

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 7, 2014

In attendance:

Clint Buhler (CB)

Del Parson (DP)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Sandy Peterson (SP)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Gail Smith (GS; Board of Trustees)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Nate Staheli (NS)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Don Warner (DW)

Erin O'Brien (EO)

RC: There have been some changes proposed for the minutes from last meeting, so we'll have to vote on those later. Our agenda for today is pretty brief; we're coming to end of the semester and school year. EO, our new Faculty Senate President-Elect, is on her way—she's been traveling from one thing to the next. For those who hadn't heard, there were two really good things: we had great candidates—we had three very qualified people run. It was a very close election, and had over 80% of eligible faculty vote. So we're very happy with the new voting system on-line, that we're getting that much participation. So when we say that the leadership represents the faculty, we can say that now with even more confidence.

DP: I could not be happier.

RC: I've been glad for the opportunity I've had as President—I've learned a lot, and I hope that we've accomplished a lot. I think we're moving in a good direction as the university is changing and growing. I expect that in the next 2 years we'll see a lot of growth because that missionary change we were worried about...? They'll flood here soon. Now, GS of the Board of Trustees is here; she and Chris Durham have brought up some issues related to faculty retention, primarily, and wanted to bring those to the whole Executive Committee.

GS: Christine Durham and I are heading this up, along with (Academic Vice-President) Bill Christiansen; as a board, we'd like to be better connected to the Faculty Senate, and one of our goals is, as we've listened and heard, maybe it'd be a good idea—and we just want to throw this out to you—is that when new faculty come in, which as a growing university we're going to have a lot of, would it be a good thing to have a committee consisting of alumni that would meet and greet these new faculty, give tour of the community, and maybe explain some of the history, the jargon (such as "What's a stake center?" and "What's a ward house?"), and maybe introduce them to the wonderful community we have here. So when they come to DSU, they have a little bit of welcome and introduction, and maybe make them feel more welcome and more at home as they get to know other faculty. How many have you here have been here a while?

NS: I've been here a while, at the institution and in the area. I'd agree.

TF: I might be the youngest in here: I'm in my second year, here from the University of Oregon, Eugene.

LJ: I've been here 7 years.

SP: I was so lost when I got here! Someone asked me to speak at a stake house, and I was looking for a sign with a big cow on it! We thought it was a restaurant! I've never heard anyone say "Well, I was so welcomed that I'm just exhausted...!".

GS: We just wanted ideas as far as who do you think might be good to be on such a committee—some from faculty. Chris and I and Bill were talking that maybe alumni would be good, too, from the Alumni Committee on campus. They could be on that committee, or maybe head that committee. They certainly know the community and have been at DSU.

RC: Would you envision this as something that was one on one, or groups of new faculty, or how do you think it would work best?

GS: We'd like to talk about that. SP, how would you have felt better—one on one, or with a group of faculty?

SP: I'd've liked just one meeting, to be introduced to alumni and representatives and the Faculty Senate President. A mixture of people, and get a feel for this place.

DP: Did you have a mentor, faculty member that helped you through?

TF: Not really.

DP: That's what we've been doing in our department, and that might be something to really consider.

NS: That's an in-department mentor? A more senior-level faculty that's helping.

DP: I think that would really help because if there are any questions, they'd go to the mentor.

LJ: At the beginning of the year, they *do* have the new faculty meetings, but it would have been nice to have another social after that—that new faculty meeting was when you got policies and procedures, but also then having the social that night, something more relaxed. Like in our department, they were good about taking us out and showing us the town when we came and interviewed.

RC: But that might be something good—find out what individual departments are *already* doing and see if we can coordinate something. I think it's very spotty—some departments may have more of a mentoring system in place. Our department has talked about it, and we've implemented it a little bit, but others have had more or less success with that kind of thing. But I like the idea of a social gathering—that initial meeting is also for adjuncts, too...?

LJ: No, that's a separate meeting.

NS: The adjunct meeting is a 2-hour meeting—I helped present that one last year; it was on “here are some resources.” We give 15 minutes to different people on campus, and they really come away from that overwhelmed! The mixer idea, something casual...

LJ: They'd be more free to ask questions about things such as “what's a stake center?”

NS: It seems like there might be a short-term fix, but also a long-term. I think the social can take care of the initial shock; after the “honeymoon” is over, 2–3 weeks later, then a mentor could come in.

RC: Even the Faculty Senate representative could introduce them and explain the Faculty-Senate structure, so they know that they have that resource because sometimes things come up right away where you can get in over your head!

GS: So I was wondering: you were taken around during the interview; would it be better to do that *after* you have moved to the community to do it again? If I'm hearing right, this was mostly faculty that you were socializing and associating with; would it be good to have a community member, an alumni member?

