

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Apr. 4, 2013

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Robert Carlson (RCa)

Rob Cowan (RCo)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

JiH Haendiges (JiH)

Dianne Hirning (DiH)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Erin O'Brien (EO) (for Jen Ciaccio)

Russ Ross (RR)

Nate Staheli (NS)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

Drew Wilcox (DW)

RCa: OK, Let's get started. Let's welcome NS officially as the new President-Elect. As of today, all of the outgoing representatives are gone.

RCo: Except me! I want to introduce my replacement, Samuel Tobler, from Physics.

PA: Timothy Francis will be the new Music representative.

RCa: Samuel, thanks for coming. We need a motion to approve the minutes from the last two meetings (RCo moves, SL seconds). Comments? (None; approved.) OK, A couple of things we have to take care of: the Professional Development Committee has a few things to change, but most need more discussion. However, the first thing we can address now is how the committee chair is appointed. Right now, it's the President-Elect, and the committee has expressed concern that there's so much turnover that way that it doesn't work. So the proposal is that the chair is would be chosen for a 3 year service from among the committee members; the President-Elect will remain on the committee but be a non-voting member, to liaise with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to ensure that no biases, etc. creep in. I don't anticipate anything like that, but it's a safeguard just in case because that committee has lots of influence. I move that we accept that change. (EO seconds.) Discussion on just that issue?

SL: So it would be chosen from this (FSEC) committee for 3 year terms? But senate representatives are for 2 years.

RCa: No, someone from *that* committee, not necessarily this one. Almost certainly not from this one.

JiH: They were doing great, but it takes so long for incoming chairs to get up to speed.

RCa: As far as I know, this change wouldn't be a policy change because having the chair be the President-Elect has been tradition, not policy.

PA: As long as there's still a tie to this body, I think it's OK.

RCa: Yes, I mentioned that a couple of meetings ago. But the connection needs to be created.

NS: That committee is populated by people *not* from in here?

RCa: Yes; having the tie would be to create a check and balance system.

EO: The only question I have is that presently, when it's the President-Elect, it's easy to figure out who the chair is, but a new one would need to be widely advertised so faculty would know to whom they should submit applications.

PA: Even when it's easy to figure out, I still get requests!

RCa: Good point. We have more recommendations that will change the submission process and make it on-line, so knowing who chair is wouldn't be necessary. But right now, it's confusing, and there are other problems. I have a document on that (passes out list of proposed changes), but we shouldn't try to tackle those now. Any other discussion on changing the chair? Oh, one other thing: one other change to make is that we want to have four submission deadlines and time periods over which to evaluate the applications, instead of the current three. The first one would be on Sept. 15, and they would be every 2 months after that. Sept. 1 is too soon; no one ready to submit by then. Delaying it hopefully won't affect too many people, but then every 2 months means that it's a shorter wait before the next deadline for anyone that misses the first one. So I emend that to the motion, too.

PA: Would that be a policy change?

RCa: Yes. But the others on the list I passed out are discussion items for later. This one isn't controversial and shouldn't need much discussion.

EO: I still second the motion.

JiH: By the way, just because we increase the number of application deadlines doesn't mean we have more money!

EO: In the past, usually by the third deadline, money is tight. So now it would be even tighter by the fourth, and some people have summer conferences.

RCa: This year, we allocated money for each deadline, and we allocated less for the final one; we misproportioned and ran out, and can allocate differently next time. The current proposal is vague on how to allocate, though.

EO: In past years, none was allocated, and it was first come, first serve.

RCa: If you want to make recommendations about how to allocate, we can do that later.

PA: The last item (requiring sending summaries of results of being given professional development money to the Academic Vice-President) on this (the passed-out list) needs to be removed because it won't happen.

RCa: We'll leave it in until the Vice-President wants it out. It generally isn't done, but from a Faculty Senate perspective, it's not an issue. It needs to be clarified from their office. So: is there more discussion on the motion to do both things?

NS: Going forward, the chair would be from the current Professional Development committee?

RCa: Yes, because people on that committee tend to serve a while.

EO: Do you have someone in mind for the position?

