

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Aug. 19, 2013

In attendance:

Clint Buhler (CB)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Robert Carlson (RC)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Jennifer Ciaccio (JC)

Scott Lindsey (SL)

Ami Comeford (AC)

Del Parson (DP)

Rebecca DiVerniero (RD)

Sandy Petersen (SP)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Nate Staheli (NS)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Samuel Tobler (ST)

JiH Haendiges (JiH)

NOTE: JDH entered a bit late, so the first few minutes of the meeting are not recorded here. This transcript begins as JiH is going over draft changes to the Professional Development policy and procedures.

JiH: I've got copies of the policy here (hands out). The major changes, in addition to the deadlines, first was just the simple matter of changing "college" to "university." With the application process, we emphasized that your approval is based off of your paragraph. Often we'd get requests that were really brief and we didn't know where it would fit under. That paragraph is central to selling approval for professional development. In section 9.4, the big, important change was: we're not funding terminal degrees, and we put in there that requests to fund mentor and student research will be through other sources. One thing we talked about in our meeting last Friday: there's a gray area that if you're just *going* to (attending) a conference, but your students happen to be there, that could be considered professional development as you attending the conference—there's no reason that wouldn't be allowed. But there was a lot of debate in previous years about if you're basically just bussing them to a conference, and you're just a chaperone, then funding for that might come through other avenues. Once again, the committee, that paragraph you write when you submit is key to telling us what exactly you're doing. Another central change we made in 9.4.1-2 is: in the past, we had Level 1 and Level 2 priorities, and Level 1 was for presentation at a conference and for pursuing a terminal degree. This institution has changed in that we're hiring more full-time faculty that already have Ph.D.'s, so that's changed terminal degree funding. I believe it's still possible, but would go through the Vice-President more than us. In the past few years that I've been there, the committee has turned down *any* tuition requests, and it would get funded only if we had money left over. It's been a controversial thing because we were supposed to fund them per policy, and it's been because of the idea that people found it unfair that faculty incurred debt and didn't get funding.

AC: Also important, for those who weren't here for original debate, is that it eats up funding fast. So with limited funding and more faculty, it's a practical issue.

JiH: Yes, tuition requests were for a lot of the funds. We did get more money by the way—I'm excited and nervous about it because getting more can create more problems, but I'm glad and it's been a long time coming.

JC: With more money, does that raise the cap on individual professors?

JiH: We're still keeping it at \$2000/academic year, or \$6000/3 years. With 9.6, it was taken out and then put back (reads document). That allows us at times that if you request funding only every 3-4 years but you go to a conference for \$3000, depending on funding we can allow that. That's the cap because some people go to conferences often, and reach that \$6000/3 years, and we tell those people not to apply for \$3000 every year.

SP: What about presenting vs. attending?

JiH: We changed from Level 1 and 2 priorities; now we just assessing it mostly off of which of those two a submission is for. One issue is how much it would improve your professional development; a second issue is how much money you've used. We're giving priority to people that haven't been awarded money vs. those that have. There are lots of worthwhile conference attendances that used to get pushed to the back, and we want to keep them on equal footing. Presenting is important—there's an accountability to the conference that you have—but we want to try to include both. I'm hoping that with more money, we can say "Yes" to lots more, and it boils down to that paragraph the submitter has to write. If

someone says that they're presenting but you can't really tell what they're doing, and someone shows that attending is key to their development as a professor, that might be more important.

RC: This is to put the impetus on the person requesting the funds to establish why they need it, and how it will help him/her, and to not have a rigid set of check-box guidelines. Presentations can still be given priority because research is important, but it also allows for maintaining current awareness of your field if you don't present for whatever reason.

NS: Can we approach administration and ask for a separate pool of money for research-driven presentations? Would that go through Professional Development?

RC: We could, and that would allow us to break this down into those different categories, but this flexible approach allows for consideration for if there were 10 presenters for every one attendee—the researchers won't dominate, or vice-versa. The committee can be flexible depending on what the requests are.