LJ: It wouldn't matter to me—just as long as it's someone knowledgeable about the area.

RC: Thank you; that's very helpful! We've talked about this from a mentorship standpoint, but still haven't finished getting anything involved.

NS: Not to put closure to it because I'm sure it'll be ongoing, but to formalize it, are you thinking that it be appropriate to have, say, an alumni representative, and someone from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), and maybe someone from the Board of Trustees if they'd like, for a 3-person committee to have the oversight to make sure that this kind of activity is taking place? Is that what you were thinking when you mentioned a committee?

GS: Yes. A committee that could truly introduce them and bring them on board. We could even go big time and bring the mayor in since he's on the Board of Trustees!

SL: The draft of our By-laws right now indicate that this falls under the purview of Faculty Senate President-Elect to oversee new-faculty orientation. So I think that would be the mechanism for integrating Faculty Senate into the new-faculty orientation. Right now, Human Resources kind of owns the new-faculty orientation that takes place during that in-service week. So I'd suggest that that event is good and worthwhile, but maybe as an introduction *to* that event, on the Monday of that new-faculty orientation, we have the Faculty Senate President-Elect come in, a member of the Board of Trustees, and one from Alumni Board, and formally welcome the new faculty, and maybe even assign them 6–7 faculty—that “These are going to be the individuals from the Alumni Board and the Faculty Senate that are going to show you around for 2 hours this week.” That will go a long way to integrating new faculty, the community, the exiting faculty, and putting faces to these programs we're trying to represent.

GS: I think that's great!

NS: Me, too. So my next action item, then, is that as next year's Faculty-Senate President, and EO as the President-Elect, we will, with your blessing, get with GS or Chris (Durham) and a member of the alumni, and make sure at the next in-service meeting, EO will be in charge of making this happen. But as FSEC, it sounds like we have approval to go ahead with this...?

SL: Make sure you get with Pam (Montrallo) and Will (Craver) (in HR)—that's their meeting, and appropriately so, but if they can give us a portion of their first-day's agenda to kick this off.

RC: I still like the idea of doing something social outside the realm of anything we've ever done before—something casual that doesn't necessarily sit within the formal introduction. This is more of a community introduction; it wouldn't have to be owned by Human Resources or even the Faculty Senate; I like the idea of coordinating with these three groups.

SL: Well, it has to be owned by *someone* or else it wouldn't happen. I think it needs to be owned by the Faculty Senate.

NS: We'll talk later that we have budget money allocated for these types of events, and we do it, and it could make a difference and have a long-term impact on a new faculty member coming in wanting to stay and be a part of what we're doing. So I'll coordinate with you (GS) specifically, and Chris, and the alumni representative, and let EO know that she'll be a part of it.

SL: She'll do a great job.

GS: I appreciate that—thank you! I'm new on the Board of Trustees, and Chris is even newer than I, and most of the Board of Trustees is new. With the university status coming, we felt in our Board meeting that, in the past, you have the Board

of Trustees, and the Faculty, and wanted some way to...we're not defined as separate; we really would like to be a help to you and unify with you and your goals and what you want to do and make it the number-one university.

RC: Thank you.

SL: A quick question: is there going to be some reorganization in the Board of Trustees? Is there a new chairperson coming in?

GS: I think that Steve Caplin, his time is up and he is staying on, and President Nadauld has asked him to. We'll probably have another election, but other than that, it's the same board for a little while longer. Thanks for letting me take some of your time!

RC: OK, I just have a couple of issues that I want to make you aware of. We talked last time about Faculty Senate membership, and I tried to write what I think are the key issues we need to resolve: who are the voting members of the Faculty Senate; are there non-voting members and, if so, who; are there going to be administrative members—all of these have had places on the Faculty Senate in the past—and then how will attendance occur at our meetings: will it be default for all members? default for voting members? non-voting members by invitation only? etc. I think those are what we've discussed; I want to get them phrased in an objective way; I'm not trying to bias the discussion, so we can get this resolved. This is the most difficult, outstanding part of passing the Faculty Senate Constitution & By-laws. Other issues are more minor things that we have to clarify, and I think we have an idea of where those are going to go..

NS: I think it's important—this body was charged in the last meeting to make this decision.

RC: Yes. In the last general meeting, they asked us to clarify what we think these questions should be and then present to the full faculty for a vote? So, how should we present these for a vote?

ST: Quick question on the voting members: I remember bringing this up—librarians are still there?

RC: Yes, they're full-time faculty based on our institution's definitions. That's not the issue—the issue has to do with people who are given *some* administrative responsibilities. You have department chairs on one side, who have some and have some teaching load and for whom their administrative responsibilities are considered above and beyond their regular teaching load—they get stipends but not as much release time—but other people are given release to do administrative things. As an example, before Martha (Talman) became the full-time policy writer, she was allocated...what, 40–60?

