

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Apr. 5, 2012

---

*In attendance:*

*Paul Abegg (PA)*

*Jen Ciaccio (JC)*

*AmiJo Comeford (AC)*

*Rob Cowan (RC)*

*Jerry Harris (secretary)*

*Dianne Hirning (DH)*

*Jack Lounsbury (JaL)*

*Betty Stokes-Crane (BSC)*

*Matt Smith-Lahrman (MS)*

*Russ Ross (RR)*

*Kyle Wells (KW)*

AC: We have a number of things to get through today, and I want to make sure we get through it without people having to leave before we're done. Here's the agenda (projected on screen). For future meetings, I'd like to have agenda items e-mailed to me by the Friday before our meetings so I can send agendas out on the Mondays before our meetings—that way, if there are items people have to read, they can be by Thursday for the meeting. That way, everyone can come prepared. The first item I have for today: the Constitution revision vote. We really need to get this out of here. So: MS?

MS: I sent this out so long ago that maybe everyone forgot about it...I thought we already voted on the changes...?

AC: We did, piecemeal, but I'd like to vote on the whole thing.

PA: The questions were about moving the effective date for the President-Elect to become President from April 1 to May 1 (6.2), and the other was to opening up voting to whole Senate, whether or not they are dues-paying members (6.4). It's been this way for I don't know how long, but BB thought it might be better to move it.

MS: Didn't we discuss this?

PA: We did, and decided to keep it to April 1.

AC: May 1 might be a better time because all the committees that the Faculty Senate President sits on keep meeting through April, so it seems best to have the same people through the April meetings.

PA: The thought was so that the people weren't brand new at the beginning of Fall.

AC: But since the President-Elect is at those same meetings, it creates that continuity. But we can do that as a model rather than have it as policy, to move it to the end of the academic year.

JC: Article 5 is on voting.

MS: But that's just about members. There isn't anything there about being dues-paying...?

PA: I thought BB had revised that...

RC: It's under "Membership."

MS: That's just the right to have an office. Oh, it's at the bottom of 4.5—it says that faculty do not have to be members of the Senate in order to vote. We did discuss this and decided that all faculty have the right to vote.

PA: Is that the consensus?

RC: Yes, otherwise you have to verify membership for every vote!

MS: And those that aren't members won't show up and vote anyway. Also, as of March 2012—didn't Academic Council just vote new departments into existence?

PA: They didn't vote, it was just a discussion item. So it's not effective yet.

RR: Section 4.6 also references the date of becoming President—we should keep those references all in one place to keep it all in sync.

AC: I think we should have a vote to accept the Constitution as is with these changes.

MS: Change 6.2 May 1 and 4.6 to May 1. I can make those two changes.

JC: It's in 6.1 as well, second sentence.

MS: OK, anywhere it says April 1, I'll change it to May 1.

JC: OK, I make that motion.

PA: Second.

AC: All in favor? (Unanimous ayes.) OK, next: the FSEC replacements. I'm replacing for English, instead of BB...

MS: In the Fall, I will change to be the Social Science representative, and I am monitoring the Humanities—they are having another vote and should have someone in a week. Robert Carlson, our President-Elect, will be a non-voting member.

AC: He's got an Accreditation Steering Committee meeting today, which is why he's not here. OK, others?

JL: Candace will be replacing me.

PA: Del Parson will replace VD.

KW: No replacement for me yet, if one is needed.

DH: DW is out—we need a Communications representative.

MS: As chair of his department, can he be on the FSEC?

AC: I think so.

KW: I'll assume status quo until that changes.

AC: OK, I'll contact DW for his replacement. Is that it? (Yes.) OK, faculty that are retiring—any updates?

DH: None.

AC: That was easy! Next: faculty availability—this was brought up in the Dean's meeting.

PA: This came from Health Science—there's a minimum required, but one of our selling points is the availability of faculty.

BSC: You mean office hours?

