

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

March 17, 2014

In attendance:

Robert Carlson (RC)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Jennifer Ciaccio (JC)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Ani Comeford (AC)

Erin O'Brien (EO)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Del Parson (DP)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Sandy Peterson (SP)

Virginia Hughes (VH)

Nate Staheli (NS)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

(JDH Note: My phone didn't record this meeting—I guess I didn't fully press the "Record" button and didn't notice, so these minutes are somewhat incomplete. My apologies to anyone whose comments got truncated or left out!)

RC: Before we get to the agenda, we should officially approve the minutes. We don't have any other actionable items than that, though we're getting to the point where we'll need to vote on other things soon. Anyone have a chance to look at them? Any problems? (JC moves; DP seconds.) Any discussion? Approve? (Unanimous.) Great. First on the agenda, NS has a few things.

NS: I'll go from the bottom up on the list. First, faculty elections: I've made pleas for candidates for President-Elect; I don't have the list of people in front of me, but have 3-4. I will confirm that that's what they want to do. Then we'll have the general election through Russ Ross—he'll help us do them next week, then we'll announce the results on the 31st. I've been trying not to muddy the water by working on staffing other committees right now, but that's where we're up after that. The names that have been nominated for President-Elect are Munir Mahmud, Erin O'Brien, Del Parsons, & one other I can't remember right now. We have a good list of people and good representation. Next, Big Brothers/Big Sisters: we've been approached by this organization and have an opportunity to participate in a fund-raiser. They want us to have faculty teams of 4-5, at \$100/person or \$500/team to bowl for 2 hours. It's like a scramble in golf—they want us to do that. I took this to Rick Miller, who's a really good bowler, and he has expressed interest in organizing it. If we went to the faculty members and presented this as an opportunity, could we do this? I was thinking maybe having departments bowl against one another. It's for an outside entity, but what would the faculty response be?

JC: I think they'd be OK with it.

DP: If they bowled!

RC: I think it gets us out in the community in a good way.

NS: I don't know a minimum number of teams. We're shooting for April 26, which is a Saturday and is tough but the best day to do it. If you're OK with my proceeding, I'll form a quasi-committee with Rick to organize teams. But if you think the faculty response would be negative...?

AC: I think the cost would be the issue.

NS: Yes. Historically, they've gone out into community to get sponsors. We can get sponsors, too—we beg money from people, or you can put in your own.

AC: Maybe just sending it out to faculty as an opportunity: as "If you're interested, let us know," and form teams from that. If you do it by department, there's a lot of pressure.

IJ: And smaller departments couldn't participate.

AC: That way you find out who's really interested.

NS: That's a good idea—Rick and I will send that out, so watch for it.

RC: I think it would be fun.

AC: A great thing to put out for people.

NS: Also: a Board of Trustees member, Chris Durham, has approached us with an idea about establishing some sort of a mentorship program for new hires. So we can have alumni, current faculty, etc., available, and if new member is hired, s/he would be assigned a mentor to introduce them to the community, take them to lunch, liaise with rest of community, etc.

DP: That's a great idea.

NS: She wants to present that idea here to us.

RC: We can save some time for her. We've been talking about that for a long time and never had anything in place, and this could be an important part.

NS: Or do we just want to agree with it? She's concerned with who would run it, etc.

IJ: Isn't there already a committee for that?

AC: It's more of a social-gathering group. But a specific mentoring process is a good idea. It'd be good coming from Chris Durham—as a member of the Board of Trustees, she has a weight we don't have. Plus, she's got lots of experience doing things like that.

NS: Do we need her to talk to us for a few minutes, or do I tell her to roll with it?

RC: Presenting it to us as part of creating a policy would be good.

NS: I'll limit her to 10–15 minutes.

RC: I'm just worried about carry-over of material from today's agenda...

NS: Lastly, Dean's Council: the main thing that came up that is of interest was that they're trying to create efficiency in the institution. They are trying to keep tuition low, but fees going up is burdensome on the students. How do we keep tuition low and maintain faculty? One idea was to increase class sizes.

RC: Someone there had the nerve to say that was "thinking outside the box."