IJ: And she's still full-time faculty because she's considered a librarian.

RC: But now she has a full-time administrative role. She was hired as full-time faculty member, but part of her responsibilities were allocated to Human Resources duties, writing policy, and it created an awkward situation. On other extreme, we have deans, and then administrative members—people who have no faculty connections whatsoever, such as the Human Resources director, who was listed as a non-voting administrative member in the past in the Faculty Senate Constitution. So those are the issues.

SL: Can you give me an example of a full-time employee whose primary job is teaching?

RC: We have people who aren't on the tenure track, who aren't even going to have continuing status, but who teach—some of them are awkward, and in this new category of “professional faculty,” like clinical faculty; some of them may occur where they have a specialized role, where they're not situated in a department—we have a handful of people on campus that are faculty but that no department owns. I don't know of any other situations that fit.

EO: There are people at TV station that do a lot of one-on-one mentoring, but are never in a classroom but a lot of their responsibilities are teaching. And yet they are not faculty. There's at least one or two over there like that.

RC: So the majority of people we consider as faculty fit the traditional definitions, but we stretch the boundaries as little bit and start to get into these pockets. I guess many of these people may not worry about whether or not they are represented on Faculty Senate, or what their place is, but I think we should try to clarify where people's roles are.

DW: Do any deans have teaching responsibilities?

RC: Some do...not much.

EO: But it's mixed.

RC: They are primarily administrative, but some *do* teach. That's why these issues aren't 100% clear-cut and we need to define some boundaries; it can't remain vague.

SL: Could we look at it in terms of some sort of matrix? So we have full-time, part-time, primary teaching responsibility yes or no...however that matrix plays out, it would say you're a member of the Faculty Senate or not. Use that as a guide. I guess it's a matter of identifying what the criteria are and juxtaposing that.

RC: Yes, that's the key part.

SL: Yes, do that first. So we have full-time faculty status...

RC: Or .74, for example. And adjunct.

SL: Then we have teaching responsibility—primary or not.

RC: That could be defined as a straight majority, or 70–30...

SL: So what other dimensions?

SP: Is that going to get us into deans? Do we have any deans that are teaching more than one class that we're aware of?

RC: They're definitely not teaching half, or even close to half.

SP: So no deans are going to be included if it's 70-30.

RC: Right. I know of one person who was hired as faculty that doesn't teach. But that person's official Human Resources label is faculty.

ST: That's the primary job.

EO: The other thing to raise is, are we going to count our .74 constantly here, advisors? We have some full-time advisors and some .74.

RC: That's another, much larger category that's more persistent—we're going to end up with lots of lecturer-advisors that have *some* lecturing responsibilities and some advising duties.

NS: Can we list them all? (Writes on board.)

SL: So we're calling this "faculty type"? There's full-time tenure track...

NS: Including tenured.

RC: We're going to have the new category of Continuing Status, which is mostly the same as tenure-track with slight differences. We have professional faculty...

SL: Is that non-tenure track?

RC: It doesn't fit either one of those, but if they've been here long enough, they sort of accrue rights, and are full-time. Then we have the temporary full-time faculty, such as 1-year appointments. We have contract full-time lecturer-advisor—I don't know how you want to classify them, but they have contracts for more than one year, but they're not the same as in the tenure track. We have various part-time faculty, including .74 and .5 and adjuncts. Then these other isolated situations—I don't know how to classify them. Like some people in Communications that are experts in their industry and that mentor and help students—that's a faculty-like role. You have clinical faculty, and teaching supervisors.

SP: Their time is very limited—none of them are even .74. They're part-time.

NS: Librarians fit in...?

LJ: Tenure track.

RC: That doesn't need a special category.

SL: So the other dimension would be "primary responsibility."

RC: We have to define "primary"—is it 51%? 75%? That will be most relevant with the lecturer-advisors.

SL: So you'd have teaching, administrative, advising...

NS: So a tenure-track could be any of those.

RC: Yes.

TF: I'm primarily concerned with how much is teaching—teaching vs. "other," and then look at %s.

RC: That's a reasonable way to break it down.

NS: Then "other"?

SL: Administrative...

ST: That's under "other." If we spell out what "other" is, would there be anything other than "administrative" or "advising" that could fall into one of these faculty types?

EO: Those weird others...

NS: But isn't the kick-out if they're not teaching?

RC: That may require us to define "teaching" in ways we're not comfortable with, but we'll see. The other one that was mentioned was "full-time" or "less-than full-time" as another dimension.

ST: Would that other dimension be already qualified as "faculty type"?

