

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Faculty Senate Executive Committee) MEETING

March 25, 2010

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)
Gary Cooper (GC)
Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)
Chizu Jaret (CJ)

Randy Jasmine (RJ)
Jack Lounsbury (JL)
Tom McNeilis (TM)
Dennis Wignall (DW)

DW: Any revisions on the previous minutes? (No.) Then I guess we approve the minutes if there are no revisions.

RJ: Since they become public, we should approve them.

DW: I'll take that as a motion (PA 2nd; approved). OK: the most pressing thing I have today is Ed's "fist aid" thing for extending the term of service – I'm in favor of it and I've heard from almost everyone -- GC, I didn't hear from you...?

GC: I agree with it.

DW: I've also not heard from SP and one other person, but... (CJ enters) Chizu, what do you think about it?

CJ: I don't think I know the policy well enough to say much, but based on what I've read, I think that everyone feels it's OK to have a longer term.

DW: There's no hard language in the Constitution for precluding it.

RJ: We're talking the temporary measure here?

DW: Yes.

RJ: There is a Constitutional measure – we need to talk to Tim Eicher and others about when this arose in the past.

JL: We didn't have a faculty vote at that time (~8 years ago); we just did it – it was pretty close to last-minute; the President-Elect they had at that time backed out and never served as President.

DW: Well, they didn't have a precedent for a decision.

RJ: My opinion is that we need to have an official FSEC vote – we can send that out today or tomorrow as an official vote, with you and PA and the members of FSEC – initiated and announced by *us*, just to say that PA has expressed concerns about his schedule, etc. and his ability to serve next year, therefore we asked DW to temporarily serve for one more year; we took a vote, etc., and I assume that'll be "yes."

DW: Can you write that and send it out? Include PA and I.

RJ: Yes; then we'll tell faculty this was what we did.

DW: Phrase it as a formal vote, too.

RJ: We can say something like "Due to circumstances unrelated to the discussion about a *permanent* extension, that discussion will continue" – we didn't act on that because lots of people want to talk about it more, so it's a different situation.

GC: Is next week our last Faculty Senate meeting?

DW: What is scheduled in the Constitution is an election for new leadership on Apr. 1; that's why I've been trying to move this forward...if we need to have a vote, we'll have a meeting and have a confidential ballot then. If the FSEC votes in favor of continuation, we'll still have meeting but won't need the confidential election.

RJ: Except for new Senators. We need to make a list of who is up for re-election/change.

DW: Yes; our Constitution requires a nominating committee from within the FSEC – I wish we had more folks here today to form that to find out who needs to be represented and find nominees in those departments. IMO, we have an expanded number of departments and programs; do they all need to be represented on FSEC? Certainly on the Senate, but...

RJ: I think the way we're constituted now, yes – if you have department status, you should. Psychology doesn't have a department but does have a program, for example. So, the way I read the Constitution, departments have Senators on the FSEC.

DW: We can have mid-term elections to FSEC as those departments get declared, right?

RJ: Do we have departments. without representation?

DW: No, but some Senators don't come to FSEC often, and might need replacing.

PA: Anyone on the FSEC can serve another 2 years if they get department support, right?

RJ: So should those of us that are leaving solicit our departments for replacement? The ballots after solicitation go to the whole Faculty to vote, not just within the departments.

DW: Isn't there a problem, then, that departments put a name forward but they don't solicit enough votes? In my view, we need representation from *all* departments – we can ask for a confirmation vote from the Senate at large in order to get a range of votes, or else the vote is loaded – large departments could have three names and small departments don't make it in, so we don't get equal representation.

RJ: No, we divide it up – for example, we don't have X candidates and take the six highest vote getters regardless of what departments they are from – the votes are self-contained within each department, but everyone in the Faculty does the voting. So the ballot says X Department's candidates are ____, Y Departments candidates are ____, etc., and then the vote chooses representatives from each department.

JL: The departments already declare who their candidates are.

RJ: We just need someone to put together the ballots.

PA: This has to be by the end of the semester, right?

TM: It is done at the final meeting in April.

DW: In the past, the Apr. 1 meeting is where this happened, but we can have a later meeting to seat people on the FSEC. But the Apr. 1 meeting has to do with Senate leadership more than anything else.

RJ: And that's why we need the FSEC ballot today-ish.

GC: Would it be a good idea at that time to put a time line on Constitutional change, so that by a certain time next year, we want to have that vote?

PA: There are a lot of changes that need that.

RJ: I think you could say that we have *these* items that need to have been voted on by Nov. 1 for these Constitution changes; we could make a *general* statement about it now, but do it like Martha does it: we're going to look at these three (or whatever) parts and vote on them by this point, then look at another three and vote on those later, etc.

DW: Sounds like a plan. We do have one potential leadership vote: do we need a second Faculty Senate President-Elect? When PA moves into the President position, we need a new President-Elect.

TM: Yes – I think we need that vote now in order to give that person more time to get up to speed!

DW: And that's the long time commitment issue.

RJ: I think we need to word the Constitution so that this committee serves at certain times without a President or President-Elect and we can appoint someone from *within* FSEC to serve in those times – the President can appoint people to chair committees otherwise overseen by the Past-President, for example. So if we extend *only* the President's period, then there will be those times when we don't have a President-Elect, etc....that way, serving is not a 6-7 year commitment, and the position is more attractive. So it wouldn't be a three year but a four year commitment, but not more.

PA: If we go with a temporary solution, we've never had a President-Elect prepping to become President – as brutal as that is, it preps person to become President.

DW: Yes, as the President is getting up to speed, the President-Elect is, too, but the responsibilities are not identical – the longer the President and President-Elect interact, the better prepped the President-Elect is to take over.