NS: I said that, moving forward, as we talk about these things, faculty have to have representation on faculty issues. The discussion about this has been had every year; we just need to make sure we have a voice. In some of my classes, I could have more students, but not in others. So maybe we need to be flexible.

SL: Do they have any indication of what the legislature has decided on in terms of allocations?

NS: I know the Staff Association is having Frank Lojko and Brad Last giving them presentation, and the President will probably have an all-faculty meeting in a week or so, and it will probably come up then. I think we'll all get a raise.

RC: They've been talking about a 1% raise since the beginning of the year, and are hoping it will go higher.

NS: There's no answer to that, SL, but I suspect the President will be addressing that.

RC: Now, we have three main policy kinds of issues going forward. The Faculty Rights & Responsibilities—we introduced that last time. Along with that, the new Faculty Senate Constitution & By-laws, and SL's been working on that and what issues are left to resolve on it.

SL: The short answer is that it's entirely open for review—everything is open for discussion. I've highlighted on a document I have here some things that I think are open still. (LJ projects draft on the screen.) One is: Article 3, talking about membership—full time & part time. Presently, full-time faculty are eligible for membership; adjuncts and part-timers are eligible for non-voting, associate roles within the senate. That's open for discussion. Another issue in Article 4 is the representation of faculty groups within the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)—how do we go about doing that? A certain number per department? On a census basis (e.g., every 15 faculty members are represented by one person)? That needs to be decided and formalized. In section 4.5: currently, who is eligible for Faculty Senate leadership positions? Those three bullet points (on screen)—are those appropriate? Should eligible candidates be tenured? Members of the Faculty Senate? We've talked about the requirement of their being from a department that has not been in leadership in the past 5 years.

NS: The only one that's been strictly adhered to is the 5 years. And number 2. I think the ones that have been nominated are tenured.

RC: But that hasn't always been followed. Bullet point 1 has been ignored.

IJ: Point 2 is moot.

RC: It's not in one scenario—if a faculty member was just hired, which would make them ineligible to run in the current year. It could have limited use.

JC: Would that really be an issue? Does that matter?

AC: I think it's good for a future point, if there are changes made of choices of who will be in the Faculty Senate.

TF: I noticed earlier—it says "eligible" to be members, but not that they *are* members.

RC: Then that needs to change. For the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities policy to be valid, every faculty member must be a member of the Senate, period. They cannot opt out.

SL: That hasn't been stated in here.

TF: It's in 3.1.

RC: In the part where we're electing leadership, we need to be more specific on which categories are eligible.

CL: So, I also assume that part 2 would mean that associate members are not eligible...?

TF: It actually says that (in 3.3).

CL: Thanks.

RC: We could clarify that in the elections area. I would like, as we start to get used to the new categories, that we incorporate that terminology. One way to do that is to say "regular faculty" as defined in that policy. That would keep consistency.

SL: That includes librarians?

NS: Yes, persons employed as regular faculty. Put that in.

RC: We've had some conflict before with this administrative-member issue. For example, we had some discussions when the Dixie name issue came up at a general faculty meeting, some faculty members were uncomfortable with administrators being there, and we asked them to leave. That created some hard feelings. So we need to know what administration's role will be in Faculty Senate to avoid hard feelings.

RC: In my experience at another institution, administration only attended by invitation. Anyone else have experience? I agree with that completely, but there will be some angry deans if we do that.

AC: Undoubtedly.

RC: Not that that's a reason to not adopt that, but it will happen.

SL: Because of their legacy of having come from faculty?

RC: Most deans consider themselves faculty in their current positions, even if they don't teach.

LJ: Aren't most deans still holding their faculty status?

RC: It's dormant.

LJ: But they revert back when they're done being dean.

RC: At any given moment, they're one or the other. It's in our interest that this definition reflect their dominant role.

JC: If it was properly explained to them, it might be OK.

RC: We'll give NS a chance; I've already tried and failed.

ST: Can it say something about the main duty being teaching?

RC: As soon as you do that, you've eliminated LJ (as a librarian).

ST: It says right there—those whose primary assignment is teaching.