RC: We did kind of do it that way, yes...

DP: What's it been in the past? No definition?

RC: It said "full-time Faculty," and then it had special provisions for administrative members and that included people that didn't have any faculty connections, like Human Resources Director. Deans have always considered themselves faculty and considered themselves part of the Faculty Senate. That's one of the parts that seems, now that the institution has grown, that there's a difference between deans and faculty.

NS: What are we trying to protect or insure or whatever by deciding who will vote?

RC: Who members are—this is membership *and* voting.

DW: One is freedom of speech and speaking your views by other faculty members.

EO: And self-governance—that's what this group has been working toward for years. And that probably extends to a lot of this list.

NS: That was my question—which of these will best represent that protection of rights?

DW: Since deans are so much administrative and have so much power, as far as saying what you really in a meeting think if your dean is sitting there, you may not want to speak openly.

RC: I don't think it's "self-governance" as much as "shared governance." We need a faculty voice within the governance of the institution as a whole. As I've been part of this, after my second year, where the most frustration has happened has been where we'd think we're representing faculty, and we'd go to a meeting, and some other entity, usually

administrators or, in one case, the Board of Trustees, would say “Nope, this is what faculty want, and this is what’s going to happen.” But we’re supposed to represent! So there is some self-governance in some respect, but it’s so that we have a voice in the overall shared governance of the institution. At the very least, the policies state that the faculty have responsibility—not shared responsibility; we have responsibility over the curriculum. How do we exert that and demonstrate it so when we have discussions about the proper ways of teaching—is that dictated to us from the top-down, or do we have a voice in determining what the best way of teaching our students is? And when there are disagreements—when someone in administration has a really strong idea—if they’re at a Faculty Senate meeting, there’s been reluctance to speak up—the faculty voice gets diminished by a sort of self-censoring. At these other meetings, Ami (Comeford) and NS and I were never quiet, but when we have the faculty meet together, we want to encourage open discussion so we can say as confidently as possible “This is what faculty want.” It helps when we can say that.

TF: Another thing to consider with the shared governance idea is when we exclude a group, like the deans, do they have another way to participate in the shared governance? With deans, they absolutely do, but the bigger question is with those other groups. But if they have another way of participating in the shared governance, then maybe we should exclude them.

RC: Because they’re, in a way, double dipping. They are getting representation on University Council and Academic Council, and then through us, too...?

TF: It should be clear that when you become dean, you give up right to be a Faculty Senate member.

RC: If you read carefully in some of the policies that are moving through very soon, the Faculty Categories and Faculty Reviews policies—they will be passed, and the wording very clearly states that—what you just said is codified in these policies. But the wording is very clear that they are *not* faculty while they’re deans. Their progress toward rank & tenure is maintained, but they don’t accrue any more while they’re deans—it’s dormant. So that line of thinking is consistent with those policies.

SP: If we can have a model of shared governance that shows the various arms of government, kind of like “executive,” “legislative”...that kind of model...this conversation really helps me! You’re saying “OK, the faculty constitute one division of this shared governance.” If we can show that with a model, then we can’t have deans saying “Well, I’ve just been excluded and I have no voice.” It needs to be clear that the faculty needs to be one “pure” kind of piece of this model.

TF: If we had something like that to show them—“Here’s shared governance; here’s deans, here’s faculty”—then there’s no room for argument.

SP: That’s what I’m thinking.

RC: Well, we don’t need to argue; we’re proposing the criteria for *our* organization. We can let everyone in the *current* organization vote; they have rights under the *current* Constitution to vote on a new version. If the vote comes, we need two-thirds or three-fourths vote...? There’s a provision for that—as long as that many vote for those changes.

TF: It’s two-thirds.

RC: Then that’s what we’ll do. Whatever the current criteria are, we’ll include those people in the voting—we’re trying to decide what are the *criteria* that we’ll vote on.

SL: So the whole idea for doing this is all to get to represent everyone on campus in the appropriate classification and then say “yea” or “nay” on each one.

NS: Should adjuncts be voting members of Faculty Senate?

RC: We said last year that they should have one FSEC representative for all the adjuncts, but not individual votes.

TF: For part-time and adjuncts?

SL: It’s a 2x2 matrix—do they have membership or not.

NS: Do we say “if primary role is ‘other,’ they are automatically out”?

TF: If we decide it needs to be a specific percentage of the time teaching...it already excludes deans.

RC: As long as we call what librarians do “teaching.”

SL: Call it “teaching or library.”

RC: That’d be perfect.

NS: So that’s the first question: teaching or library. Then, should it be >50%?

IJ: 60%.

EO: We want to be sure that we don’t exclude NS next year, with his three credits for being Faculty Senate President!