RJ: So we need two years as President-Elect, too?

TM: One year isn't enough! If we elect another President-Elect now, then there are two – the new one begins getting up to speed while other one has had more time.

DW: So we have a President, a Vice-President, and a President-Elect – rather than two Presidents-Elect. The closer one to President is the Vice-President. We have to create that label in the Constitution.

PA: But that still extends the time of service.

DW: Yes, but the President-Elect is a less firm commitment – they have a year to figure out if they want to continue.

JL: But if that goes to two years, then it extends *everyone*.

DW: I wonder why the Past-President role exists...?

TM: To help the President as an advisor.

JL: What do other schools do that have two year terms?

DW: Some have Past-Presidents, others don't. If you spend two years as President, we don't need a Past-President because the President-Elect has had two years to prepare.

RJ: So we're back to a 4 year commitment.

DW: Yes. He Past-President rotates into the Faculty Excellence Committee chair– anything else we'd have to fix with that?

PA: The Faculty Salary Negotiating Committee, but that doesn't exist anymore.

DW: Well, I did suggest we reinvigorate that...

RJ: From a practical standpoint: do we anticipate these changes, or wait until discussion takes place? We're not going to elect another President-Elect now, right?

TM: There's a proposal that we possibly do that...

RJ: Yes, but in the Fall, after discussion, etc. If we appoint another one, and give the rationale that we've talked about, that's presumptuous that the Faculty will approve the changes we want. There was a good amount of feedback that we shouldn't do that.

DW: Yes, but that may be because we made it look like a rush job.

RJ: It needs more discussion before we have substantive change. So the only vote we have coming up is for new FSEC members, not new Senators. I'd only be in favor of things if the President-Elect vote comes from *all* Faculty, not just the FSEC.

DW: Well, out of paying Senate members, not all Faculty.

RJ: Yes.

GC: And if we have more than two, is it going to have to be majority?

RJ: Yes – however many nominations we have, we vote on those. We can word in the Constitution to do a straight vote, or, as in some places, take the top two and have a run-off election.

DW: OK. Taking suggestions for a place for the Faculty to talk about things: that got me trying to figure that out. I thought about creating a Senate-only e-mail list (not all faculty). The problem is that, in reviewing the Constitution, it says that all Administration except the President can be members of

the Senate if they pay the dues. Dean Hinton, Donna, etc. all pay dues, which by definition makes them Senators, which would include them on e-mail list – do we just exclude them? They can't vote in the Senate, but they can suggest and second motions.

GC: Can there just be a voting member e-mail list?

RJ: Yes, the language is there, and we could emend it, but we don't want to exclude people that want to participate. But a voting member list would be OK.

DW: I just need to phrase it some way – I can get it set up quickly.

TM: I thought Munir was going to set it up?

DW: No, that's just the web site.

RJ: In that way, it addresses two concerns: people that don't pay dues, can they vote?

DW: Not on Senate issues.

RJ: Then we make it a voting members list – as soon as they pay dues, they get added to the list.

DW: That creates a list that Administration is not overseeing what the Senate is doing.

RJ: Yes – but there's always a possibility that Administration can see such messages anyway because the school technically owns e-mails in their system.

DW: I looked into that – Federal laws say that as soon as the Send button pushed, an e-mail is public. I'll get that up and running. Now, as Senators, when you go to your departments, let's encourage non-dues-paying individuals to join and increase the strength of our voice not only with the school but the Regents, etc. Right now, it looks like we have a fractured voice because one-third of the faculty are not members! That's crucial – that's an oversight to appoint Senators that aren't paying dues! We need to make sure that we're working on those people. An alternative to becoming a Senator exists: rather than set up payroll deduction, a person can pay the Senate Treasurer directly. I prefer to monitor it via deduction – for one thing, it's easier! But we need to get our Faculty into the Senate – it underscores the Faculty Association idea – they pay dues, elect Senators, the Senate elects the FSEC – three layers of governance. If all Faculty are Senators, who do they represent? Dues paying cannot be mandatory for employment, but...

PA: Do we know how many new Faculty are coming in in the Fall?

RJ: President Nadauld said eight.

PA: If we take time in new faculty meetings to talk about it...

TM: That's already done – I've done it the last two years.

DW: We can make the plea at the new faculty lunch and have forms available.

TM: Are we going to raise dues?

RJ: What's our deficit?

DW: It's gone, but it took us a long time!

RJ: I think that maybe next year, we decide on that finally and couch it in "Do we return to lunches?"

And when we bring the lunches back, if we decide to raise dues, do it then!

DW: Another problem with the lunches: people that *think* they're Senators go get a free lunch – how do we monitor that?

TM: Have a check-off at the counter.

DW: I don't want to police it, but people can't police themselves.

RJ: Maybe answer is to have lunch only 1-2 times per semester.

PA: And have a set spread on the table, not an open-ended thing.

TM: But that's more expensive.

GC: We could also give non-paying members a "buy" for one lunch, but not after that.

DW: It can get really complicated and start to look like policing.

RJ: I was thinking about paper vouchers that would go to department representatives, who would then distribute them to dues-paying members each month – we can control it that way.

DW: I can see that working...

GC: When I talk to some older faculty, they're acutely aware of the dues situation...it hasn't been changed in 16 years. One thing we should make other faculty members aware of is that we can't just spend wildly for everyone, and that we'll have to address it at some point.

TM: For the April meeting, we must have a final vote on the new Faculty Excellence questions for the student reviews.

DW: Just send it out to rest of the faculty.

TM: It already has been; we just need the final vote.