...

ER: There were two documents: an earlier version and a later one I presume has Donna's emendations...?

DW: I have the non-red one (compares documents). OK, they're the same. In the first paragraph (1A): it says everyone will teach 15 credits in the Fall and 12 in the Spring; in appropriate areas, this can be reversed. This is limiting – depending on enrollment, faculty need to be assigned as needed.

MM: That was my observation, too.

DW: With more flexibility, or as department needs require – that should be added to this. A department might not need someone to teach 15 in Fall, but another might have massive enrollment increase in the Fall.

DH: Could someone end up teaching 9 one semester and... If it were lopsided, couldn't it be detrimental to the faculty member?

DW: No, it's a maximum of 15/semester.

ER: It seems to me that a difficulty might be that if I teach, say, 14 credits, and I just choose that the Fall is the lesser of the two that I have to teach, then I claim 2 overload credits; if I don't teach 15 in the Spring – it will be hard to identify what is "overload" unless there's a set amount each semester. I don't know that there's a workaround.

DW: My hunch is that under those special circumstances, there should be some wording in here to address that. If it were 14 in the Fall and 13 in the Spring, then the faculty member ends up teaching four classes in the Spring, producing an extra hour of credit; where does that go? Someone could

probably argue that if you do 14 in the Fall, you have to do 15 in Spring because you didn't do a full 15 in the Fall.

PA: Doesn't that fall under purview of department chairs?

ER: But overload depends on that standard is for a semester. If that fluctuates for everyone every semester, it's hard to know what's overload and what isn't.

DW: There's a possibility that we need to advise Martha that while this is a nice model, any kind of anomaly creates a problem with regard to overload. So we'll bring it up.

ER: The other thing is: our chair (in English) said we want to have approximately one-third of our faculty that will, off-the-bat, designate that they will do the 12 and 15. If his understanding of policy is correct, that does leave an individual open to do something different. He's working with it on an individual basis.

DW: That may be what is suggested in this first paragraph: in specific departments, the 15-12 can be reversed, but it doesn't talk about individuals. It needs clarifying language. I'm leaving it up to department chairs, consulting with their deans, to make specific changes for individuals as needed.

GC: I'm flipped around right now: 15 in the Spring because I had an overload last semester and would have had two this semester.

DW: OK, think about that – I just want to bring it up, but we can't solve it. OK, 1A-i: we have more than one academic dean, don't we? So here it should be the academic dean *for each division* that makes decisions within his/her own division. The language here is just a bit loose.

ER: Could it just say "makes all academic decisions within departments"?

DW: That's good. I have nothing in B; in C, last line: credit equivalencies. I wanted to add "reassignments not related to teaching." This is intended to deal with *outside* committees or whatever – we can still reassign people to teach within departments. 2A: overload: in my opinion, a tenured associate professor teaching his/her workload has to suddenly take a pay decrease to teach overload or during the summer. If the expertise is there, then a percentage of that should be used to pay for overload or summer, based on equity. A full professor that's been here for decades has to get only \$1500 to teach a class? That's not fair.

MM: I think they're moving that way now, even if they can't pay that way now.

DW: What (A) says here (reads aloud) – I'd like to see it say "at a percentage of current gross salary" so you don't have to pay taxes twice, or if you do, not at a reduced salary. That's what I've seen done everywhere else, and it's fair because it reflects where they are in the salary hierarchy anyway. We're being undercut big-time when we teach overload or summer classes, but it suggests that there's a restriction on what we can teach (12 hours beyond contractual load). 12 hours = 4 classes, that'd be \$20,000 at full salary for \$50K salaried faculty, so there should be a percentage -- that's fairER. Ultimately, it means we can put more tenured faculty in classrooms than adjuncts, and chairs don't have to deal separately with a faculty body in the Fall & Spring and adjunct body in the Summer. It's not a good system with two different bodies of people doing the same thing. It has more long-term benefits beyond long-term cost.

JC: It would also encourage more hiring – if everyone is teaching overload, at regular salary, that's one whole salary's worth of money anyway!