RC: The "and" part is problematic.

ST: Put "or professional librarians" before teaching.

RC: OK. I just want the wording to reflect...

TF: It has to match the policy definitions.

AC: At the very least, the dean issue aside, the President, Academic Vice-President—do we want to across-the-board say, other than deans, that they're not faculty at all? They don't come *out of* faculty? They're completely administrative; is that a better definition?

LJ: So (Academic Vice-President) Bill Christiansen gave up his faculty status (in the Business Department)?

RC: It's dormant.

AC: He's not going to step into a classroom—a dean *could*, but I find that unlikely for the Vice-President.

NS: Before, was it a dean? Or who did we ask to be excused from that meeting?

AC: Better not to say.

NS: Can you carve a situation where it only relates to their division?

AC: What's the purpose of having administrators on Faculty Senate? Is there a reason for them to have membership?

RC: We have lots of meetings with them separately...

JC: But they don't have to be members!

CL: What's the purpose of *not* having them there? Anyone who thinks you'll have privacy to talk about administration without them knowing even if no administrators are there...

JC: But there's a definite chilling effect if they're in the room with you.

SP: We need to have consensus on whether they're on Faculty Senate or not, then get rid of the convoluted language. If we're in agreement, have a clear statement that says "Although administrators are not members of Faculty Senate, they can be..." whatever.

RC: That's a very good point. Would you feel confident deciding on that in FSEC or through the faculty you represent?

AC: I think the faculty.

RC: Make a mental list and go back to your faculty about this—eliminate section 2, and add in language later.

AC: "...and will regularly meet with Faculty Senate leadership," which they already do.

RC: But that should be an issue that comes up.

SL: So just generally speaking; are you making notes about this?

JDH: I am.

RC: Then we're back to the elections issue.

NS: Wait—associate members. Currently, we don't have any adjunct faculty representatives...?

RC: We've voted to have them, but never implemented it.

NS: So that representative should attend this meeting and try to help represent *their* interests, too. They can't vote, but can participate in committees.

LJ: Hopefully we're going back to our departmental adjuncts, too, as well as regular faculty.

RC: Although quite frankly I don't know how many of you go back to adjuncts, vs. the 0.74 faculty.

JC: We have so many, and are different each semester!

SL: Do we need to come to consensus on who's on FSEC?

RC: Currently we have about 15 representatives. The problem is: there's no other body on campus that has a similar division of faculty. For example, the RTP Committee has nine. If we have 15, part of the problem is that some of you represent many more faculty than others. What's the right number?

JC: It's the Senate, not the House of Representatives.

NS: If the purpose of the FSEC committee is to gather information and communicate about stuff, and disseminate that information back to our constituents, then by department might be good. But when it comes to voting, etc.—if Business has lots of members, it can control a voting block. What purpose to we serve with this committee?

JC: You also don't want to be too big or else nothing will get done.

RC: Right. One challenge we have is that the word "department" isn't used consistently across campus. Some deans talk about "departments" because it raises the statuses of those segments of their schools. But some "departments" consist of one full-time faculty member and one adjunct. That would create far too many representatives.

NS: Can we do it by division/school? Business would have enough for two representatives.

IJ: That would alleviate Health Sciences because they have only one department...

RC: Of these *regular* faculty, not that many, yes.

AC: How many areas are feeling disenfranchised? Everyone is represented by *someone* on this body—are we getting complaints from any areas? If we can isolate them, we can focus on changing it.

RC: There was concern was when we formed new History/Political Science department—it's very small, but they wanted a representative. That would add to our numbers. Health Sciences says "We have lots of departments, and need more representatives." I was concerned that adding many was opening a Pandora's Box and would balloon the FSEC. It's evolved in a way that isn't necessarily logical. The representatives we have now are because of historical accident more than a plan.

AC: I understand that, but if there are only isolated areas that are problems, I don't see a need to shift what is working rather than realigning. To solve the small, isolated problems seems like lots of extra work on our part.

JC: This is kind of something I just noticed (on the projected document): it says "science" there under who gets representatives, but there are two different sciences.