JiH: When money was limited, it was tough at times because all Level 1 presentations would get funded and 2's got rejected or only partial funding, and that wasn't what we wanted. More money means we can allow more attendances, but we want to fund as many people as possible for academic development; taking away funding of terminal degrees also frees up more money. The clause is in there that there should be money through students to help out that faculty member that is mentoring students performing academic research.

RC: There is separate money this year for funding student research.

AC: Who does that go through?

RC: I was told that was available; I assume the Academic Vice-President, but I don't know.

AC: We should definitely disseminate that information to our departments because that's been a real problem for faculty advisors.

RC: Part of the reason for clarifying this policy is so people won't be so confused about where to go and which processes to go through. Once we find out the process for applying for mentoring funds, we can put in this policy reference to the "where to go" to apply for that.

JiH: After this can go through is to then make the application process as transparent as possible. A lot of this has been updating—we've got a lot of new faculty but the policy was staying the same—the tuition is an example of that. I want to change application process at least a little bit to make it easier.

SL: Can we distribute this document to our faculties?

JiH: Yes.

RC: JiH is just introducing this here; we anticipate a vigorous dialog among faculty before we're ready to present this. The policy process has specified in policy that once you have a proposal, there are steps you have to follow: it has to go through the legal team, through Human Resources, then different committees, etc. We're trying to do things as a Faculty Senate *before* it gets to that stage. We want to know what the faculty find acceptable before we even start the rest of the process. We want to hear from faculty before all that because in the past, complaints came in when faculty weren't allowed comments until end of process. So we're trying to front-load the process, and we want to make all necessary changes before it goes forward.

SL: We should do this with all policies—if we can get as succinct as possible summaries of changes, we can have a basis for that.

JiH: I can do that this afternoon.

RC: We're trying to do that in general—we're having a policy subcommittee to do just that: summarize key changes and issues.

SL: So we'll get that summary along with this document electronically?

JiH: Yes.

RC: JiH is rushing this one; we'll hear more at subsequent meetings.

NS: A quick question about the process: if we distribute this to faculty and then open it up for discussion, over e-mail or whatever—that's how we've done it, or do we have the representatives bring it up in their department meetings and discuss it there, and then bring the comments back here?

RC: I think that's the best first step: discuss it in your departments, then get their feedback, and we can then get a "final" version that may not be absolute but that we can distribute for wider general Faculty Senate discussion. It'll be more efficient in departments.

SL: If we do this step-wise fashion, and we do our jobs and have individual faculty comment on it, why would we have additional step of releasing to all faculty?

RC: We might not, but this institution has never had a representative Faculty Senate system in which people relied on that. In the past, things *have* been done in general way, and we're building up to this idea that we're just a representative body.

SL: I'd like to avoid getting these e-mails that are ridiculous. If we can manage it at the department level, we'll probably get better feedback and condense it and bring it here, and then present it to faculty as a finished project, and avoid convoluted discussions that go on forever and fill up everyone's inboxes.

RC: I think I agree with you.

DP: In my area (Fine Arts), it includes Dance and Theater, but we never meet with them. It's a program, but it's separate—we only meet with the department head. So I'm more inclined to say send it to everyone just so they get it just so I can get their feedback.

RC: We're going to have that issue in many areas, such as Health Sciences that are covered by just one person right now. We're going to have to find a way to reach out to people not in our immediate department areas—maybe through e-mails...? At least those are smaller lists than the larger all-faculty list.

DP: I can do that...it's just that we just don't meet as a whole group, and don't have that one-on-one association.

SL: But aren't you, in practice, their representative?

DP: Yes, but we're in different buildings, and we never meet as a whole body right now.

RC: That's a valid point, and related to agenda item #4. Remember that this is the *proposals*; we'll put a watermark on it so everyone knows what it is and that it's not a finished policy.

NS: It says it's a draft, but we've started new dates already—I anticipate that you're going to get questions about that.

