

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Apr. 19, 2012

In attendance:

Paul Abegg (PA)

Jen Ciaccio (JC)

AmiJo Comeford (AC)

Robert Carlson (RCa)

Rob Cowan (RCo)

Varlo Davenport (VD)

Jerry Harris (secretary)

Dianne Hirning (DH)

Jie Liu (JiL)

Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)

Russ Ross (RR)

Kyle Wells (KW)

AC: OK, let's get started. I think we have a quorum here and can have a vote on these issues: the summer schedule vote; to potentially change to two seven-week sessions; we also need to vote on a PTR recommendation. And I want to give you a few minutes to think about Curriculum Committee decisions that faculty need to be aware of. RCa will be here today and is on the textbook subcommittee and made the comments on the draft of the policy that went around, so I may push that to the end of the meeting. And Faculty Rights & Responsibilities—hopefully, you had a chance to glance at those, and I want to find a point/clearing-house person to funnel comments on that when it gets rewritten. And lastly, about FSEC replacements: I just want to make sure that everyone is in place. Any other items for today that you weren't able to send me before now?

JC: My chair brought up an assessment issue—the sheer amount of stuff. We attended the workshops, and there seems to be a *lot* that was done—is all of that just a suggestion, or does it absolutely have to be done under penalty of flogging? Clearer guidelines are needed.

AC: That's a good point. OK, so let's move ahead: what was the feedback from departments on a vote on the summer schedule change? Academic Council wants to get moving on this for the registrars. So we need a vote from this body so PA and I can represent it at Academic Council.

JC: I move for a vote.

RCo: Second.

AC: Any discussion?

RCo: I've heard from my faculty that they like it now with eight- and five-week semesters.

JC: And with the change, there would be no break between the Spring and 14-week summer semesters—no time for prep, recovery, etc.

RCo: Along those lines, why not just go to three semesters that are all evenly spaced? Then assignments could be to teach two of the three. People can then rotate—they can take a Spring off if they want.

AC: The problem with that was putting so much material into a five-week section!

KW: They can't do a three-semester system because of financial aid—it doesn't go over the summer. Summer has to be self-funding by Board of Regents policy.

RCo: If we want to go to 14-week summer, why not just make it a semester?

AC: It has to be in the Pell-Grant-segmented time sets, and they don't cover summer anymore.

KW: You can tell financial aid that you want to do two of the three semesters, and they'll pay for it.

DH: But only if it's a full semester.

RC: Maybe that was the logic of going to 14—other places have done it that way.

DH: It doesn't sound like two seven-week semesters will be good for faculty sanity.

RR: But it's an improvement over the five-week block! We'd rather have a block of empty space at the end.

AC: Or at the beginning.

RR: So we didn't have an opinion on the seven-seven system. But that it was an improvement over eight-five.

JiL: I think seven weeks is too short.

AC: Is there a call for a question on how the registrars have favored it? All in favor of the seven-seven system? (Two.) All against? (Six). OK, onto the post-tenure review recommendation vote—is there a move to vote on the final draft of the policy up for discussion?

KW: I move

JC: Second. The only comment I had was the switch from every five or six years.

AC: Just in the verbage?

JC: Yes.

AC: Is there other discussion? DW isn't here, but he e-mailed me and voiced concern about merit pay being tied to this, and he reiterated that.

RR: I'm concerned about the timing—the idea that we've been doing it for a while, so therefore we must vote *now* even though the policy has been changed a lot—this idea that it started a long time ago, so therefore it must conclude now.

DH: That's probably because of accreditation.

AC: Are there specific area that are still problematic? Is it the process?

RR: At this point, all we can voice is our approval or disapproval. Our past comments were all rejected.

JC: Wasn't just the second-tier rejected?

RR: When I read it, basically every change we suggested had a note next to it saying "no."

AC: They definitely took out a lot of the philosophical underpinnings that said how *we* saw it.

RR: And how it complied with state law, etc. But the amount of change means we should have more time to look at it again—they're just being impatient now. It's not that we haven't been doing anything; it's just a complex process.

AC: Any other discussion? I think this is an example of what we *don't* want to have happen with the Academic Freedom thing coming up. We want to be in front of these things.