ST: I don’t see why we shouldn’t do 51%—if they’re doing more than half of their allotted time as a teacher, then they probably

think of themselves as teacher.

RC: We can do a straw poll here on this on how we present this to the faculty at large.

EO: Do we have flat-out line saying that deans are higher administration and also excluded?

RC: Did we get rid of all Associate Deans? We sometimes do have intermediate administrative positions that would be trickier—that’s what having a rule is better than doing it by terms.

LJ: Would any deans or associate deans teach more than 51%?

RC: We did last time my school had an associate dean—he taught more than 51%.

LJ: More than 60%?

RC: I'm not sure.

LJ: If we bump it to 60%, we'd guarantee...

NS: 60% of 24 cred would be 14.4 credits.

RC: Fifteen out of 24 would qualify as faculty...?

CB: What kind of duties do Sue Bennett have? She's not a dean, but I don't want her to get excluded on a percentage basis.

NS: (Robert) Huddleston is still teaching eight, so he's...

EO: Steve Armstrong still gets nine for hosting undergraduate research and hosting conferences. And I think that Sue is on part with that.

RC: So 15 credits might work.

EO: Sue would be fine at nine, but not 12.

RC: So 60% sounds good.

SL: Does 60% show up in anyone's contract or job description anywhere? How do you judge 60%?

RC: Teaching load?

SL: That's not a commonly-used metric—you've have to define it as hours taught.

CB: This allows us to not have to change the policy if the numbers change.

RC: We're asking for something that isn't relevant anywhere else on campus.

SL: OK.

ST: So if we leave it as 60%, it will be assumed that if you teach 15 credits in two-semester time frame, you're considered predominantly a teacher...?

RC: Sure—put that in. Do we want to say “in an academic year”? With the role statements, that's where it's going to get...

EO: We have to be careful about that language—what about people who take on teaching in the summer?

RC: That's extra and doesn't count.

ST: And overloads?

RC: Overloads are extra—this would be for regular, assigned responsibilities. But, for example, someone in theater directing plays, that's still teaching, not administrative. Or music lessons—those are normal, curricular activities. That's why we have to be careful in defining “teaching.”

EO: We also have to be careful: we have policy in place for maternity leave that gives credit to that system—it's a six workload credit; then there's banking, which doesn't count as overload...

RC: We could say—and this would require finessing the language—that in those situations, it's not out of 24, but out of 18.

CB: Put “60% of the required teaching load.”

RC: “...of the required workload.”

TF: If we do that and make part-time faculty part of the Faculty Senate, that's 60% of whatever their required workload is.

RC: In the past, we've had multiple tiers for that—for example, there have been full voting members, and other members that can take part but not necessarily vote. That's a reasonable requirement; is this a requirement for membership? Voting membership?

SL: Voting membership.

RC: Do we want to add full time for that, or include even part-time?

CB: I thought this was for tenure track.

RC: Well, we have lots of categories, and haven't talked about which this applies to.

ST: I'm leaning more toward this being criteria for voting; anyone that is teaching might want to get their opinions and voice out there, but whether or not they get a vote would depend on how *much* they teach.

RC: This *could* be the criterion for membership in Faculty Senate, but not voting. Full-time status could be the additional criterion for *voting* membership. If you're part-time, like a lecturer-advisor, you'd be a member, but if you're full-time *and* you met that, you could vote. That may be too simplistic—I haven't thought it through.

ST: Would those lecturer-advisors not in the 60% be represented some other way?

RC: We'd probably encourage them to be part of the staff organizations.

EO: We could possibly also slate this in the workload model, things are divided based on the *type* of credit hour. So Sue Bennett as Honor Program Director, or for Undergraduate Research, Service Learning—those all fall under “academic credit hours,” whereas governance (such as FSEC), and “instructional credit hour equivalency,” which is a catch-all that includes deans and others. Those don't count as *academic* credit hours.

TF: That would help define “teaching,” using Human Resources' definitions.

NS: So the first hurdle would be 60%. Then the next type is type—or vice-versa? Does that matter? Will some of these even qualify? Do we want part-time faculty to be voting members?

RC: My proposal is that full-time faculty should be voting members.

ST: What about the .74s? To an extent, that's more than 60% of a faculty member.

RC: They'd be members, but not voting members.

SL: Why the distinction between a "member" and a "voting member"?

RC: I don't know...historically, we've had one.

JDH: If there were non-voting members, would they even want to participate at all?

RC: Hopefully they'd have helpful insights—they would still be teaching, and have experiences that are relevant to all faculty to hear about. But we already have two classes of voting—one on tenure-like decisions, and continuing status won't get those no matter what. Tenure decisions are restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty. But for the Faculty Senate issues, the representatives of the body, the issue is that the full-time faculty are outnumbered by the part-time faculty, but we're the stable, core teaching force; part-time faculty are more transient. I don't know the fairest way to do it except to give everyone a voice.