RCa: AC and I do. All in favor? (Approved.) Now, the Academic Honesty issue we've talked about before. (Passes out a document.) I proposed this summary at Don Hinton's request. Please look this over and let me know if this is a reasonable summary of the issues we've discussed, to be used as a road map to future policy changes. This has already been sent out; please look at it and ensure it reflects what we've already discussed.

EO: This is exclusively about student honesty?

RCa: No. One of the recommendations is for this to apply to everyone on campus.

EO: In order for us to qualify for many government grants, we have to have a professional integrity policy that would include this.

RCa: We now have a draft of a Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy; I don't know that that would be in there, but we'll see. The problem is that what the state government wants is *very* restrictive in terms of things like patents, copyrights, etc. We need people to look over this and prepare a policy. A year ago, a policy was created on how policies are presented. There's a lot of tension between Human Resources and the rest of campus on policies—Human Resources is the clearinghouse for policies. The new proposed policy doesn't require their involvement. They want to be involved, but any entity on campus can propose any policy it wants, though it would have to go through all the required channels. For example, an honesty policy would have to go through the Legal Committee. We can create our own policies. So my recommendation is that we form a committee to write a policy on Academic Honesty. I think most of the people on the Policy Subcommittee are leaving the FSEC. That subcommittee was intended to take already-proposed policies and provide summaries about them to the faculty for discussion. *This* is asking for people to actually turn something *into* a policy—it's more work, but needs to be done. So we need volunteers to do this—that's why it's an action item on our agenda.

EO: Right now...?

RCa: Hopefully. But if no one can decide now, we can wait, or we can wait for it to go through Human Resources' priority list.

PA: I still wonder how common is it for Human Resources to write policy?

RCa: I don't know, but we shouldn't address that.

PA: The new Academic Vice-President might rearrange things.

RCa: Maybe, but I wouldn't count on it as a priority for the incoming Vice-President. Our current policy allows us to do this, and we should.

EO: When would this take place?

RCa: There's no deadline, but because it can affect grants, and has caused problems for some faculty, we'd like it addressed sooner than later.

DW: If a committee forms, and the policy is written, what's the implementation timeline?

RCa: Probably 3-4 months. It has to go through the Legal Council committee, various student committees, and all affected entities, then to Academic Council, then University Council, and then the Board of Trustees.

DW: So by the 2014-2015 academic year?

RCa: It doesn't have to wait for a new year; it could be by end of Fall if it's written over summer. I'm just bringing this forward to seek volunteers. And you don't have to be on the FSEC to be involved.

NS: I'll be involved.

EO: Me, too. Maybe Tim Eicher?

RCa: If he wants to, that'd be great—he's focused on implementing the current policy. Lish Harris would be another one, and has advocated for a department/program- or school-level involvement that's not in the current policy. I'm not worried about reforming the Policy Subcommittee until next semester; volunteering now is *just* to be involved in working on this one policy.

JiH: I'll volunteer.

RCa: Good; now we have a good start. OK, the last action item on the agenda: the Faculty Senate web site. Currently, Munir (Mahmud) controls it, and it needs updating. He's willing to do it, but because he's not part of this group, it's not a high priority. So we can let him continue, or we can have someone else take charge.

NS: Is that a secretarial function?

JDH: As long as you don't want anything fancy, I could do it.

SL: Munir also wanted list of current committee members.

RCa: Our organizational structure is a mess here because we focus on programs more than departments, but FSEC representation is based on departments.

EO: (looking at current web site) A list is there, but needs updating.

RCa: OK, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy: On Tuesday I found out we have a draft finally.

SL: Who wrote it?

RCa: Martha and Pam. Martha was hired to do it as overload. Louise Excell still has a role, but in other policies.

SL: Is this Martha's last hurrah?

RCa: I have no idea about the future; all I know is that she and Pam felt strongly tied to this and wouldn't let it go. So we're scheduling a meeting for tomorrow afternoon, at 1, to discuss this. She'll summarize what's in it, and we'll start modifying the draft. The purpose is to get a final *draft*, not a final version, that can be distributed to the campus community. All I want to know is if you're interested in taking a role in this, please come to the meeting. Varlo Davenport is in there; DH, even though she's leaving the FSEC, will be a part.