RCo: My comment is along the same lines: the people that reviewed the policy were demoralized because there were changes to be made, and they all got rejected, so why should we bother at all? I don't know if that's true, but that's how it appears.

VD: I concur. Looking at the process and comments, it's...I just don't know that it's going to make a difference.

DH: We spent *hours* on that, and they basically round-filed everything we did.

RCo: If they're going to do it their way anyway, why waste *our* time?

KW: Well, it's similar to why argue with the referee if he's not going to change his mind on a call? But he might, next time.

BSC: In relation to this, are we developing an "us vs. them" mentality at Dixie?

AC: I think we're trying *not* to do that...this policy may mean that there are areas for which that is true. But there is a compromise position, and PA worked hard to achieve that—that we need to provide input *before* things go for review. And he has an agreement from Pam and Donna to ensure that we don't end up in this situation again. That suggests that there's room for a non-adversarial relationship.

VD: We've had a nice six-year lull where everything has been pretty amicable.

BSC: But the war is beginning...?

AC: It doesn't have to. This policy was charged to us a few years ago by administration, and nothing happened for a long period of time. Legislature was pushing administration on it, so they had to do something. I think that's part of what happened in this instance. Whether that's valid or not, I don't know.

RCa: As we have more of these issues, they'll be revising all policies. We have to have a plan where their requests for input goes beyond sending out an e-mail saying that if there are no responses, they'll assume that we're OK with it as is.

VD: Free-wheeling as the discussion was as we developed it, I thought we had great compromises.

AC: I agree—we just needed more time. If we'd had a whole year, it might seem less adversarial.

RCa: But Faculty Senate had been working on it for a year-and-a-half before that.

AC: Now that PA has a process in place with which we can input *before* drafts are made, if our comments don't show up in the draft, we are in a stronger position to protest. OK, is there further discussion on the post-tenure review vote?

JC: One more thing: who makes sure that you go through the PTR process? Who says "it's time for you to do it again"?

DH: It doesn't say explicitly.

AC: I assume Human Resources.

RCa: Yes, they have to at least initiate it to provide the staggering between people.

PA: It was put on *this* body in at least one draft.

BSC: We took that out.

AC: Is there a call for the question?

JC: Sure.

AC: All in favor of giving support to Academic Council? (10). All against? (Two.) OK, about Curriculum Committee. I want to brief you on what happened yesterday: there is a move toward having portal programs, which is where we buy up spaces in other university's classrooms, and those classes are made parts of our degree programs. This is something Curriculum Committee passed—it was not a discussion item previously. It was just introduced and they called for an immediate vote. These will be used initially for three new degrees—Parks and Recreation, E-marketing, and Spanish. These are not 100% on-line classes, though.

RCa: Spanish and E-marketing each have 2–3 classes, some sections of which are on-line, and Parks and Recreation would have a substantial portion on-line.

AC: Not just through us, but bought up spaces in other classes in other universities around the country. So a class could be at the University of Wisconsin, for example. We're just using it as part of our degree program. So the articulation would be automatic.

PA: In discussions, is this done when we don't have faculty to cover things ourselves?

RC: Yes.

AC: I understand that it would be a regular option.

RCa: But they *have* cited lack of faculty specifically.

AC: But that won't always be the case. The idea is that buying these spaces means we wouldn't have to hire new faculty that might not be useful 10 years later on. Other universities have already made those faculty investments.

RCa: In some cases, we can't afford those faculty.

VD: If we do eventually become big enough to support a home-based instructor, will it change?

DH: This is the tool under which the President envisions us becoming a university—it wouldn't be a home university; just all on-line.

RCa: The one positive thing is that the Curriculum Committee specified only those three specific programs—there are no rules saying that *all* programs must do this. In creating a policy, we should have a voice and start now.

BSC: Would a degree in this program be a Dixie degree?

AC: Yes. In terms of the policy to regulate this, I assume that, at some point, there will have to be a minimum percentage of classes taken on *our* campus to count as a degree from us, but Curriculum Committee didn't address this. Faculty need to be *really* involved with this. After President Nadauld talks about this later today, we all need to take note and make comments.

RCa: One challenge would be that these are all Dixie courses, even if taught elsewhere. The origination of the class is irrelevant.

BSC: This is like the airlines hiring feeder airlines.

