

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Mar. 1, 2012

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Sue Bennett (for Brad Barry)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Rob Cowan (RC)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

John Goldhardt (JG)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)

Kyle Wells (KW)

PA: Thank you for being here. I need your feedback going into College Council about Winter Break—having talked to your faculty, do we want to extend that?

JC: No one has said anything about it to me.

MS: My group overwhelmingly said to keep it the same as the kids'.

JC: That's Spring Break.

VD: The one discussion my department had is that there's an employment advantage for our students to being available earlier than other schools for students.

RC: The first ones out of school get first dibs on jobs.

PA: OK. The next item: they are breaking ground tomorrow for the addition to this building, so please make your faculty aware that parking will be affected out there.

JG: My faculty are really annoyed by the lack of parking as it is!

PA: I think we could get more leverage with that if they stopped handing out faculty permits to people that aren't faculty. I see students get out of cars with faculty stickers.

SB: When President Nadauld came to our department, this was brought up and he said that parking is not something he is currently concerned about. He said that if you get here early, there is plenty of parking. He said it is not an issue on this campus.

PA: Well, we have luxurious parking compared to the University of Utah. And at Michigan State, it's \$300-\$400/year. So he might be telling us that we have it good.

MS: I've never had a problem parking behind the communication building...

JC: But also by the dorms...there is always space there.

JG: If this continues to be a problem, the other option is to run an hourly shuttle in a loop around campus.

SB: We talked about that when they moved nursing across the street.

BSC: They did it for a while!

SB: Was it used?

BSC: I don't know.

MS: They have one from student housing to here.

JC: That's paid for inside the housing budget.

JG: If you bring your bike, there are bike lanes.

MS: I think PA is right—there are bigger fish we need to fry.

RC: Eventually they may turn student spaces into faculty ones.

PA: Next item: I e-mailed you the request about the student research funding. I heard back via SurveyMonkey from 7–8 of your, and everyone seemed concerned that we don't set a precedent. It was pretty split as far as giving support, but the concern was about the role of our budget. And on the SurveyMonkey reimbursement issue: DW said he'd rather see the money go to the student research, and he would waive his reimbursement request if we contributed to the request. I think we need to vote on this now.

BSC: Point of discussion: in the past, when students have wanted to do an activity, they've done fund raisers.

PA: I know that club requests go to Student Government...

JC: But this isn't for a club.

PA: But the point is that the students should be doing something to pay their own way.

JC: I think the issue is the faculty going with them—they cannot get funds from other channels.

PA: That's not the case—there are plenty of cases. AC is absent today because she's off with students at a conference. So there are avenues, like Professional Development.

SB: The problem for someone like AC is that she uses her money to sponsor students, so she has none to present at a conference herself.

PA: But she has received both in the past. Anyone can apply for Professional Development money, but getting it is not guaranteed, and that is widely misunderstood.

MS: It seems like the whole campus needs to have a student research organization at this point, and this is not our responsibility.

JC: An Undergraduate Research Office.

SB: We think the school should support this as a budget item.

JC: But the issue is that there's no time to construct any of that for this one instance. If we do this as a demonstrable, openly declared one-time deal, we could do this.

MS: That's not fair to anyone else, though.

SB: This year is unusual because the NCUR conference is in Utah—there was no state UCUR conference.

JC: And this won't happen again for another 48 years.

PA: But MS is saying that if we grant this, then what do we say the next time a student group approaches us?

SB: Are other groups campus-wide like undergraduate research?

PA: Some are. Everyone seems to agree that we should support research, but the dilemma is whether or not the Faculty Senate budget and mission are intended to do this kind of thing?

JG: Isn't it student-fee oriented? I'd rather have student fees go to *that* than to student officers.

BSC: Why can't they develop a scholarship fund to which we could contribute?

MS: So if we create a line-item in our budget for, say, \$500, every year groups could apply to it.

JC: But do you want to make that a yearly thing where we vote on those proposals?

PA: But time is a viable concern for this instance. So, should we take a vote?

SB: I need clarification—how much are they asking for?

PA: \$638—they are asking for us to cover the difference between what they already have.

JC: This is to get two faculty advisors to go up there with the students.

PA: It's for registration, transportation, hotels, food, etc.—they already have most of that covered; this amount is just for the difference. Donna is planning to contribute \$2500, they are requesting \$2400 from the Student Senate, and some from other sources, to cover the students.

JC: The problem is that because this is the national conference, the registration fee is *much* higher. Usually they're really cheap.

PA: I don't think the amount is the issue, especially if DW waives his reimbursement for SurveyMonkey.

BSC: If I formulate a motion, I'd say that I move to approve a one-time donation to support the two faculty members—does that limit it enough?

PA: Anyone second?

JC: Second.

VD: I'd add "due to this year's unusual circumstances..."

BSC: I emend my motion to say that.

KW: This is the wrong place for this—we have accounts for this. Professional Development has a budget and they are not over it.

JC: The reason they didn't apply for it was because they thought they were ineligible because they were not presenting anything.

KW: No, attending is OK and even on the application form.

JC: Can they get Professional Development reimbursement?

KW: They have to hurry and apply. We should tell them that Professional Development is a better motion. I move to send a message of support to them, but redirect them to Professional Development.

BSC: OK, I withdraw my motion.

JC: Second.