RC: Fine & Performing Arts also had only one until recently.

AC: In English, we have 20 full-time faculty—should we have two representatives? One for composition and one for literature studies? For me, I think no, even though we have one of the largest faculties.

NS: I just looked at how the University of Utah does it (reads from web site): they base it on faculty in their divisions/colleges and based on the numbers of students going through those colleges.

RC: So equal representation across campus.

NS: For faculty *and* students.

AC: But that disenfranchises departments that aren't GE, and that's not fair, either.

RC: If you have strong thoughts one way or another, we need to address that.

NS: What is the current way?

RC: We have the categories (on the document), and that's who we are.

AC: Although Developmental Studies needs to be removed.

ST: I represent Physical Sciences, but JC is Life Sciences.

RC: It's not exact, but it's close.

SL: OK. Section 4.5—are we OK with that as it stands?

RC: Keep "should" (referring to having tenure to be a representative)? Or make some mandatory? We've been strict about enforcing rotation.

AC: Tenure should be mandatory to protect people in that position.

RC: Before, we didn't have as many tenured faculty, but now we have enough that that's tenable.

AC: I think that's a danger to the person in that position if s/he doesn't have tenure.

RC: So I think making all should musts would be better.

SL: Last year, we also did voting procedure—there's a technical name for this that I can't remember, but you vote once, and you successively eliminate those candidates that received lowest number of votes until you attain a majority.

CL: Russ already has that implemented.

SL: So it's good. We make reference in section 4.7 to a secretary/treasurer...?

JDH: That's me.

RC: We had an interesting e-mail that JDH forwarded to us last week: SLCC asked us if we have full-time assistant to the Faculty Senate; they have a ¾-time person and they were trying to make case for a full-time person. Our ears perked up, because frankly in the past, when Faculty Senate was self-supporting through dues, administration hasn't provided any money if you count Professional Development separately. They've already agreed to fund the Staff Associations with

budgets, because they also got rid of dues. We never made that request, so we should be able to ask for money to help out with things.

NS: What's the minimum we can ask for? Stella Callaghee had offered her services.

JC: We should ask for the most we can get, and negotiate down from there.

NS: That's probably not going to happen. I think we can ask and expect an administrative assistant on campus to come and pitch in.

JC: I think we'd need a half-time person,.

SL: What would that person do?

AC: We should see if we can get more workload release for the position.

RC: How much do you get?

JDH: One credit per semester.

JC: Is there any staff support for Professional Development?

NS: There's not.

RC: The Faculty Senate secretary helps with that a bit.

NS: It's now automated; the committee meets and approves applications, and Jim sends information onward.

SL: Could you (as Faculty Senate President) offload a lot of your work onto someone?

RC: Compiling requests and summaries? Yes!

SL: No, for Faculty Senate.

RC: I don't know—right now, little things go to my departmental secretary, but we have two part-time secretaries. That's been the default; I do most things myself.

SL: We should be reticent to ask for resources unless we're willing to use them.

RC: Yes.

NS: We do have a need.

TF: I think the model works; we just need to up the credit numbers.

SL: That's it for the Constitution portion. In the By-laws, we make reference to distribution of funds—I know we have a balance (*\$15,829.40 as of this writing—JDH*), and we haven't drawn on it for the past 18 months or so. What will be done with them?

RC: They're just sitting there.

SL: How do we disburse these funds? Do we need to formalize this?

NS: This is political, but I note that the Staff Association is getting traction from administration because they have a scholarship that they use for staff with some of their dues money.

SL: That's a really good idea.

NS: I think it can also get us more love from administration.

SL: We've also talked about having an optional fund-raising arm—a Faculty Senate foundation, and we can use that for scholarship. If we have that, then we could make case for an administrative person.

RC: I agree—I just don't know how to start it.

SL: It's troubling to me that that money is just sitting there and not being productive.

RC: Because we have no income, we're not trying to spend it too quickly. Without dues, it will never grow unless administration gives us a budget. When we have beginning of year luncheon, that's what it's used for.

