

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

March 31, 2011

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Brad Barry (BB)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Munir Mahmud (MM)

Shane Prine (SP)

Ed Reber (ER)

Dennis Wignall (DW)

DW: Who do we have here whose term is up at the end of this semester?

ER: Matt Smith-Larman is the new representative from our area; I don't know what to tell him when he shows up in the Fall.

DW: To keep some continuity, we ought to stick together 'til the end of the semester, and we should invite Ami to these meetings from now on.

ER: Since there's only one Humanities nominee, there doesn't need to be a general vote...? Can you make that an official notice that he was the nominee and agreed to do it?

DW: Yes.

PA: MM, this is your final year, right? Who's replacing you?

MM: Can a non-tenure-track faculty member have this position?

DW: That's a good question.

PA: Is there anything about that in the by-laws? I thought it said tenure-track only.

MM: We have an alternative, too, that is full-time, but not tenure-track.

JC: Are these people full-time lecturers that are renewed annually?

MM: Yes, but no one was sure in terms of what is required for being a representative.

PA: Who else is up?

SP: We are, but don't have a decision yet.

JH: Gary Cooper is out and Rob Cowan is coming in for Physical Science.

ER: DW noted that we changed the Constitution as we've grown, but it ought to be changed to make it a procedural matter each year that if new departments are created, they can select a representative, rather than have it go to the whole faculty.

DW: (looking at by-laws on-line) MM, it says full-time...it doesn't say anything about being tenure-track. It could be 0.74, too.

MM: I was wondering if tenure-track was a requirement.

PA: Do you want to put forth the name?

MM: At this point it is Bryon Geddes.

DH: I was re-elected for another 2 years.

DW: I'll have to serve anyway as Past-President and so will represent Communications. After that, the department will decide if I'll continue. OK, is that resolved? (Yes all around.) ER sent around an e-mail about the number of departments on campus now, and we can use that to elect representatives from new departments. For me, the item of greatest importance today is policy 3-10 (workload) and policy 3-18 (compensation). (Goes to policies on screen) This is what's currently posted. The two red sentences Donna lined out. What it was was that we presented the idea that this seemed too static and doesn't give departments the flexibility to shift faculty from 15 to 12 on a need-based basis. In the sentence previous to the one in red, we put in 27 credits "are typically as follows," making it flexible. But the one I'm getting dinged with is on the second page (II.C). The discussion was presented that the word "average" was problematic. I think everyone got my lengthy e-mail yesterday to define things. Equity is established by CUPA, which is a national organization that determines this per discipline/department. Equity as included in any of our policies comes from that benchmark. It costs us \$300 to access that; both Pam and Donna have said that any

one of us can come over and look at that printout. In there, one of the things that has been confusing and creating a sense of unfairness is that by linking equity and workload together, it creates a compensation statement in a workload policy. Donna was clear that “equity” and “workload” are two different things.

JC: So what we wanted was to take the word “average” out to make assessments on a person-by-person basis, not a faculty-wide basis.

DW: Since this all happened, I’ve been thinking about this. Personally, I will empower someone else and trust them to be fair; if I empower them to be unethical and untrustworthy, then I’ve empowered them to do something negative. I’d rather take the higher road, which admittedly makes me vulnerable. Donna and Pam have done nothing in the 7 years I’ve been here that indicate that they would in any way back off from their approach to equity. From their point of view, if administration changes above them and then requires some statement that defines how they are to achieve 90% equity mark, then that new administration would fall back on an unrevised policy, and where it says “when funds are available.” If that person went that way, it wouldn’t be unethical; just following policy. Right now, no administrator is going anywhere, so we can revise 3-18 and 3-10.

JC: The issue I have is that DSC has seen how administration can change overnight, and it could again. It can change for many different reasons—illness, etc. Because those things can happen, between now and whenever we revise 3-18...

PA: We’re talking April 7!

DW: Here’s another time-line thing: College Council meets Tuesday; Academic Council meets Thursday, so whatever lands in Academic Council Thursday won’t see the light of day in College Council ‘til the next time they meet, giving us a month. President Nadauld could get killed tomorrow, but that doesn’t change the ethics of this.

DH: But we have no guarantee that this will get approved.

PA: There’s no guarantees about any of this, but we have to have our voice.

VD: I don’t see why we can’t do both 3-10 and 3-18 at the same time?

PA: 3-18 isn’t currently under revision. We’d have to stall both of them in order to get that done.

JC: Why is that bad?

PA: That will put it into next Fall.

MM: Business department is in favor of deleting that clause.

JC: I think we need to take it and put it *into* 3-18 *before* we take it out of 3-10.

BB: 3-18 is well written; it just needs one statement about administration striving to keep us at equity.

PA: Robert Carlson addressed this in an e-mail, and Martha indicated that we’d meet resistance if we tried this.

DW: Martha doesn’t make these decisions about what gets revised; she provides revisions and we and administration look at them and come together on them and decide on a final format—it’s that simple.