JiH: I'm anticipating that as chair.

SL: The dates have been adopted?

JiH: Yes, all four. That will hopefully help people out because conferences happen throughout the year, including the summer.

AC: Do you have a file for the document that will be the new application? One that will have drop-down boxes, etc.?

RC: We haven't created anything like that yet.

AC: Send me an e-mail reminder because we have a template for that; one that was created by one of our faculty but just never implemented last year. It just needs to be uploaded.

RC: If this is what's approved, there'll just be a few boxes to fill out and some basic information that will be clearer and more straightforward.

JiH: In closing, I'd say that one of my hopes as chair of this committee is that I want to make this really clear—there's always some frustration that the same people use up the money while others don't even know how to apply and so never do. I want to advertise it. The danger in that is that the money will run out quickly and we don't know when we'll get more, but I want to make it clear to everyone on how to apply, even if they never use it. We're still working out what this committee does, but once this is set and the steps are easy, it will be transparent. It's gotten a reputation as being sort of a club for certain people to get money, but that's not what it's supposed to be.

RC: The rest of these agenda items are brief introductions; we'll have more elaborate discussions about them at future meetings. First: the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy: we have a subcommittee for this already formed. Varlo Davenport is heading this up, and has expressed interest in it from beginning two years ago. We have a draft from our policy writer, and so now the Faculty Senate are evaluating it in depth before it goes through formal approval. It's a 50 page document that's being divided into sections that they will work on for a few weeks each. Their job is to highlight what significant changes/key issues there are to produce a summary document easier for all rest of us to digest. They're still in the beginning of doing that; I don't expect that we'll have that summary for about 5 weeks or so. Then there will be more time for feedback after that; they're just trying to simplify that.

SL: Who's the writer?

RC: Martha Talman has been hired to just write policy.

SL: My concern with this "eating the elephant" approach is that there are many policies that wait for approval until the massive policy is digested, approved, and implemented, and a handful of things I talked about last year languish for a time until this big thing gets worked out.

RC: In some ways, that's been taken out of our hands; we were dictated to that there will be this big omnibus policy. The Professional Development changes will end up in this policy once we've agreed on it. We're treating this as a separate issue because of changes not anticipated previously. I understand your frustration, but hopefully it won't languish any more—this is on as fast a track as the faculty is comfortable with. The bulk of the policy writer's job is done; we're here to modify it so we're comfortable with it. Changes to faculty status, to add a track to allow for professional experience and other very important issues are in it. It is moving forward. Having Martha write policy full time means that by the time we can make our changes, it will be easier for her to implement changes we want because she doesn't have her other, old responsibilities anymore.

SL: Who establishes her priorities?

RC: She reports directly to the director of Human Resources, so Pam Montrallos, but so far she's been really responsive to working with us. I don't think implementing them will be a problem. If we want, we can write things and word them any ways we want, but she has quite a bit of experience getting things so they'll pass legal muster. That's why she's a very valuable resource.

AC: I like this idea that we're actually moving forward. There are many policies that the institution doesn't think will have to be in such massive bills, and many going forward can be done more piecemeal to speed them up. Are there specific ones you're thinking of?

SL: In the past, I've talked about Professional Development; the other is availability of salary data on which equity is based.

RC: That's almost not a policy issue though; just a negotiation with Human Resources.

SL: Our current Academic Vice-President has expressed support for that to be in a policy that comes from Faculty Senate.

RC: OK, that we could move forward independent of this. We can start it, or work through Martha as policy writer—we have both options. Eventually she'll be addressing it; if we come up with our own draft, she can address it as part of her own functions. We can work on it ourselves, or ask her to do it with the ideas we have about it.

SL: Another policy that Dr. Christensen has suggested come from the Faculty Senate is about exceptions to the start date on tenure clocks. He's supportive of being more lenient than has been in the past.

RC: You mean for prior experience?

SL: Yes.

RC: We can definitely address that.