TF: Unless you do voting based on a percentage.

RC: That's really complicated. People get offended when you give them two-thirds of a vote.

ST: To bring up adjuncts: a year ago, we voted that adjuncts should have a representative on the FSEC—would that representative have a vote? Or do all adjuncts get a vote?

RC: We actually haven't clarified this—in the policy, do we say when the FSEC votes on things and when the Faculty Senate as a body votes? That's left ambiguous. As our default, when there's a contentious issue, and elections, we let Faculty Senate individuals vote. But for a lot of the day-to-day running things, the FSEC decides that among ourselves—the faculty that way have a collective vote. They'd at least have a vote that way, if we implement that, which I hope we will. That's one thing we haven't addressed very specifically—individual vs. representative votes.

ST: I'd be fine with proposing, then, to the Faculty Senate—everyone—that .74s and .5s would be members, but not voting members.

RC: That makes sense.

SL: Whose primary responsibilities are teaching.

RC: Right—they still have to meet that. So if they are *mostly* advisors, then they would not vote. Is that reasonable? Good, we've made progress! We've simplified it, relatively speaking. Now, do we want a category for administrative members?

TF: I think at this point we don't.

RC: I think so; I think that's kind of where we've been leaning. That's a perfectly reasonable suggestion—I don't know that we should decide on that final version; it'd have to go up for a vote, but that's how we can present it...it can be worded that way. Or do we just say this, the 60%, that's the criterion, and that implies it.

NS: Does the Board of Regents define what a Faculty Senate is and what the members of that body are? If so, we need our by-laws to be in line with that. And if it doesn't, does it behoove us to go to Bill and say we're revamping our Constitution and By-laws, and just so you're not blindsided, we're going to exclude what had previously been known as *ex officio* members unless specifically invited to a meeting?

RC: I think he'll understand that. What we'll have to do, is that based on our *current* by-laws, people that are *currently* members of the Faculty Senate have to have this information presented to them, so people that potentially will be excluded will be informed. The way we're presenting it, we're not *trying* to exclude anyone directly; we're just presenting criteria for who's *included*. Sixty percent seems like a reasonable criterion; it's not exclusionary, just to define "faculty." I don't think it'll be a big fight; we'll just give them a heads-up when we have it finalized.

NS: We had that one issue where administration wanted to be involved in of the discussion...

RC: The last issue, then, is: now that we've defined Faculty Senate, meeting attendance may be a non-issue—would anyone be bothered by anyone that meets these criteria for membership, even if they're part time, attending a Faculty Senate meeting?

SP: No, we don't want to be exclusionary when it comes to faculty.

RC: I think it would be beneficial to have the part-time faculty at our meetings, so I think that's a moot question. So even people not under this would be welcome at meetings. So the proposal to present will be that membership in the Faculty Senate requires 60% of your required workload to be faculty responsibilities: teaching or library; and, to be a voting member, you must be full-time—that would include temporary full-time, is that OK? (Many yeses.) Thank you very much!

ST: Adjuncts are...?

RC: Part time—their expected workload is smaller than full-time, and they will be members of Faculty Senate...

ST: So they'll have a voice, but not a vote.

RC: And when we make the change on FSEC representation, they'll have an indirect vote through their representative on the FSEC.

ST: Would that just be FSEC, or even in Faculty Senate voting—would the adjunct representative only vote with FSEC?

RC: Only with FSEC; with individual votes, only the voting members. The next issue on the agenda is the faculty handbook: a couple things you need to know about. (1) The faculty handbook is a non-binding and anything you read in it is not

policy, which disturbed me. That's where it says you have to have office hours every day of the week—that's not policy! So we're going to work on changing that, to change some of those things that aren't policy, and not have requirements in there that you shouldn't be expected to follow.

IJ: Did you check with Human Resources on that? I know that that was on their docket, too.

RC: At the last Academic Council meeting, I asked who owns the handbook, and answer is nobody.

IJ: Pam and Martha were talking about working on it.

RC: So we need to coordinate, because there's some misunderstanding there. But there's a problem with it—for as long as Sheila Bastion can remember, it's labeled "New and Adjunct Faculty Handbook," but that's incorrect—it's for *all* faculty! So it's a problem; there's no policy related to it. It's just there as something written that has, as best I can tell, no force of law. But we want it to *reflect* the policies—now that we've made a bunch of policy changes, we want it to be an easy-to-understand guide that will help faculty when the need answers. That's what we want to do with it.

TF: Make sure it has references to the policies.