PA: That and responding to messages from students. This was brought up so that it can be reiterated to meet the needs of our students. Pass that on to your areas.

KW: Do we know the source or extent of this complaint?

PA: Details weren't discussed.

RC: It'll be more of a problem because they expect instant messaging-rate responses.

BSC: We're expected to place a response time in our syllabi—how fast we will get to stuff, as well as office hours.

JC: Wow, we don't have an e-mail response window...!

BSC: You can say you won't respond on holidays, weekends, etc.

JC: And students often mistype addresses when e-mailing but expect responses!

AC: This sounds like something that's not campus-wide, but because it was brought up, they will be watching for it. Next: the post-tenure review policy—isn't this over yet?!? Almost! In Academic Council meeting on Tuesday, this was brought up to be voted on, but the people there wanted to know if us faculty gave our recommendation. Because our meeting schedule got missed up with Spring Break, we haven't had a chance to talk about it again. We need to review this, and in our next meeting, in 2 weeks, have an up-or-down vote, period. Academic Council is done talking about it, and they want to know what we think—if we support it or not. So for Paul or Robert and I to really represent faculty, we need something very specific from this body. Otherwise, we're voting on what we think as individuals.

BSC: What is the specific document we're looking at?

RC: The version AC sent. The one marked up in red—the red is what is being removed.

MS: Can't we just look at the final version?

AC: Yes, that would be fine. The first version I sent has the explanations about why stuff was removed, so it didn't appear arbitrary; the second is the finalized version, and you can note problems with that one.

MS: Do we send this to our constituents?

AC: Yes, get a vote from them—say "We need to have this information by our next meeting."

MS: But you're not looking for changes...?

AC: Only if they're major and prevent people from voting and that, in turn, would prevent us from voting. So Academic Council wants our opinion, and we need to give it or they'll stop asking us in the future.

KW: I solicited my faculty, and the comment that came up often was that if there are not funds when you're eligible for a 2% increase, are you still eligible when funds *do* become available? And, if you don't pass post-tenure review the first time, and you make the changes requested in that review, are you then eligible for the 2% increase?

AC: Good—that's the kind of thing we need to bring to Academic Council, and say we want these addressed. Then they'll table it until Fall. The difficulty we're in now is that we need to know how to emend it, not just get and give comments like "I don't like it" but with no reasons. So what KW has done is what we need to do in our departments.

BSC: I have sent e-mails requests to my department, and get no response.

AC: Then we assume your constituents OK with it. But if there are department meetings between now and then, put this on that agenda. I know it's difficult, but we need to get through it. That's what we'll talk about at the next meeting.

KW: At least in my conversations with Donna, it's not an issue of "do we want it or not;" it's going to happen. I don't know that they will table it—Donna has to present it to the Board of Regents.

AC: I'm just saying we might get out-voted, but we can be on record saying we're not comfortable with it in the official minutes.

DH: That we weighed in and gave feedback and care.

AC: Exactly. OK, next: the textbook policy. I asked PA to address this because I can't make it to the meetings on the subject.

PA: This is similar in that it's rather urgent, and one of the deans caught something: under the current policy—we all get e-mails from people wanting to buy extra textbooks, and that's actually illegal in this policy.

MS: Weren't they going by state policy? About a \$50 thing?

PA: The state policy is that we cannot accept gifts worth more than \$50 (reads it aloud).

AC: Doesn't it also say in the new policy that you can't resale books?

PA: (reads about complimentary copies of textbooks). The dean was interested in how this is going to be policed, but Donna said that it doesn't matter—if you're caught, you're liable. It also says that chairs are responsible for putting books on reserve in library, but that's never how it's been. This is a case where we need to be making comments as soon as Pam puts drafts up, which is usually 30 days in advance.

JC: But I don't remember that being in the policy when we looked at it a year ago...? Has it been changed?

AC: I don't think so.

MS: So why are we bringing this up?

PA: This was tabled because of these two issues.

MS: Where is this?

