

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Faculty Senate Executive Committee) MEETING

March 4, 2010

In attendance:

<i>Paul Abegg (PA)</i>	<i>Randy Jasmine (RJ)</i>
<i>Georgine Bills (GB)</i>	<i>Jack Lounsbury (JL)</i>
<i>Gary Cooper (GC)</i>	<i>Munir Mahmud (MM)</i>
<i>Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)</i>	<i>Dennis Martinez (DM)</i>
<i>Dianne Hirning (DH)</i>	<i>Ed Reber (ER)</i>
<i>Costel Ionita (CI)</i>	<i>Dennis Wignall (DW)</i>
<i>Chizu Jaret (CJ)</i>	

DW: PA has language for Constitutional change (on the issue of a 2 year vs. 1 year term for President-Elect and Past-President) – could you elaborate?

PA: It's simple: the idea is whether tenure should be 2 years to increase efficacy and continuity – the advantage is that the people going in have more time to get up to speed; the disadvantage is that on the 6 year model, whoever signs up does 6 years of service (which is a serious commitment!) – a 4 year model leaves a hole on either end of service, so it can really only be either a 3 year (as we have now) or a 6 year thing.

DW: In thinking about this, 6 years is liable to frighten many people, but a person can opt out at any time – if they have too many committees, they become ill, etc.; then a special election can be held, so it's not a "sign-off-your-life" thing. There's been concern from some faculty that the terminology of the proposed change looks like a power grab. I think this position (President) is one of the *weakest* on campus because it "gets it" from both ends – the Executive Committee is the power group.

ER: The thing I'm struggling with is: there is tremendous value in having faculty cycle through this experience, working with administration, getting more closely engaged with the policies of the college and Faculty Senate. I think that's a strength of the institution if more people do that, but with a 6 year policy, that cuts the number of potential people cycling through in half -- that'd be a loss. I'm struggling weighing those two things.

DW: An empirical perspective from my time in this role: I'm finally getting comfortable dealing with administration and vice-versa; it's taken that long for that to happen. Maybe that's a personal thing, but in a relational setting, it takes a while to build trust to move ahead and not be hindered by a lack of trust; by the time Summer transpires, the installed person has had only 8.5 months to do this – I'm not convinced it's enough time.

PA: In talking with past Presidents, I've learned that this issue has come up before – has anyone been involved in those past discussions?

ER: I haven't heard that; we had something like it with Tim Eicher – he was asked to serve a couple of years, but that was an ad hoc situation.

DW: I brought this up at the Utah Faculty Senate Leadership Council meeting here a few weeks ago. Every single campus in higher education in Utah was there (their Senate leadership) – one of the things they said is that many of them are moving to a 2 year role for Senate leadership. That's part of why I support idea. Leadership Council leadership is also a 2 year role – I am now in that position, too.

PA: So the others are 6 year models?

DW: Pretty much, though I can't point to specific language to support that.

MM: In the current format of the Constitution, can you run for President again?

PA: No, the way it's set up: the President-Elect becomes President. The other issue is: from my short tenure here, I've not seen a lot of interest in people wanting to be considered for position – there were only two people on last ballot.

ER: No, that's not right – the way it is now, the President-Elect has to be from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, not *all* faculty.

DW: Maybe we need to open it up more. But we have more turnover in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which sets more people up to run for President-Elect. I'm still trying to process the 50% reduction of people involved – can you clarify?

ER: Within 6 years, you'd have 3 people instead of 6 cycling through.

PA: Is it a time issue that more people aren't interested in the position? Is it a junior faculty issue? Awareness?

RJ: I think it may be commitment length, and extending that will make that even harder. Even if we choose from within the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the President would be in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for a minimum of 4 years anyway – that already turns people off.

PA: What if we increase the potential pool to those that have also been on Faculty Senate Executive Committee in past?

RJ: Why don't we just open it up to full faculty for President-Elect?

DW: That's interesting – becoming President-Elect automatically makes the person a Faculty Senate Executive Committee member even if s/he wasn't before.

RJ: Whatever changes we make, we should take nominations from the faculty at large.

ER: I can't speak for everyone, but as someone that loves to teach, I've always felt it my duty to do something like this, and I'm always happy when the term of service ends and I can get back to teaching – it reduces the ability to focus on what you really love to do. On other hand, the complexity and size of programs...

DW: We're growing so much in Communications that I get comp time to do this, but have to take an overload of courses to meet demand. But it's been doable because of support.

ER: I suggest we draw up language for extending terms, but I trust faculty enough that if we present it to them, they'll vote for the best way since we can't decide it among ourselves.

RJ: But we have to do this SOON (April)!

DW: We can't use e-mail to do this...but a General Faculty meeting usually has only same ~30 people anyway.

ER: I think e-mail is OK. I think we should do language the other way, too – that nominations can come from anywhere in the faculty.

DW: I like that – anyone wanting to move toward tenure may want to engage at that level and have that on their dossier (CV) – some junior faculty would welcome that.

PA: Do we need to start process of identifying interested candidates before Spring Break (via e-mail)?

RJ: That's the question – if we throw this out, should the proposal say "effective immediately" or "effective July 1" (meaning DW stays in another year)?

DW: The proposal, in terms of the vote, should have an informational block on the rationale behind the issue and options; I can post that and a survey on SurveyMonkey. First would be the proposal

language to present to faculty; then we suggest they give feedback and deal with that in FSEC, then put the issue up to a vote and share e-mails with all faculty...if someone wants to say what they feel about the proposal, it can be confidential.