AC: If I'm understanding: SL, you're thinking of a separate fund to which faculty members can contribute to that would fund a scholarship that Faculty Senate would award to student, etc. If we do that, we have to set up a 500-level account. Talk to Rick Palmer about it—on the "Giving" webpage, there are options of where donations can go. We'd need something there for someone to specify putting something into that specific account.

RC: I think NS's point is important: that if we as a faculty body support that account, that will improve our standing.

AC: Right—I'm just talking about how to implement it.

SL: Who disburses those funds?

AC: The Development office. Everything has to go through them; all incoming funds go to them, and they give out receipts to donors for tax purposes, but monies are ear-marked for individual 500-level accounts.

SL: So under the current structure, would this account accumulate, and then FSEC would be responsible for making distribution decisions in terms of certain pre-defined uses—scholarships, charitable events, etc...?

AC: I think it has to go through them; if there's anything contributed, it has to go into another account. I've been going through this to get alumni to donate to English Honors Society.

SL: Who decides what students get money?

AC: We would, but the money has to go through the Development Office. Any funds for that would have to be put in other account. It's just an administrative process.

SP: They sent out an e-mail—we have to go through them by law, but it's not hard to do; we make all the pertinent decisions.

SL: That'd be great.

NS: I move we designate time 2–3 meetings down to talk about this.

RC: When I get the minutes, I'll see what we've gotten through and when we can insert this into our agenda.

SL: Two final things. Article 8 talks about the Faculty Excellence Committee in the By-Laws—my initial reaction was “Why is that in the By-Laws”?

AC: I think it's there to make sure it's always under Faculty Senate control.

SL: It's not an institutional committee?

AC: It's always chaired by Faculty Senate leadership.

NS: There was talk of eliminating it.

AC: Yes, and leaving it here protects it.

RC: There's a competing committee right now—it's newly formed: Teaching and Learning. They'll be distinct from this, and we want to make sure that they have different roles, and that this one stays under Faculty Senate.

AC: The Committee now is making sure of Faculty Excellence through policies that are set out to define it, such as tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and faculty evaluation. Right now, we're looking at portfolios and the review process. Right now, there's no place for problems to be addressed via Faculty Senate before they come to FSEC. It's chaired by the Faculty Senate Past-President, and both the President and President-Elect are on it. And it's populated by the Faculty Senate, so they can make recommendations about who should be on it. Rightly or wrongly, it's on here.

SL: Last thing: new faculty orientation. Do we want to formally state that we are going to shepherd that and make sure it happens and what happens in it?

RC: It's happening. The mentorship part isn't, but there's a meeting at the beginning of each year.

SL: But it's been significantly downgraded since I was here. During the first semester I was here, every other week, new faculty had meetings.

RC: There was a misunderstanding about what that committee's intentions were, so it changed practice. So they're still trying to achieve those, just differently. This year was an exception.

SL: So we need to just itemize what will be in the orientation, and make sure it's properly staffed and has administrative support.

RC: And once we figure out what those are—which are responsibilities of the Faculty Senate and which of institution as a whole. This doesn't make sense to have in by-laws, about what *administration* is supposed to do. That should be a policy. So if there is something to this that is Faculty Senate's responsibility, that should be there.

JC: Is that (reads about who leads the committee)?

RC: It's difficult for the person that's just been elected and doesn't know what they're doing.

LJ: Plus they didn't know what was in the by-laws!

RC: That was great, SL. Please take those issues back to your constituents and get their thoughts. OK, now we need a very brief Academic Integrity update, because EO has met with our policy writer and—did you talk to Mike Carter (DSU legal counsel)? I know Legal had issues.