AC: That's not in the current tenure policy; actually the Faculty Excellence Committee will take that up, and we chat about that and can think about how to make that work and recommend to this body.

RC: Anything else on Rights and Responsibilities Policy moving forward? I just wanted to keep you updated where we stand on the process. OK, next: the Academic Integrity Committee and policy—you heard Erin (O'Brien)'s presentation about that and she'll be compiling more ideas about the specific language and formulating a draft for how that could be changed. An outstanding issue is where to have this policy. Right now, it's in the student section—definitions of dishonesty, the process for faculty to follow, rights of students, etc., and it's not clear that's the best place because faculty have had problems finding it when they have issues of dishonesty arise. It can be left where it is, it could be redundantly put it in the faculty part, or it could be split up between the faculty and students, but that might be difficult because they are sometimes intertwined. Or we can come up with a new place for it, with references elsewhere to where it is for both students and faculty. If you have ideas about that, they haven't come to a conclusion on that, so make recommendations. If you have examples from your department or know of faculty that have encountered problems with current policy and can recommend changes, please let them know. This is very important. Next: we are also working on changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws. This has been in the works for at least three years, before I came in; SL is working on this but isn't yet ready to provide a synthesis combining ideas from last year and a few years ago. One issue that has come up just this semester that has come up that wasn't part of the discussion before: we have to decide how many representatives we want on the Executive Committee. We have two competing interests: it's more convenient to have from each department because faculty know who they are, see them at department meetings, and it's easier to facilitate communication that we want to have happen. But we're already getting big—Health Sciences says they have nine departments, though I don't know what their definition of a "department" is. We have a new department in my building that has six people in it (including those that are not full-time). So we have departments of all sizes. If we want one from every department, we need bigger room, but could make getting things done more difficult. How many do we want, and how do we determine who gets a representatives on the Executive Committee? Please think about this: we can mirror this after the designations used by the Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Committee. It's spread-out across campus, and not by department based on total numbers of tenure-track faculty. One of the groupings is arbitrary, such as the Library and the technology part of Science; Science and Math are a separate group. It's awkward, but it has existing designations. If nine is too few, or too many, we're not bound by it, but it's a possible model we can work from to determine how big this body should be and who gets representatives. Right now, Health Sciences has only one representative; I was recruiting for new Political Science Department, but it's unequal how many people each representative represents!

JDH: How do other institutions in state do it?

RC: I don't know. Does anyone know? (No.) We may be more lenient about what we call a "department," so finding matches across the state may not be helpful.

AC: We also should consider the number of faculty inside programs. I think nine is too few, frankly, especially with so many new faculty.

RC: There's a difference between "full-time" and "tenure-track," and that's a problem with using the RTP groupings—they only use tenure-track.

AC: Well, even between 170-180 faculty, nine is far too few. Some departments are really big: English has 21 full-time, tenure-track faculty, and others are also big. I'm in favor of looking at the number of departments and programs represented in making designations.

RC: So when we write this up, it could be a fixed number, a percentage of total faculty (e.g., one for every 15 or 20), or other ways, but we need a system that will last so we don't have to redo this in another five years.

SL: Is there a committee that includes all department heads?

RC: Yes, the Curriculum Committee.

AC: That's not entirely true: they have one Health Sciences person for all their departments, and the Integrated Studies program is represented by the Education person.

RC: So we could use that, but historically there's also a terminology problem: some groupings in Health Sciences that Dean Grady called "departments" I think are technically "programs." I don't know how to reconcile all of that. The fact that we have one department with six members; if it was all like that, there'd be 30 representatives! So we have to find a balance, but I don't think by department is best. Finding reasonable groupings might be better.

AC: Right—DP's grouping might then equal others.

CB: Every faculty issue has their own motivation, but on certain issues, all faculty members in a department will have a unified perspective, and a smaller group might have a radically diff grouping and if they get grouped in, they won't be represented.

RC: Yes, that's an important consideration. I don't have an answer as to what a balanced approach will be.