RJ: Yes, they can speak to us representatives.

PA: We're talking about "immediately," yes? Whichever way we go, it'd be an immediate thing?

DW: Yes. Let's try to keep this as simple as possible, and we can always change it to July 1 later.

RJ: But that should be part of what the faculty decides! ("Would you like this to be immediate or begin April 1 or July 1?")

MM: I like it – this avoids looking like power grabbing.

RJ: And the third option is there, too (leave things as they are now) – we put them all together.

MM: So DW is President, then PA is President – are you (DW) out forever? After you're Past-President, can you come back as President-Elect again at a later time? *[most think so]*

JL: We should also put in a reminder about being a dues-paying member of Faculty Senate in order to be able to vote.

DW: Pam has list of dues-payers.

PA: Yes, that should be a requirement to vote.

MM: Did we talk about new faculty and dues-paying?

DW: Yes, that's the next item on the agenda – this goes along with the idea of having a Faculty Association. At the Utah Faculty Senate Leadership Council meeting, most were in favor of an Association kind of approach, where all pay a mandatory \$2-4 to belong, then *they* vote for senators, then *senators* vote for Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which votes for leadership. But with a Faculty Association, everyone has participation. I find it frightening that I can't identify people that have been here for years – they never come to meetings, participate, etc. when their input would be invaluable!

GC: How many faculty are there?

DW: About 150.

GC: So about one-third don't participate...?

DW: Yes...it's usually a hard core of 30-35 people that give input, etc.

MM: For a long time, I didn't know that dues had to be paid; I filled out the form and sent it in, but it didn't go through, so I went in and did it manually – it should be automatic.

DW: Looking at the numbers: if every faculty did \$2 each paycheck, we wouldn't need to raise dues. From Human Resource's perspective, it can never look like being hired and retained is tied to whether or not a person is paying dues, though.

GC: "If they don't want to come, you can't make them stay away." – it's hard to compel people.

DW: Having a Faculty Association, to my mind, legitimizes all faculty being members of an organization, legitimizes a service opportunity, even if they aren't active.

GC: Part of that goes with what PA said about time – I'm overloaded, and everyone I talk to is overloaded...

DH: Do we need to create task force to work on recruitment of getting those people that aren't paying to pony up?

DW: That's a central issue.

ER: There are also privacy issues – in the past, we did get a list of dues-payers in our departments and we would encourage those not on list to join.

DH: Some of these people might not realize they aren't paying, or what the benefits are of paying (what does Senate do for them?) – I just mean maybe we should be making appointments to see them and give them a form where they can fill it out, and talk to them about what we've been doing in Faculty Senate– we can educate them, not force them.

PA: That's good point – it's about awareness.

MM: Bring back the lunch, then lock the door! *[laughter]*

DW: It's sad when the only way to get participation is to buy them lunch!

RJ: Technically speaking, their money does go to that lunch...!

GC: At the last school I was at, Senate meetings were at 4-4:30, and had great attendance! And all they did was put out soda and cookies, but we had lively discussions – the faculty felt they had more ownership of the institution.

PA: Part of appeal of extending the term is that I'd be more comfortable with another year before becoming President!

ER: ...and that's the main concern about it being an ad hoc vote.

RJ: If we had a vote and it didn't come out either to stay the same as it is now or for PA to serve 2 years as President-Elect, we need to do things NOW before his term starts on April 1.

DW: We've been hashing this out for 5 months, but we should just move forward on it. We could also vote on the dues and Faculty Association issues at the same time.

RJ: So I'll write up options...

PA: Could that be a fourth option? A temporary adjustment of things?

DW: That would dilute the vote – we just have to have clear options. *[sends around handout]* Louise Excel has asked for us to look at this and give feedback.

ER: I'm on the Accreditation Committee and was asked to represent the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to them in developing core themes and values – I don't know if she wants a statement, but at some point, we'll have to look at the college's mission statement and make a statement about our contribution to the measurable goals of college and the values we support.

DW: What she's done here is ask for comments in advance – she just wants comments and reactions, not policy statements.

ER: In our individual departments, she wants statements of themes.

CI: I'm not clear what the "themes" are.

ER: They're supposed to be statements about our aims and goals that are measurable and that encompass the mission statement. *Then* people will state values that are aspirational, not measurable. Eventually, there will be 4-5 themes that will work for the college as a whole, then others for departments.

GC: So how are we generating these themes?

ER: Many departments have already come back with proposals.

MM: This is for Accreditation...?

DW: If you would, read this over and before the 11th; if you have comments, send them to Louise and identify yourself as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

ER: I can bring in some of the existing ones.

GB: I'm confused – these are eligibility requirements – what are we supposed to comment on?

CI: If we want to be judged by these criteria.

GB: But it's an incomplete list...! *[document is missing several pages]*

CI: I'd've liked to see shared governance in here, etc. as a criterion for the school! That they accept a Faculty Association (or whatever group) as part of shared governance.

DW: One more thing: I have heard from many that \$30 was too much for inauguration lunch, so they reduced it to \$20, so...! That's on the 19th; some of us have been asked to sit on stage; I encourage you to participate – it helps students (the cost goes wholly to scholarships). You should all encourage your departmental faculty to participate, too.