

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 21, 2011

---

*In attendance:*

*Paul Abegg (PA)*

*Brad Barry (BB)*

*Robert Carlson (RC) (for Ed Reber & Matt  
Smith-Lahrman)*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*Gary Cooper (GC)*

*Varlo Davenport (VD)*

*John Goldhardt (JG)*

*Jerry Harris (sec.) (JH)*

*Jie Liu (JL)*

*Munir Mahmud (MM)*

*Dennis Wignall (DW)*

NOTE: This meeting opened with a discussion of a revised version (second draft) of guidelines for faculty self-evaluations by the Faculty Excellence Committee. As the representative for that committee to the FSEC, JH presented the version and could not document the discussion. Excellent discussions and suggestions about various points were made by nearly all committee members present. Essentially, there were concerns that (a) the presented draft would cause faculty to write exceptionally lengthy, time-consuming documents, (b) the draft did not adequately cover some subjects (such as a faculty member's performance and time dedication to specific tasks compared to their job description and contractual obligation), and (c) had too many required subjects to be addressed. A new version will be generated by the Faculty Excellence Committee and re-presented to the FSEC next Fall.

PA: Here's some of the policies we've been asked to develop (reading from the handed-out agenda): PTR (DW), sick leave (KW), 0.74/0.5 (GC, to be transferred to Rob Cowan), textbook policy (JC), Constitution & by-laws (SP, to be transferred to Russ Ross), hospitality (DH), terminal degree (BB)...

DW: A draft of the terminal degree revision exists and was sent out, but we got sidetracked with the issues pertaining to 3.10 and 3.18.

PA: Ok, good. And last, 3.10 & 3.18—we'll have to start with that one going into next semester. Any questions?

DW: Concerning the tenure issues that have arisen in the state legislature, I'd encourage everyone here to think carefully and deeply about why tenure exists and phrase it in such a way that the average person off the street can understand why it exists and is valuable. We're going to get hit with an "improved" bill by the individual that wants to get rid of tenure.

MM: That guy is still at it?

DW: We need to make sure that we can present a really cogent, forceful statement about tenure and why it should exist, things that the few schools that don't have tenure didn't see coming when they got rid of it.

BB: The one argument concerning tenure that is valid is that everyone has an experience with a teacher that is terrible and can't be gotten rid of easily because s/he has tenure.

JH: That seems to be primarily at universities where faculty are hired for their abilities to get grant money and do research, and where their teaching abilities are considered less important for tenure purposes.

BB: Well, not all the reasons that will be leveled will necessarily pertain to us, but they'll still be brought up as anti-tenure and we'll have to address them.

DW: Once we learn what administration's criteria are for getting rid of a teacher, we can better address them.

BB: If we create an antagonistic relationship with administration about these issues, it looks bad, like we're a union protecting ourselves.

DW: The PTR policy will address that. When you point out to people that you go through undergraduate, Masters, and any terminal degree work, etc., followed by a probationary period...all that takes up to 15 years...it's a time/energy investment demonstrating success. Does it mean everyone gets to a point where they have no serious problems in teaching? No, but we need to demonstrate that there *are* criteria from administration's point of view that can be invoked by aggrieved people to pressure administration to enforce their rules to deal with someone that is ineffective. PTR is a buffer to prevent administration from blankly firing at a faculty member for a vague reason.

PA: How does RateMyProfessor.com factor into this?

DW: It's only the people with negative statements that ever post there.

BB: No, positive things get posted there, too. Students don't get to see other students' evaluations, so they have to have another outlet where they can see how their thoughts compare to those of others.

JC: Many students don't think faculty ever see the evaluations! I've had to explain that we *do* look at them and deal with issues brought up in them. They're always surprised by this.

PA: I think that, of these policies, the most urgent are the workload & compensation policies; second would be the Constitution/by-laws issues, because we're currently working under policies not reflected there.

DW: One more is: faculty overwhelmingly voted for a dues increase. It's never been put forward to Payroll; nor have forms been distributed to have people sign up for the increase.

MM: There's a link to that form on the Faculty Senate page.

DW: I talked to Don Hinton about this; when he was FSEC President, anytime he met a new faculty member on the campus he introduced himself to everyone and asked for their support via the deduction. He had a near-100% enrollment rate!

PA: So you're volunteering to do that? ;) Does anyone want to take on the workload issue? I was thinking Ed Reber because of his experience—can he be approached for that? Would anyone else be good for that? Donna said all we need to do is request this policy be marked as “under revision.” Anyone who knows some of the history and is willing to put in the time...

DW: The person that does this should have strong language and policy-writing skills and be able to work collegially with Martha Talman.

PA: The role of this person would be to work with the policy revisers.

DW: Who's on that committee?

PA: Just Pam and Martha, I think. Hands-on, at least.

DW: Whoever represents FSEC should be on that committee, too.

PA: So in light of this, we could easily consume these meetings talking about any one of these policies, and I'm determined to keep these meetings at 50 minutes, so these meetings will be reporting-to-the-group events, and we can deal with other stuff by e-mail.

DW: If MM wouldn't mind researching how to create topic message lists for discussion, so everything would be all in one spot and we can go there to review that material...?

MM: Isn't there already a forum like that for these discussions?

JH: Yes, but I don't think it's been used for 4-ish years.

DW: Has anyone used opine?

JC: That's just a mailer list.

DH: And it goes to staff, too.

MM: Why not use the e-mails to just our group?

DW: If we have all these various policies with subsets of people working on them, then the e-mails would be overwhelming, but the relevant people can just connect on a dedicated forum.

JC: Would it still be visible to everyone else?

MM: No, just the subcommittee dealing with the issue.

DW: When the subcommittee has something to share with the FSEC, they'll do it, condensing this whole process.

PA: Do you know how to do all that?

DW: I'll go to IT and talk to them about it; then we can go to faculty and populate those lists.

PA: OK. Last, I put the list of Representatives on the agenda. I've created a contact group for this, so the e-mails I'll send out is one you can duplicate. Our next meeting is a general meeting, the last of the academic year, on Apr 28.

DW: I'll confirm the \$5 food credit for that meeting.

PA: Please pass that information on to your constituents. Ami Comeford (President-Elect) will be at that meeting and we can introduce her.

DH: Before we hand out changes for the fee, do we need to officially change the Constitution/by-laws first?

PA: I think so.

DH: I'd be happy to pass them out in the Library, but I don't want to do it prematurely.

MM: Someone has to go there and change it?

DW: Yes. Just change the \$2 to \$4.

PA: Is the amount specified in the policy?

DW: I don't know.

PA: I'll notify HR, and they have to tell future people about the new amount.

MM: I took my form to Payroll, not HR.

DW: Yes, I think that's the correct place to go.

PA: Anything else?

JC: When is our first meeting next semester?

PA: I want to stick with the 1<sup>st</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> weeks schedule that we've been using, but I'll consult with Ami, and then post the schedule on the web site.

DW: Move to adjourn

PA: Second. (Adjourned.)