SL: Martha and Pam will be there?

RCa: Martha will; Pam tends not to go to these things. But they've both been very helpful in accommodating our suggestions for changes in the past. It's just that Martha has been a bottleneck and has had her own list of priorities, but she's always been very helpful to us. We'll try to address a number of issues. In addition, a workload issue that just came up: some people have heard that e-portfolios are mandatory for our 0.74 faculty; that's not correct. It's optional, but not mandatory. Making them mandatory would mess up the 24-27 thing.

NS: Not required, but encouraged...?

RCa: Don Hinton didn't say that; just that it's optional. If you have 0.74 people that feel pressured about this, please pass this information along.

EO: I'm on the Workload Committee, and one thing that came up at our meeting last Monday is that we've been getting lots of proposals from people that are basically supervising adjuncts or peers, but that are not serving as chairs. I think we're at a point where the committee is willing to put forth the political effort necessary to produce an equation so people doing supervising can get credit for it. Please go back to your constituents and find out who's doing this sort of thing, and let me know—I need to know who they are, how to reach them, how many people and/or classes they're supervising, if they're doing instructional meetings, doing curriculum development for all sections, and the frequency with which they're bringing in new people and have to train.

RCa: These would be like lab and clinical coordinators?

EO: Yes; I know that there are people like this in Accounting and E-marketing; also Li Lei's request for a mini-chair thing...anyone putting in for this. In the sciences, some do and some don't get credit for doing this—it's just politics.

RCa: Yes, uniformity would be nice!

DW: A lot of our instructors are asking me that with the move to 24, some of them are on 9 month contracts, but many of us do 10-12 month contracts—how does the shift to 24 change things? Not too many of my people are on 9 month contracts.

RCa: I will bring that up with Don Hinton—he's been very good at getting me answers on problems I bring up. OK, the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws: we need changes, from the mundane (such as changing "college" to "university"), to more substantive. Previously, we voted on two changes that we have to implement: we voted to eliminate charging dues, but it has yet to happen. We also voted to add one more FSEC representative from the part-time faculty. There's just a problem: Janet Walker let me know that many advisors are full-time—we don't know where they fit. I think, if they're full-time, even if they're not tenure track, then they're part of the department they're in. But it depends on whether they're advisors or instructors. I was under the impression that they were all part time. So I'm not sure how that would work out.

PA: If they're full time, they're represented by the department's representative.

RCa: We'll clarify the statuses. Also, there are two kinds of tenure track, for example: the traditional academic one, and one that compensates for lacking a terminal degree—a professional tenure track. I don't know how other full-time instructors will work; I didn't know we dealt with that.

EO: Can we poll them to see how they feel?

RCa: We've already voted to add the representative; we just need to find that person, and that will be someone that is 0.74 or less, and assume for now that full time advisors will be parts of their respective departments.

NS: Didn't we decide for adjuncts?

RCa: The problem with that is that there's not a standard definition of "adjunct." Some people have it as "auxiliary," and include 0.74 people, even those on salary. Don Hinton is saying that the new workload thing will benefit adjuncts, but it doesn't benefit those on 0.74 salary because they have to teach more under the current definition.

SL: So the 0.74 people would have a single, collective representative, regardless of the departments they're in?

RCa: Yes, because there are issues that affect them that we don't always see.

SL: Advisors would be a part of that?

EO: My concern is that these are people that, with this change to 24, wouldn't be on committees, etc., and so would be teaching at a 27 credit load, and would feel that they're not represented.

RCa: Perhaps—I don't know what to do about that. We're trying to represent their voice, as we learn of their issues, in all our committees; having a representative here might help us learn more. I personally know a lot about the 0.74 problems because my wife is one. But some 0.74s are being told something is or isn't a requirement. We're not ready to vote on all of the other issues on this list, but we need to begin dealing with these. I tried to word things such that they are consistent with previous policy to be neutral, but we need to discuss what we want to do for breaking ties, etc.

PA: We talked about this last year; didn't any of that get put in?

RCa: I didn't have time to incorporate anything other than what I remembered.

RCo: I thought Brad Barry did that.

RCa: Possibly, but I don't know where that document is.