DH: On the policy page.

KW: The problem is that there's always 6–8 to look at, and most don't affect you.

PA: Yes, so be discretionary when looking at them.

BSC: Pam does send out the links, but maybe we need more eyes looking at them to find the problems.

KW: But it's information overload—as a Faculty Senate representative, part of my responsibility is to filter, and pinpoint the ones that faculty in my area need to see. This one is important. I read it initially as if you write your own textbook, you can't get money for it on campus.

AC: So take this back to your constituencies and inform them.

DH: There are a number of faculty members that will donate those copies to the library—if it's staying within campus, it's OK. We put them out eventually for students to take for free; ones that don't get taken are donated to a charity service. I'm wondering how that relates to the policy?

AC: Good question—I'd direct that directly to Pam.

RR: A lot of the publishers send copies out as write-offs, so I feel no obligation to them.

AC: OK. Academic Council will meet Tuesday after graduation, and Robert will be there to vote on our behalf. Summer schedule was also tabled.

PA: Because as they looked at the calendar, they realized that there were no breaks. The issue we need to give feedback on is the summer schedule: they want to reschedule the blocks. It sounds like no matter what they change it to, it won't work for some areas. They're open to customization based on need, but one of the big items of feedback is that if there are 2 7-week blocks, there's no break. Registration says that the second block is never used as much as the first. None of this forces teachers to teach both.

JC: But it sounds like it discourages anyone from teaching *either* of them.

DH: It's not a problem for us as far as LIB 1010 is concerned for teaching, but in circulation, it's a staffing problem. Right now, we're only open 8–5 except during the major block (8 week) one—then we're open later to accommodate students taking later classes. If it gets expanded, we'd have to provide staffing. And over the summer we don't get student workers. That might also be an issue for other departments on campus, like Registration.

PA: Well, Registration is the one leading this conversation—it's common on other campuses, and they're looking at transfer students and accessibility. The biggest restriction for us is the lack of faculty to teach both blocks.

RR: Why do we need to do this?

MS: Because everyone else does it.

RR: Maybe switching the 8 and 5 week blocks...?

RC: There's no preparation time when it's that early, unless you're just repeating what you've taught earlier.

AC: OK, we'll get more feedback on that. The last item: faculty rights & responsibilities. This was one of the major high-priority list items that will affect us. We don't want the post-tenure-review thing to happen again, where we're just reacting to what was written—instead, we want to be pre-emptive and let them know what issues we want to see addressed and how and what to change to affect those. PA worked really hard to get this system set up, but we need to be more involved at the front end rather than the middle and end.

RC: Is this a new policy or a revision?

AC: A revision; PA & I talked to Pam about this...something like 8 years ago this was brought up and it was a fiasco that the Board of Trustees didn't pass, so no one has approached it since then. But Pam has an entire file about why it didn't pass, etc. But this does have to be rewritten again—this is the academic freedom part. What I'd like to do is, at our next meeting, review the policy that is in place so we know what the potential problems are, and to think about if you would like to be part of a subcommittee out of this council to be the point-persons for this, to solicit recommendations and be the clearinghouse for those. Once we have hammered it out, we take it to the full faculty. So if you're interested in chairing or serving on this committee, let me know. Academic freedom impacts all of us, so we want our stamp on it.

RR: Can we get a summary of the points of contention?

AC: We'll look at that and get a sense of it from Pam. Sometime around July, this will come up and get written when we're not around, so I'd like us to get started on it so it doesn't hit us by surprise.

KW: Is it on the web site?

AC: Yes, but not under revision—just the existing policy. It's just on the list of Donna's priorities to address. We need to look at the existing policy to see what's problematic, what's important to retain, etc. Our next meeting is on the 19<sup>th</sup>. So, for our next meeting: be prepared to discuss post-tenure review, feedback on textbook policy, work on replacements for this council, and any other items that come up between now and then—if you have one, please get it to me the Friday before our meeting.