DW: That's excellent. Now, Pam et al. have argued that we're within 10% of equity – that's not above, that's below. So we're not paid what our colleagues across the county make, so that 10% could be \$7K or more less than everyone else. If we at least get into that 10% window of equity...it's currently a misleading definition of "fairness" if we're still underpaid. Just looking at the Chronicle's almanac, you can see comparable salaries.

MM: Are we supposed to change this whole policy or is Martha's committee to do that?

DW: Make notes and we'll get them to JH, whose notes will be posted on-line.

PA: But we have to cover our costs as an institution...!

DW: I'm not bad-mouthing adjuncts – they're not paid enough to be here all the time to meet with students as it is, and students complain about it.

JG: The summers need to be better used here. In our department, we turn students away because we don't have faculty to handle them.

JL: Aren't they paying better in summer now?

ER: Donna tweaked it to \$750/credit hour in the Summer. Following up on PA's comment: we have difficulty on the other end – I agree with what we're saying, but we had philosophy professor from Stanford & UC that was perfect, wanted to teach, etc. We told him the adjunct salary and he laughed. Recently, we're desperate to teach upper-level psych classes and had a retired Utah State professor that agreed to do it; she came in, set up the paperwork, saw the pay, and said she was being paid \$10K at US for what we pay \$1500. We need to increase adjunct pay, too – how we get both theirs and ours up, I don't know. Don't we have a committee that negotiates that?

DW: I reported this to Academic Council and said that this is a faculty issue and the committee should be populated by faculty. And the chair/dean should have no vote. Faculty for a long time hasn't had voice, but it's needed on this campus – I'm not being contentious, but if we identify weaknesses, and I see this as one, and we don't make a stand, we're kaput. Martha made another comment on this awhile back: something along the lines of "carried on backs of faculty" for many years. Fine, but now it's pay-back time. When we get to statement about equity, I still see it as a misapplied attempt to be fair, and we're still 10% below average. There are people paid well above equity; so we're the underpaid faculty of the group by definition. Equity looks nice on paper, but when you break it down by numbers, we're not. If we put a policy like this forward, are they going to fire the faculty? I don't think so. We need to create something actually fair and actually equitable across disciplines.

MM: 10% below means 5% below because of the retirement thing.

DW: But in this policy, it really is 10%. I don't know if they use the almanac or what; I think they do comparisons only within Utah.

DH: I've heard that Pam uses only similar institutions nearby for comparisons.

ER: No, they use CUPA data, which is nationwide.

GC: I looked because of my rank advancement.

MM: Is there a lag there for currency?

SP: I have a web site on this?

DW: Could you send that to everyone? (http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/nfss_surveydata10.asp)

GC: But DW is right because if we don't ask...

SP: But if they say "Pfffft – we're not going to pay you more; what are you going to do, leave?"

DW: If lots of faculty said "yes," then...

GC: ER is right that we just can't hire anyone.

PA: Maybe that's the way to approach it: offering higher salaries will make us more attractive to highly qualified faculty.

ER: I think we could just recommend other things: saying that compensation should be a percentage should be voted on.

DW: Yes, we will: here, and then among the general Faculty.

ER: We certainly need to also put these comments through Martha.

PA: On a related note, separate from this policy: how many years has it been since we had pay increase?

ER: We've pursued rank advancement increases, but not equity increases.

DW: Well, my reaction to these documents is certainly poor timing in light of the current economy, but it should send a message to our administration and to other colleges and institutions in Utah that this needs to be addressed. If we're going to just sit and take it...too often at these meetings, people simply ask "What are *other* institutions are doing?" We can take the leadership role in the state.

ER: But it doesn't hurt to ask about those comparisons – sometimes, you can say “Everyone else is there; we're a four-year college; treat us like one.”

DW: Our administration still points out that we're the cheapest institution in the state – where would money come from to increase salaries? From enrollment, and we *have* increased enrollment!

JC: We just got permission to get on the university track, right? So now is the best time to think about these things.

JG: And make connections to highly qualified faculty.

DW: That's excellent – we won't get the faculty if we don't pay them!

MM: At other places I've been, they've had 8-9%, and teaching one course in the summer still pays well.

ER: We should put this to faculty as a resolution.