BB: My feeling is that Pam and Donna would be amenable to having that statement in 3-18. “The administration will strive to have each faculty member at 90% equity or above.”

JC: Or within x amount of time from when they are out of equity. There has to be an incentive there other than the goodwill of the people in charge.

DH: It has to be in writing.

JC: When you are met with, say, five things to get done, equity will be last.

DH: Especially in this economy.

DW: That’s an unfounded assertion.

JC: Well, the possibility is that hiring would be first, and better packages for new hires would be made more important than equity, so there has to be some incentive.

DW: If it’s connected to overload...

PA: Are we in agreement that we want this to be disconnected from overload?

ER: I don’t see why we should go back on what we voted about before... Clearly, Martha and Pam are of the opinion that this is a good thing to help us keep administrators focused on bringing everyone back to 90% of equity. I want to give an example about DW’s ethics thing: it’s not that simple. A few years ago, we found out our salaries were far below CEU and Snow College. We found out that when someone retired and left an unused \$60K salary, and someone was hired at \$30K, the remainder was taken out and put into scholarships rather than back into the pool for faculty salaries. I don’t know about the ethics of that, but the *effect* was that our salaries and our morale was dismally low, so there’s every reason to have language in the policy until there’s a reason to take it out.

PA: Is that the consensus? (Yes from nearly everyone).

DW: I have received a fairly balanced feedback about leaving it in vs. taking it out and putting it in compensation. It’s a mixed bag.

VD: Is there any need, other than that it's on the docket, to rush the change and make it happen next week?

DW: Yes...they're going to make contractual compensation decisions between now and July 1, so the language is going to reflect or support the decisions they make or don't make in the next few months.

ER: There's a bigger reason not to delay: what the policy *now* says (the first sentence crossed out in II.C) is not our practice; the workload model says something different, and that's what we've been following. Next year, when we go through accreditation, we don't want this disparity. That language is in the workload model that we've been following. We didn't put in a link between reaching 90% of equity and overloads; the administrator(s) that made this did. Because that was the practice before, it rolled over into this.

DW: We're back to the same initial problem of having two issues related to two policies in that one statement.

JC: I don't see that that's what is confusing most faculty. Most know the difference between equity vs. average (or whatever other statistic). Without "average," everyone has to be at equity.

VD: Is there a short-term compromise in that we go back to our original motion to take "average" out and that resolves the workload issue, and that in the Fall we'll work on 3-18?

DH: Yes.

ER: Yes.

DW: Then what we should do is call for a vote: I'll move that we remove "average" and leave the rest alone.

PA: We already did that.

DW: Then to reiterate it. (Unanimous ayes.) That should do it. The next step is to visit with Donna again, but she won't be back in town 'til Monday.

PA: So not before April 7.

BB: Could the two of you send an e-mail to her saying that this is what we voted on and what we request?

DW: Yes.

ER: Could we send this to the associate deans, too? The Academic Council that will be voting on this later?

PA: Yes, they should know how the faculties in their divisions feel.

ER: Yes...that we'd like to consider 3-18 before further revisions.

PA: So...pull it?

ER: No, because we need that first sentence removed.

DH: Just put forth the subtraction of the word "average" with the understanding that we'll revise 3-18 before any more changes to 3-10 are made.

PA: Do all of the deans know how their constituents feel?

DW: The representatives should go talk with their deans.

BB: Did we just conclude that DW would communicate with Donna and all of us our deans? (Yes.)

MM: Can we put in our minutes the exact format of ER's rephrasing?

ER: "When faculty base salaries remain within 10% of equity benchmarks, faculty overload shall be limited to one course with a maximum of 5 credits per academic year. Exceptions are subject to the approval of the Vice-President of Academic Services."

DW: (types e-mail to Donna covering this discussion) Could you look at this and tell me if the language is OK?

VD: Can we say that we'll take this up again next year?

DW: Well, this is just for Donna as a professional respect; when she responds and gives me permission to send this out to faculty, then I'll do that.

PA: It would be good to put specifically how we want it to read.

JC: And that we'll take it up again when 3-18 is revised.

DW: OK, hold on. (Cuts existing policy from web site, removes word "average"; matches ER's phrasing above).

BB: Maybe it should say "When each faculty member's salary *remains* within..."

DW: That's better suited to 3-18.

DH: Agreed.

PA: Say "here's the language that is requested," rather than "suggested."

JC: And that we'll readdress this when 3-18 is revised to put equity in?

DW: No, that's in the minutes, and that's enough for now. Donna will read the minutes and see the rest of what we've talked about concerning workload. OK, now I want to look at something else quickly: 3-18 (salary schedule): 18.1 specifies national survey data...18.2: should say FSEC, not Senate...18.3: should reflect CUPA. OK, here it is: 18.5 & 18.5.1: these plus 18.6 are equity statements. I'm still bothered by the assignment of overload to underpaid faculty—

basically, if you're bothered by equity, you get overload. This is the unfair statement. But we've voted and the e-mail is gone, so I call this meeting adjourned.