EO: Just to refresh our memories: we revised Academic Integrity so that we clarified the role of the Academic Integrity Committee, and create a system for people to report issues, and take the burden off the reporting person. As it turns out, there's actually already a reporting system in place that no one's been told about during orientation or the week of meetings! It's controlled at a phone-call level—you call the Registrar's office; they have a code system that a limited number of individuals can decode, and they enter information on student's file. There's no reason why you could not access this information under appropriate conditions. Departmental secretaries actually have, at some point, been given this code. So the system is built into Banner that allows faculty to quickly submit something, and get information back about if it's a repeat offense. So the question is: do we want a system that doesn't require picking up a phone? Legally, any system has to be behind the school's firewall. And FERPA controls who has access to the information—to guarantee that a faculty member that just doesn't like a student could query it even if no violation happened—it's a checks-and-balances issue. The other issue for which I need feedback from you guys is the big issue if FERPA. We're keeping our definitions vague so each department/division can come up with their own, and Legal didn't have a problem with that. So do we want a *new* reporting system, and be concerned about how it will be protected against misuse? It doesn't seem like it's going to be much different in terms of dissemination of information, but when input is anonymous, perhaps that provide hindrance to getting information you don't need...

RC: In the original policy proposal, there were different levels of severity of offenses and sanctions. For the simpler cases—for example, someone has a small assignment and plagiarized a small portion. It's noticeable, but it won't rise to more far-reaching penalties. In those cases, we want a simple system that doesn't dissuade faculty from entering that information.

EO: That phone system is apparently enough for administration, but for faculty...?

RC: It *has* to go through the Registrar?

EO: Yes, because it's recorded in Banner—not everyone can enter this kind of information, though lots can view it.

AC: As it should be.

RC: That's fine, but that's why we proposed the alternate system that is automated.

EO: This system also doesn't notify students. So it comes down to that it doesn't do what we like, but it is secure. If we build our own system, it has to be taken over by our IT people, and have certain things in place for FERPA violations. That crosses into a gray area. That's a decision that has to be made. Also, this is more informational, but the Academic Integrity Committee, according to Legal, has violated policy and due process in its current practices, and we have to return to our past practices, where we were involved in meting out punishment above a certain level.

RC: Due process in which part?

EO: Going outside the class—beyond a classroom policy, everything has to be labeled as due process, and has to have peer representation. I'm not sure how we then have a sufficiently independent appellate process. Basically, it sounds like we need another committee.

RC: When I first heard about that, my thought was: was when our Dean of Students (Del Beatty) decides that a student should be expelled, it has to go through a committee?

EO: According to Legal, yes.

RC: That's how due process is usually done.

EO: And that's how it's been done here. I'll check with Mike, but he raised a red flag. This is already considered appropriate due process; why doesn't it apply here? That could result in big changes in committees—another would have to be formed for appeals.

RC: That's backward, because the more committees that are involved, the less private it will likely be.

EO: Can I get a consensus of if we like a separate system, or whether we want to use the existing system?

RC: Who has access to see the notations?

EO: Deans, the deans' secretaries, and departmental secretaries.

RC: It does not show up on transcripts?

JC: If it's already in place...

RC: Would there be a hybrid approach, where an on-line system sends stuff to the registrar?

TF: That would be ideal.

RC: That may not solve the problems because of the firewall thing. But if it's possible, it would facilitate all this.

EO: And have a check in there for FERPA issues, about which faculty are querying it. Some sort of follow-up reporting so faculty don't query it just because they're curious.

RC: Would it require department chairs to sign off on each submission? I wouldn't expect to be too many of these at any one time.

AC: I think a department chair signing off on query is reasonable.

RC: So it would be obvious if someone was reporting 30 infractions at once.

EO: I will run that by them and see if that satisfies some degree of FERPA coverage. If we go through with this, we have to find people that can make it.

RC: And making sure it's secure is not trivial.

EO: IT chuckled when Martha approached them about it.

SL: How much is the current system being used?

EO: Not at all—no one knows it exists!

SL: Why create a new one when a current one exists? Just inform people of current one, and if we outgrow it eventually, we can revisit the issue.

EO: So we'd have to add another agenda item during week of meetings to describe this.

RC: Yeah, but that's like an extra five minutes. This policy isn't in the current pipeline to be approved, so this is a good trial run. There are other changes we'll want to get through first.

EO: So I propose checking in with Mike on his opinion, and determine if what Del Beatty is doing is comparable to what this body would do, and leave the component of policy about a reporting system, and not give any details. If we go through this trial, if it works, we'll leave it alone, and if not, we can modify the policy later.