RC: Exactly—it will direct faculty to policies. One thing came up related to a change in the handbook: in Academic Council, from a legal perspective, they want it written down, and want faculty to follow it, but don't have time or desire to go through the faculty process, and it is: if a student doesn't show up during first week of class, or fulfill a meaningful assignment in an on-line class, the faculty member *must* drop them from the class. In the past, it's always said "should." This is for federal requirements with financial aid. It's causing problems when there are students that game the system: they enroll in classes, collect their financial aid, don't show up, and keep the money. Eventually, we realize that and have to bill them, but that makes us look bad to the federal government when we wait so long to bill them for money that they owe, and it causes them some headaches, and can threaten our financial-aid eligibility with the federal government. So that change has to be incorporated there, and that is coming down the line because we don't have much of a choice. I know that it's something that, well, we don't like being told what to do, and it means that you'll have to take attendance for the first week of classes.

EO: There's a problem with that in the sciences: we have labs that first week, and I'm going to create a massive headache for myself and the adjuncts who teach under me if I administratively drop students who, for whatever reason, can't make that first lab. Can we push it at least a week? Will that cause problems?

IJ: In LIB 1010, we wait 10 days because our first assignment is due that first Thursday, and then we have a test-out within that first 10 days. The time you have to make administrative drops *by* is when they do that census, whatever that date is. That's what the registrar told us—that administrative drops have to be done *before* whatever that census is.

RC: But, at this meeting, the proposal was "within the first week." They sprung this on us, and we didn't have a chance to discuss it, so this is good feedback we'll take back to them, and ask about once-a-week labs.

EO: And in some of those labs, we do a lot of on-line stuff, and un-enrollment means they no longer have access to that.

RC: A way around that might be if they have a substantive assignment that they have to complete within the first 10 days, so even if they didn't show up physically to class, if were able to log on and do something substantive that was graded, that may count.

JDH: One other potential problem: I've occasionally had students that have e-mailed me and said "I'm unable to attend the first week, but I will show up the second week"—how do we know if they will?

RC: If they made contact with you, that's fine. We're good there—that part they addressed specifically.

DW: What if they show up the first day, but never again?

RC: That's a separate issue, and we don't have to worry about that as faculty.

CB: When you administratively drop someone, and someone drops in off of the wait-list and miss a whole day of material, and you can't do anything about it—could we close the wait-list Friday at noon, and then we'd have to submit by Friday at 5? Every section I teach has a wait list, and this causes problems. So if the wait list closes Friday at noon, and our administrative drops have to be in by 5, that's be fine because once they're dropped, I won't get a wait-listed student showing up that missed a whole week of material. I always wait for the wait list to close before doing my drops.

RC: Your labs—are they a separate number from the class?

EO: They are.

IJ: Other issue we have for LIB 1010 is that we're concurrent with English, so we drop everyone that's *not* in English, but then English doesn't drop, so we don't, etc.

RC: Labs might have been excluded; I'll have to check.

EO: They'd have to be, because in many semesters, if the schedule allows it, we don't even have labs during that first week because of problems of students trying to get their schedules fixed.

RC: We also talked about classes that meet once a week—students are expected to contact the professor.

ST: When is the last day that students can un-enroll, typically? I mean, not including the students that have a wait list to worry about. If after the first week they get dropped and realize that they screwed up, but I still need this class, can they still get on? It's more like a wake-up call for them.

IJ: We get that a lot in LIB 1010.

EO: The Pell grant survey are typically three weeks in.

LJ: Yes, that's when we have to do it by.

EO: So moving everything to 2 weeks, which might simplify a lot of the problems still doesn't get into trouble with financial aid.

LJ: And that's what we've always been told for LIB 1010.

NS: I think the discussion *was* two weeks...

RC: We'll clarify that.

DW: Can we notify the student that s/he's been dropped?

RC: I have no idea.

DW: I've dropped students and they show up to take an exam and couldn't, and they get upset!

LJ: I don't know if they get notified, but if they drop on their own, they can drop all but one; they have to do the last one in person.

RC: I'll ask about being able to send a notification—that's important to notify the students if the drop was an accident.

Thanks for that feedback—that's very helpful! Another change being made is a proposal to eliminate the WF grade. But what goes with it is that every F will require a last date of attendance.

ST: Even if that's the final?

RC: Yes. That's also a financial aid issue. There are students that drop out without telling anyone during the semester, and their financial-aid situation, in terms of paying back the federal government, differs depending on that date.

EO: So we realize that they're adults and they come to class or they don't, but we've now got policies where we have to take attendance every day...?

NS: They made the comment that the date of the last assignment or test they took would be OK.

LJ: LIB 1010 does, too because it's on-line, and there's no way to take attendance.

