

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (FSEC) MEETING APRIL 16, 2009

In attendance:

Randy Jasmine
Jack Lounsbury
Tom McNeilis
Costel Ionita

Ed Reber
Gary Cooper
Dennis Wignall
Shane Prine

Jerry Harris (secretary)
Paul Abegg
Dianne Hirning

AGENDA:

- (1) Approval of minutes – *Motion to approve: DW; seconded, TM; approved.*
- (2) Discussion: Randy Jasmine - Standing Committee for policy review/rewriting – *see (4), below.*
- (3) Discussion: Tom McNeilis - Last year's budget "black hole" – *previously, Martha Talman had reported that for the previous academic year, the FSEC account has ~\$8000 and was now \$6000 in the hole, but TM & JH pulled up the account transaction records and discovered it is only ~\$1700 in the hole; a small amount was carried over from the previous year. In the 2008 academic year, roughly \$9300 was spend from the account, primarily to pay for the lunches at the full senate meetings, but other expenses are included, such as Best Practices and some mysterious charges that require further investigation; rare one-time expenses, such as the painting for Dr. Caldwell upon his departure, also came from this account. Subsequent discussion focused on courses of action to reduce the deficit and prevent this from happening in the future. TM suggested increasing the dues/membership fees from the current \$2 per paycheck (which it has been for a minimum of 15 years) to \$4 per paycheck. A second idea was to provide the cafeteria cashiers with a list of dues-paying faculty, and only they would have their meals paid for. CI suggested making the meetings mandatory as a means of encouraging current non-dues-paying faculty join. The suggestion was also put forward to have the lunch meetings have pre-prepared box lunches only for those that RSVP they will attend. DH suggested capping the value of the food purchased to match the dues/membership fees; anything beyond that has to be paid out-of-pocket be individual faculty. DW suggested a movement to increase enrollment by actively recruiting current non-dues-paying faculty by informing them more of what the Faculty Senate does and why it is valuable – GC noted that some faculty may not be members because they are unaware of the group's function and/or effectiveness. DW suggested moving the discussion to e-mail to establish what course(s) of action will be pursued before putting anything either to a vote or in front of the full senate. He also noted that we may need to amend the current senate policy to require a more accurate and detailed paper trail for expenditures as well as more rigorous monitoring of the account budget, perhaps requiring two signatures on any expenses (e.g., treasurer + president).*

- (4) Discussion: Dennis Wignall - Current policy revisions as presented by Martha last week – *DW encouraged everyone – FSEC and other faculty alike – to read proposed policy revisions and proposed new policies with a specific eye toward how they will equate to the future, rather than merely serving as “Band-Aid™s” for current policy deficits – to exert changes from within the faculty body, rather than have them inflicted from outside the faculty body. ER noted that it is not sufficient for policy-makers/revisers to just (in effect) toss out drafts and request that faculty look at them, but have often singular writer/revisers be the ones retaining control of bills; to ameliorate this, a senate subcommittee may be required through which all proposed policies and policy changes would go. RJ specified that, on Donna Dillingham-Evans’s advice, the senate should construct and appoint a standing committee to review policies and recommend courses of action.*
- (5) Discussion: Dennis Wignall - "Hiring Committee" members and mission – *much discussion on this issue! ER and RJ commented that if only Hiring Committee (H.C.) people are trained by Human Resources (H.R.) on what to do, and chairpersons of departments doing the hiring are not, then the H.C. people will exert unfair control. DW noted that H.C. representatives on any individual hiring committees are supposed to represent H.R. and legal concerns; there was some subsequent confusion about whether these individuals simultaneously need to be concerned with a candidate’s qualifications (e.g., teaching ability) and therefore have full voting rights in which candidate is selected, or whether the candidate’s qualifications are the responsibility only of the department doing the hiring. CI suggested that chairpersons of departments that will hire someone are the ones that should be trained by H.R., rather than a group of H.C. people that may not be called upon to use that training for many months, after which time they may have forgotten a great deal; the department chairs, then, would be responsible for imparting that training to members of their individual hiring committee – including outside representatives – prior to the initiation of candidate examination. RJ offered to write up varying viewpoints and send them to the FSEC for further consideration. ER noted that if H.R. needs to make a decision about a formal H.C. soon (they had suggested a July 1 deadline), then the FSEC should recommend that department chairs be trained while the senate continues to work on the structure (if any) of a formal H.C. DW offered to follow up on that recommendation.*
- (6) Discussion: Dennis Wignall - Guidelines for the construction of a teaching portfolio -- *no discussion*
- (7) Discussion: Dennis Wignall - Should we populate the Exec Committee with at least one faculty member from each department?
(See: <http://www.utexas.edu/academic/cte/teachfolio.html>)
- Action:
Creation of a faculty-populated committee for Departmental Reviews -- *no discussion*
- (8) Ongoing: Encourage faculty members in your areas to contribute ideas, insight, and constructive criticism throughout the academic year. -- *no discussion*