PA: Anyone opposed?

SB: Have they already applied and been denied?

PA: I don't know.

SB: That would be different—if they were denied, then I'd be more inclined to help.

KW: There are exceptions to the limit. A few years ago, I had an opportunity to go to an overseas conference that was over the Professional Development limit, but exceptions can be made as long as the applicant doesn't apply again for some time.

SB: The last two times I went to NCUR, it was with Professional Development money, just to support students.

MS: When is the conference?

PA: March 28–31.

KW: Let's vote.

MS: I think we need to find out what other funds they have applied for before we can vote.

PA: They did not tell us that.

KW: Based on the e-mail I saw, I think \$638 is doable.

PA: So are we unanimous in redirecting them but with our support and that we are hesitant to set a precedent...?

SB: I still want to know if they have applied for Professional Development money and were denied.

PA: OK. As far as the SurveyMonkey reimbursement: all those in favor of reimbursing all or partial, please raise your hand. (Four for, most saying "partial.")

BSC: What is the amount we are going to give?

PA: We'll get to that. All those against reimbursement? (Three people.) Any other discussion?

VD: Do we have a policy on reimbursement?

PA: No, but the usual means would have been to get approval before subscribing. Let's revote. (Two for, five against.) That carries it, and I'll communicate to both parties. OK, two other items I was hoping to get to today: workload, and Constitution revision—are we prepared to finish that? It's urgent because it has to go to College Council—they meet today for March, and they only have one more meeting this year, and then it goes to the Board of Trustees at the end of April. For workload, the concerns are, as we revised policy last year—they tabled it until now, and it was up for discussion for a period of time similar to other policies. It was approved by College Council before Christmas and by the Board of Trustees in January. If we make changes, it won't go into effect until next year because it's already been through the process this year. But the issues are valid ones.

MS: The other day when the President and Donna came to talk to us, I asked about the compromise for the one overload per semester, and the President said they'd be kind on this.

KW: But didn't approve it.

MS: No, but said they would hear department chairs when they said they needed someone to teach an additional overload. But there might not be urgency here if it won't happen until next year anyway.

PA: Yes, so I recommend we work with our chairs on this and talk about reflecting it in the policy next year. Right now, the Academic Vice-President can grant exceptions as needed.

JC: A question: do we have a right to say "I want to teach an overload, so give it to me," or does the chair make that decision?

PA: The chair can make the decision.

JC: But do faculty have precedence over adjuncts? If a faculty wants to teach a class that needs to be taught, even if it's an overload, does the chair have to give it to him/her instead of an adjunct?

MS: Depends on where you are with your limit.

RC: Our dean is trying to cut down on our overloads...

PA: The reason they are trying to be more precise is because if we take on more, it weakens our argument to have better pay as we move to a 24-credit university system.

VD: Will Craver has said that all faculty are at 90%—is that correct?

PA: Yes.

MS: Do we get to see these data?

PA: Human Resources will show you where you are.

KW: HR's attempts at transparency about this have not been great, but the rest of what they have done is good. When I asked them for CUPA data, they gave me a spreadsheet, but not something that said it was from CUPA. I asked for a copy, and they said no—it is proprietary, and they paid for it. What is published in the Chronicle is not as detailed as the actual CUPA data—it doesn't include who we are compared to, for example, although I think that is very liberal. But I've heard stories about unfair comparisons.

PA: Maybe it would be a good idea for more of us to request to see that info—then we can make a joint request for more transparency.

MS: We would go over there and ask “Where do I fit?”

KW: Yes, they will tell you that.

PA: Go to Pam or Will. Let’s see if we can finish up the Constitutional revisions.

RC: This is just an informational thing. When I started looking at this, some of these departments/programs—that’s part of the problem. Some are growing fast and others not so much. Do we need to revisit who is on this body based on the numbers?

PA: The chart that you built this off of is what we based representation on last year.

RC: So it is being taken into account.

PA: But if you see anyplace that isn’t on here, let us know.

JG: Physical Education isn’t on here, but they are part of Family Studies.

JC: Next year, Physical Sciences get divided into Chemistry and Physical Sciences.

PA: Last time, we got to the subject of increasing workload for the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect—Donna is in support of moving that through, so AC and I will fill out the form on that for three overload credits/semester for each. It’s encouraging that Donna was in support of that. That takes us to the Secretary/Treasurer position—any issues on that?

JH: Not that I can think of.

PA: Munir has been our webmaster, posting the minutes and maintaining the web page on the college site. It just needs to be kept current.

RC: So that’s an existing position already...

MS: This says it’s a new position.

PA: It’s not in the policy and needs to be introduced and have workload.

BSC: That should be simple

JC: It might be just pushing a button.

PA: Could you check with Munir on that? Is this other item on the list a new item?

RC: I don’t know; that was from BB.

PA: Is everyone on this list of departments/programs represented on this body now?

RC: I’m not sure.

PA: (list which departments/programs have representatives on the FSEC). There’s a part of the Constitution that talks about a negotiating committee. Is it time to revisit that?

KW: How much power do we really have with that? Donna is not the top, there; the legislature is.

PA: If it’s as simple as designating someone to liaise between us and HR, that would be easy. Let’s go into our next meeting seeing if we can wrap that up. Our next meeting is March 8 in light of Spring Break. Thank you everyone.