SL: If you request the last date of attendance, essentially it's still a WF!

RC: No, it's an F. Many places don't have a WF, so on our transcripts, the grade was confusing people. So now it's either W or F; there won't be an intermediate category.

DP: When a student is registering, do they know for sure that they have to be there the first week?

RC: I think so.

JDH: In biology, if you don't have labs during the first week, how do the students know that?

EO: We normally have the lectures tell them, and we post signs on the classroom doors.

RC: Do labs ever occur *before* the first lecture?

EO: They can—a class could meet Tuesday & Thursday, but the students could have signed up for a Monday lab. In those cases—that happens with anatomy all the time—we always post signs on doors.

JDH: Part of the confusion there is that a bunch of students that have friends that took it in previous semesters get told by those friends that they don't have to show up; they won't bother to go check the door. Why can't Banner just notify them that yes, they have to go to class the first week?

EO: How would they know if it changes from semester to semester?

JDH: They just show up, and if there's a sign on the door, then fine.

DP: It'd solve a lot of problems if it was so clear that they have to show up the first week, or they're automatically off.

RC: I know that there's *some* notification; we can ask that they beef it up.

EO: Couldn't it be a line when they register for classes, on that form, that attendance first week is expected?

DP: There might be, but I don't know.

TF: And if it's not there, then it needs to be fixed.

CB: Whatever happens, you need to notify faculty, especially new faculty at their orientation.

RC: You have the right to, if you want.

CB: It was presented as "you have to." That needs to be clarified.

RC: You have a right to, especially with a big waiting list; you *must* by the end of the first week—that's the proposed change. And we'll get lab issue qualified, and get some information out.

NS: On elections, we have other committee elections coming up. I do want to comment, though, on something for everyone to think about: we have \$15,829 in our account, left over from dues collecting. We need to decide—not today!—on what we can do with that to help someplace do something productive. Scholarships? RC and I went to ask for some money because we're no longer collecting dues. And they were gracious enough to give us some.

RC: He said he'll match what he gives the Staff Associations, which is \$3-4000.

NS: So I went to the budget administrator and he said "Yes, you have \$3000, but oh, by the way, you also have an ongoing budget of \$9000. Just to clarify, we asked for the money not knowing we had that ongoing, so we said if you need to take that \$3000 back, please do so.

SL: So we get the \$9000 this year?

NS: (reads aloud e-mail on the subject) \$9000 UPR 1/20.

SL: So in actuality we have \$24,000?

NS: On-going base budget—I think the \$15,829 is something we can do something within our by-laws; I don't think we can take \$24,000 and go do an endowment or anything. But we can do something that we all agree is in the best interest of the faculty we represent. The \$9000 is for support. With your approval, I'd like to put together some sort of strategy for using that money—maybe it involves sending our Faculty Senate President-Elect to a conference. (continues reading e-mail) So the base budget is \$12,000/year. I don't know that we're going to spend \$9000/year, let alone \$12,000, so I made the comment about giving back the \$3000 in our best interest.

RC: In the past, there are training conferences for Faculty Senate representatives—I don't know what they are, but they can do that with the funds. Some of that money from the dues did go to scholarships, so it would be appropriately spent on that. In addition to whatever ongoing expenses. I didn't know we have ongoing funds, so we've been frugal this year.

NS: I'd like suggestions on proper use of that \$9000 ongoing. I thought about taking two divisions, such as Business and Humanities, and having a luncheon just for those two—mix it up. If there's a Faculty Senate luncheon with everyone, people tend to get in their own groups. But with two, maybe you start integrating and collaborating. Also, on April 17, I've reserved the ballroom for an end-of-year faculty luncheon to introduce the new President-Elect and recognize the outgoing, and talk to faculty in general. We have the option of box lunches option at \$7/person, or buffet at \$10/person that's a little more classy. I've reserved it from 12-2 so that faculty members that can't come at noon can at least come and eat; based on that, we may do our business at 12:45-ish—does that make difference? Do you have preferences? We've got the money to do it, and I don't want to waste it. I think this is important at the end of semester.

DP: I like the idea; it's a good use of the money is opportunities to get faculty together.

DW: I agree—I'd like to get to know more faculty.

NS: There's really no other day... Also, I'd like to have it be clear going forward, and maybe we have a 2-3 person finance subcommittee; I'd like to establish a clear strategy of what we can do with our budget to improve—training, resources, etc.

SL: As part of that, I'd like us to consider establishing a Faculty Senate foundation, a separate dues-paying body that's voluntary only.

NS: I've talked to Rick Palmer about setting that up—it'd be easy to elect into if we want.

RC: Do you have any suggestions for a name?

SL: The Dixie Faculty Foundation?

RC: That's good.