PA: I will see if I have that information.

RCa: Good, but we need to have these changes. We have voted, but not implemented, because things are not specifically worded. OK, my last question for us is: we have money in our account.

JDH: Right now, we have \$15,692.99 in our account.

RCa: So we have money, and we have to decide what to do with it.

DH: I will need a couple hundred dollars to get cards, etc. for retiring faculty.

RCa: Yes, we've already approved that. With the rest, we can sponsor a scholarship, sponsor activities, etc. Maybe we need to leave it until we have a budget allocated and have money to spend in the future.

SL: Doesn't the President-Elect have a conference in the summer?

RCa: Yes; the next one was to be held here, but many people said they couldn't come, so it'll be in the Fall. Because it'll be here, it won't be any expenditure.

SL: There had been some discussion of a Faculty Senate Foundation; this could be seed money.

RCa: Like a university social club. Since we're taking away dues, we've encouraged formation of such a group.

SL: Its charter would be more than social; usually, such groups are philanthropic.

RCa: Yes, but such entities usually have fund-raising money.

SL: But this could seed that.

RCa: This is why we need to implement stopping Human Resources from collecting dues.

EO: Maybe wait until we see what enrollment does to our funding...?

RCa: I don't think we should decide now; just take this information back to your constituents—tell them that we have this balance and we want proposals for what to do with it to vote on. OK, the smoking policy: students and Student Government have the impression that this will be made into policy to be voted on. Currently, it's a white paper, not a policy, but they expect it to be one. They also expect it will be voted on at the next Board of Trustees meeting. But school policy says it first has to go to the faculty and staff organizations for approval before the Board of Trustees can move on it. We'll push to have a review period that won't include the summer because so few faculty are here during that time. The students presented on this to the Faculty Senate, and at that time, their paper primarily mentioned smoking, with ambiguous references to other forms of tobacco. The current version is more specific and broader: it bans smoking from tobacco, e-cigarettes, and chewing tobacco. Most of the previous discussion was about second-hand smoke, but that doesn't apply to e-cigarettes or chewing tobacco. So the current version has changed, and I've mentioned to Del Beatty that the faculty consider those changes to be substantive. So we expect another presentation on this.

EO: I haven't read it in detail, but is it broad enough that it bans things like nicotine patches and gum?

RCa: No, it considers those "treatments," which are positives encouraged in their paper. I'm just letting you know where this stands; it's not a proposal yet, and it has to go through legal and all affected groups.

SL: I thought it was already an agenda item for the Board of Trustees meeting...?

RCa: Maybe, but we have to tell them it's not ready. The Board of Trustees can do whatever they want, and suspend policy to vote on it, but that would be a very bad move on their part.

SL: They're educated enough about the state of the policy to not approve it?

RCa: I'm sure that they're happy to approve it, but there's nothing to approve because it's not a policy.

NS: We have faculty concerned with its content...

RCa:...and balancing out personal liberties. And, is the process of approval and enforcement legal and fair—those issues have to be addressed.

NS: The Faculty Senate was OK with the previous version?

Rca: No. And other things have changed: Campus Security is now in favor of it, but wasn't before.

EO: So are they going to enforce it? Before, it was based just on self-monitoring and voluntary compliance.

RCa: Now there are actual fines.

EO: But last Fall, it was said that we'd self-police.

RCa: Now there are actual consequences. I will have to check, but I believe that Security will be involved in enforcement.

These are changes that weren't in the old proposal and that have to be addressed. The Board of Trustees have been very good about ensuring that faculty are involved in shared governance.

SL: Two items we shouldn't lose sight of: (1) the issue of making CUPA data available so we can all see it without having to go to Pam; and (2) my faculty have raised the issue about the policy on hiring committees again.

RCa: I agree completely—these aren't priorities, but yes, we need to get to them. My priorities now are: fixing the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws and making the two relatively small changes to the Professional Development committee. I don't think we can finish all the other issues with that, but I'll talk to them. I'll talk to Pam about the CUPA data, and try to convince her that having it readily available will be easier than having 50 people converge on her office to all see it at once. Please take the issue about the hiring committees back to your constituents again.