NS: How many schools do we have?

RC: Six, but not all the same size

NS: So what if it was proportionately from each school maybe...?

RC: That's a possibility; then within each school...

IJ: The Library isn't in a school at all.

RC: These are all reasonable issues to think about to come up with a comprehensive solution. SL will continue to work on this and can incorporate what we come up with on this. One other issue: it became clear when Vice-President Christiansen started a dialog about possibly contracting some committees that the Faculty Senate has ownership of two committees; policy says we might have third. If we explicitly tie them to our Constitution, that might help us maintain control of them. They are Faculty Excellence and Professional Development. We should think about incorporating that into our Constitution, that these will be officially sponsored, or controlled, or whatever to keep that connection explicit—historical memory sometimes dies. It's important that we have role identifying faculty excellence and professional development policies and funds so we have some say in how our faculty development happens and is funded. We also need to consider that. Next issue: I just learned that a new position is being currently hired: the "Program Development Coordinator." It's a full-time position; there's an external search for it, and the job will be to facilitate development of new programs. I don't know how many are actively in pipeline; in the past, these duties were shared by the Tech Review Coordinator for the Curriculum Committee and by Assunta Hardy's position, both of which were part-time. This person will be important in developing programs and will chair the Curriculum Committee. This is a significant change to the Curriculum process, and I wanted to make you aware of this. With these changes to the process, the institution-wide Curriculum Committee will only meet three times per year, not monthly. They will *only* address issues related to full programs or course changes that affect more than one program. They won't have to deal with issues of changing pre-req's that only affect people in that major. For those, there will be a school-wide curriculum committee keep it within the school; someone from another school won't have to discuss something they know nothing about. For those that haven't been part of Curriculum Committee, this is a non-trivial change—in the past, someone with a burr in their saddle about something and would force a discussion that stalled the process. Things only affect your school can now be dealt with within your school—this is part of Vice-President Christiansen's vision of giving schools more autonomy. For things that do affect whole institution, however, you can expect the process to be much slower—you can expect 18 months or longer for some.

AC: It will be more careful so that stuff doesn't come back again later.

RC: We rushed many things in the process of becoming a university, and it may be that the ends justify the means. But there's no need for that in the future. Reasonable, prudent process is where we're headed with this. But it doesn't mean you should expect to pull a few strings and fast-track your program. Pass this back to your faculty that the process will now be slower and more deliberate. OK, one last thing; those of you that don't know that Paul Abegg started a tradition of meeting with the President on a regular basis, and we've continued that process. An issue that has come up, and also come up in our meetings with the Board of Trustees chair, is that our faculty are not visible enough. Right now, people in the community have skeptical-at-best-, and antagonistic-at-worst, opinions of faculty on campus. There are a couple of approaches suggested that we need to consider. One idea that's been implemented by the Board of Trustees is that when faculty do something noteworthy—conducting research of interest to others, etc.—we're going to highlight it at Board of Trustees meetings—that's already been happening and we want to continue it. If you have faculty in your field that are doing research of interest to a broader group and affects the broader community, we want to know so we can give the Board of Trustees opportunities to highlight it.

SL: Why would doing that increase visibility?

RC: Because there are people in community that spread the word—they'll hear about this and see that faculty are actively involved in Board of Trustees issues. In the past, we've been seen as being roadblocks; here we're showing what we're accomplishing.

SL: I've seen things covered in the *Spectrum*.

RC: This will address it more directly: we need faculty to actually interact with the community more, and here's some ideas of how to do that (and we need more!). If you do research—for example, ecology in Zion National Park—lots of people who love the wildlife around here! Have the people doing that research considered giving a talk at a local service club or other community organizations that they could give talks at, just to show that we can be a resource for people interested in those things? If you have expertise related to family relations—I know our Psychology chair gave a presentation on family-child interactions on campus, but could it be off campus? If it's on the community's turf, as it were, that would help build bridges. If there are things like that that you can think of, where you can present things in a *helpful* way, that could have a softening effect of us being part of community rather than being against the community, as is the perception right now.