AC: For assessment, degree programs will be affected by this—it's easy to regulate faculty in your own department, but not elsewhere! How are faculty elsewhere being assessed? Are the same tools being used to assess them as are being used here?

DH: What does this do to the credibility of our degrees?

RCa: That was the one area that brought up sympathetic nods at Curriculum Committee.

AC: We need to be very vigilant about this, and attentive and proactive.

BSC: How are those faculty paid?

AC: By us—we literally buy up spaces.

RC: Like a special form of adjunct relationship.

AC: So if, for example, the University of New Mexico had a science course with five open spots, our students would buy those through the college.

RC: Instead of transferring credits after the fact, it's up front.

KW: These are proof of concept—there are no plans to expand this to all areas. I told him there are some places where this mode of teaching simply does not work, but in these three proposed areas, it's good.

RCa: Parks and Recreation was the only place that actually suggested where to get courses from—most are from the University of Utah, and some from Northern Arizona University. For Spanish, it's just a few upper-level classes.

AC: We will need to have more discussion about this, especially after the President talks about it later today. OK, for FSEC replacements—just e-mail me if you're being replaced, and let me know who is replacing you. Is there anyone that wants to be a point person for the Academic Freedom subcommittee?

VD: I'd be happy to serve *on* the committee.

BSC: Me, too.

AC: OK, the last item under the "other" category—Don Hinton called me and asked who would serve as the Faculty Senate representative at our convocation. All three of us (AC, PA, and VD) are in the same one. We're sort-of supposed to have one at each convocation. If you want to be that for yours, just contact your dean and ask if you're expected to be there as a representative to be on stage and present diplomas. I'm hoping that each of you will be willing in your school. Just in the small convocations. If you'll be there, please contact your deans and tell them you'd be willing to represent the Faculty Senate if they want that. OK, onto the textbook policy discussion.

RCa: I represented Faculty Senate on when we met as a subcommittee on that. We had a very amiable meeting, and a few things came up that affect us. I've heard from other faculty, and I want to hear from you. (Puts policy up on screen.) Under the "Conflict of Interest" part: the subcommittee proposed (and this will be passed on to some other committee) that the issue about adoption of one's own textbook—that will stay because it is pretty standard across the country from my research. If you made your own textbook, you can't choose it just to get royalties from it.

JC: Everyone I know that has their own textbook balked at this.

RCa: I've not found a single college that allows this, though. Our policy mirrors those of others. Any profits from sales of a book in one's own classroom cannot go to the creator of the materials.

JC: Including study guides, etc. that are not textbooks?

RCa: Correct. That's a clear conflict of interest. We can talk about it, but I don't think you'll have much defense based on comparative policies.

RR: But if a student buys it from a third-party source, you don't get royalties anyway.

RCa: It will be hard to enforce...I don't know how they do it, but it is standard. My guess is that the textbook companies have no problem figuring out where each pool of money came from.

RR: Is that only profit? In other areas, you have to front money to get a book published – in art, there are royalties on images, etc.

RCa: All of that would have to be accounted for.

DH: You'd have to have a lot of documentation to prove what you spent!

RCa: But you have to do that for taxes anyway. About sample textbooks: the recommendation was accepted by all subcommittee members to be left in. It's redundant and unnecessary, but there's a state law that says that you can't receive more than \$50 for selling off gratis textbooks. And you can't take trips to Aruba from textbook reps. Part C: we voted unanimously to eliminate it—the only time it would ever be enforced would be for punitive reasons, anyway. What was recommended was that the bookstore *already* has a means to distribute unneeded textbooks to places that need them—we propose that the college provide a means of redistributing them. The conflict of interest is legitimate—if you're colluding with a book rep behind the scenes, you could make hundreds of dollars. No one does that here, but the idea is that the college has property in these textbooks didn't make sense. That's just the recommendation—it's not policy yet. Do you agree with getting rid of part C and everything in D after "purposes"? Part A is retained.

DH: Sometimes faculty members will bring copies and donate them to library. If they're current, we put them in the collections; if not, they're put on the free shelves for students to take. They are finding good homes.