DW: They can read the notes on this, but can you put that together? ...OK, in the next paragraph under overload (C): it says one course per year thru five5 credits – that's be \$1500, \$1750 per credit – a 5 credit hour course for \$1750? Once per year? The accrediting agency will look at the workload our faculty are assuming. If they see lots of overload, then they see faculty quality as going *down* in each class. Too often, faculty go into a Summer course unsupervised – because there's no oversight, they can just show up, teach, and leave. It's not as rigorous as in other semesters. I think there's a kind of dumbing down of courses because they're not paid as much.

JG: And students don't do evaluations in the Summer, either.

DW: It opens the door to not perform.

ER: When you said “5 credits/year,” part D allows for 12 credits of overload.

DW: But summer isn't overload – D is non-contractual hours, but C is contractual.

MM: I was confused on that, too – C says if you're at 10% equity, you can't have more than 1 overload. If you're doing 15-15, does it mean you can't teach in the Summer?

DW: No – Summers are outside the contract.

ER: There are number of things in C: for one, the overload limits, which were there in the earlier version – I don't know if they're crossed out inadvertently, but it reads like if we don't reach 10%, then there's no limit on overloads. I'm guessing that that's a mistake and must be an oversight! I think the main concern is that when it's written like this, it depends on having a benevolent administration, and we should never depend on that – we cannot assume that having the average wouldn't create a very skewed system with some departments being highly paid and others not. I think she's right and we cannot look at the average, and Pam's 90% equity thing has to be in there – it should go back to what it said in the earlier draft.

DH: In the library, our faculty felt the same way.

ER: The word “remained” bothered me.

DW: Let's say you have 15 in fall – there's a subtle thing here where administration can jack up class caps. In the Spring, if you do 4 classes, and you had overload in the fall (18), and lots of students want Spring classes, then chairs have to increase caps on classes to avoid opening more classes. And you don't get a dime more to grade extra papers!

DH: Or extra chairs in classrooms.

DW: OK, this is all fabulous input. In D: my reaction to the 12 overload is: I say phooey: they're trying to create contractual language for non-contractual environments! You should have opportunity to be paid for normal loads – it should be 15, not 12.

JC: But because it's over 8 weeks, I don't think anyone could do 15!

DW: Well, I'm expanding the upper limit – there are some classes I won't do in 8 weeks, but the fact is that there's an artificial limit that says that what you do in the Summer isn't the same as in the Fall and Spring, even for identical classes. If you have the opportunity to approach the upper limit and get adjunct pay for giving up your summer, it keeps students in the matriculation path by offering classes. We're tapped out in this community for adjuncts!

DH: Last summer was overwhelming – it's the first year since I've been here in which I felt just as busy over the summer because I was handling so many students in the library. I don't know how they expect to continue to run with what is basically a 3rd semester with just adjuncts.

DW: In procedure: A-ii: "The faculty workload committee shall be..." – a couple of points. Faculty on the committee need to be elected, not appointed; and deans should not vote on faculty committees because they can unduly influence faculty populations on the committee.

DH: Now it doesn't even specify how many faculty!

ER: Below (a), it says must be at least six elected by regular faculty. And next it says that the number will never be exceeded by administrators.

DW: Language just needs to be inserted about how many constitutes a majority – is it a simple majority? Otherwise, it's open-ended so that there's nothing that validates the voting process.

ER: Is this a standing committee, where you, the President, Vice-President, etc., sit down – is that how it's done?

DH: It used to be, but now "standing" is crossed out – it needs to be replaced by "elected by ___ kind of vote."

DW: We need language for the voting process itself.

ER: It does say "elected by regular faculty for a three-year appointment." Would that be in a regular Faculty Senate meeting?

DW: This has bothered me since I was President-Elect – we'd sit down with Donna and put faculty into various committees. We (faculty) need more control over that – there are certain people that *should* be on certain committees because of their expertise. On the next page, under C (no little a?): here's where vote results could be located – the process and how to arrive at the process could be inserted here. On the last page of this document: it goes to Academic Council and to College Council – no Trustees? Just a procedural point. The only other thing I have is: in the second document that Martha wanted us to look at, on page 2, the second bolded area: that's important. What I will do is call another meeting next week because this is such an important issue. Right now, this is an administrator telling faculty what this policy should be, and it should be the other way around.