KW: If you read the state law—and it's OK because it has "may" in there—the act of *accepting* the gift is not a violation; the violation comes if the *incentive* makes you make an improper decision, or if you now or will soon be in a government decision affecting the seller. But the book reps are there to try and get you to buy their books! That was what I wanted feedback on. I agree that it puts us in the position where, ethically, if not legally, you could go click all the "send me a book" buttons and make a lot of money selling them off. We need to let faculty know that if they're doing that, they need to rethink their ethics.

JC: Is it considered a "gift" if it's an evaluation copy?

RCa: If it's an *evaluation* copy, no.

KW: Accepting is not bad; accepting while *knowing* the policy is.

RCa: OK, so these are our suggestions. And we'll add that the college provides a place to discard unwanted books if you want. But making them the college's property is ridiculous because they don't know where you got the book from. The last issue (3A-ii) is tricky: faculty members, when deciding on a textbook, are supposed to know the retail (MSRP) price, not the wholesale price. Just call the bookstore, and they'll tell you. You have to know that *before* you make the decision to adopt a textbook. This is to ensure we're considering student costs in our decisions.

VD: How do you enforce that?!?

RCa: The last thing, and this is important: federal law requires that the bookstore lists prices of books *the day* registration opens, and they can only do that if we tell them our adoptions early! There are a small number of situations where this doesn't happen—not all faculty are getting those adoption in on time. The dates are posted well in advance—faculty have not been doing that very well. The dates are coming earlier, but that's federal law.

RR: The process could be easier. No one in our department can get the adoption web site to work!

RCa: They're fine with telling them in an e-mail. I recommended that they link the login to Banner, and they'll try to do that.

VD: Is there a deadline when teaching assignments are supposed to have been made?

RCa: Yes, under department chair responsibilities. Down under part iii—are you OK with this? (Many nos!). Someone said that this isn't necessary. The bookstore has no problem removing that—right now, it's not being done. This is to ensure that there is a book by the time registration opens.

JC: In BIO 1010, you have adjuncts...

RCa: But that's OK, because there are lots of sections that get added at the last minute, and it's not a problem because the books have already been adopted for those.

JC: Where would this happen when there's registration for a class with no faculty assigned?

RCa: It's happening now in Psychology. It will definitely happen. We know who a teacher will be, but because it's not official, we can't pick them or a book yet.

PA: What's a viable solution?

RCa: That as soon as you have an official teacher, you get a textbook decision to the bookstore.

DH: Is it problematic in your Psychology example where you know who, but it's not finalized, so they can't do the textbook...?

RCa: They could, and the chair would sign off, but there might be situations where hiring is still going on.

PA: In those cases, the chair could have them make a decision while the hiring is going on.

JC: Can you put in that if the instructor hasn't been assigned to a specific course by the time registration begins—two weeks before the semester starts—a decision has to be made?

DH: Rather than the time registration begins.

RCa: That's possible.

RR: I think it's better to leave out a policy about how we intend to break federal law...!

RCa: I don't know what federal law is for teachers under hire...

RCo: Students can ask why a course is listed, but not open...

RCa: If we keep this in, it doesn't break federal law, but gets into the issues of Academic Freedom. ...OK, we'll throw those things around at the next subcommittee meeting. The bookstore has one other concern: if departments produce their own materials, then number 3A-v applies: determining the lowest cost option *has* to include the bookstore—if your department self-produces materials for more than the bookstore does, that's not the lowest-cost option.

DH: How do we prove if we've investigated it?

RCa: If you didn't ask the bookstore, it's pretty easy. But otherwise, I don't know. The bookstore will know what the options are. At the very least, coordinating with the bookstore seems to be the minimum standard, and the bookstore thinks that's not being done and that departments have contracts with Kinko's, etc.

JC: But the materials can't have any profit for persons—can departments profit?

RCa: As long as it's lower than the bookstore. Profit margins are irrelevant. If you undercut the bookstore by a penny, you've met this requirement.

KW: Printing may be cheaper if doing it yourself, but you have time, royalty fees, etc.

JC: But then I'd at least want the department to have the profits so that supplies could be purchased.

RCa: I don't know how you reconcile those costs with material production. If you pushed hard, administration might say that doing it is part of your job description and you should be doing it anyway. They wanted me to pass this on.

PA: Thanks RCa—and welcome to the group. Our next meeting, next week, is a general meeting, and it's our last one for the semester, so please inform your constituents.