CB: At my last institution, we had a Community Outreach Coordinator that would facilitate that. If you had an interest in doing such things, you'd let them know and the topics you could talk about. People in community would then know who to call to get people to give presentations on subjects.

RC: That's an excellent idea.

SL: Don't we have a Community Outreach dean in Becky Smith?

AC: I think that's Continuing Education, she functions differently by bringing people *here*, not us going *out*.

SL: But isn't Community Outreach in her title?

RC: That might be the right way to do this. We'll meet with dean's council, and I'll bring that up. That may be right.

CL: Why is it us leaving the campus—why not be more inclusive about who we invite *onto* campus?

RC: Sure, we do that with Continuing Education, but it was an idea that we could go in reverse, too.

LJ: (looks up and reads Becky's title, and yes, it includes that)

RC: OK, we can suggest that she keep track of requests for those kinds of things. If you know of opportunities like that, or topics that your faculty can present about, please let the appropriate people know. Business is already very good about this; the rest of campus can do more to facilitate our image. I think we do disagree with some people in community on some things, but overall, we mostly want to offer what we can for good beyond the classroom. I want to keep this going.

LJ: Isn't community involvement part of our tenure process?

RC: It says "service," which is usually interpreted as campus service.

SP: One category is "public service".

RC: OK, but I assure you that it's de-emphasized right now. Highlighting that it counts toward tenure consideration would emphasize it to people that might be reluctant to participate otherwise. I think a lot of faculty would do this if they knew there were opportunities—most of us like to talk about what we do.

NS: I think there's a lot that goes on, but this is more about advertising and bragging.

CL: A lot goes on, but public relations is the problem.

RC: When we do these things, report back to the Community Outreach person to advertise and promote what we've done and will do. That would help, I think.

SL: In the past, when some research has been done, I've seen write-ups in the *Spectrum*.

AC: As we talk more about this, I wonder if there's a sense that there's still an isolationist perception. If we're doing research, and we appear to be saying that "We can help you by giving you this information," and it still feels like it's not integrated. We need to make the foundations of the community feel that we're integrating, rather than being just a guest speaker, as opposed to "you're a community member and visiting us as part of the group, rather than representing the institution." That's harder to do, and I don't know how to go about doing it, but we should have a discussion about it.

CL: I think on that: we find groups that are already meeting that have a special interest—we invite them to meet *on* campus in facilities built by the taxpayer anyway, and integrate yourself into those communities by *hosting* the event, and make it a gathering place.

AC: Yes, participating as a member rather than as the "expert" speaker to impart your knowledge. I think there's a sense that "Oh, you're from the University and you think you're so great." We have to overcome that distinction.

NS: But in Business, it's more natural because there are clubs and business interests, etc. But there are other groups—Leadership Dixie, which is community program to promote leaders to understand more of history of the community, etc. Or the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Lion's Club, etc.

RC: I agree. I want to continue this discussion—yes, integrating is much harder, and research on overcoming stereotypes require a more cooperative process to overcome prejudices and stereotypes. I think we need to start.

AC: I'm on board with this.

RC: Our last issue: our meeting times and how often? I cannot do Thursdays at noon. Today we met for about 1 hr. It's hard to conduct our business in 50 min. I'd prefer to shoot for that, but have flexibility to go longer when big things come up. Last year, a lot of big things came up, and it was hard to get them done. We're trying to attack these issues by delegating them to smaller groups, and they'll break issues down into smaller pieces. But still, we want to get it done and we may have to go for longer than 50 min. We shouldn't restrict ourselves then. Monday at 2, as today, allowed the majority of us to stay, but obviously not all, and one representative has class at this time. So when's a good time to meet?

2 PM worked for almost everyone, which was remarkable. I was thinking that at 2, if a marathon session happens, it doesn't eat too much into your evenings. But I'm planning on 3 PM for most meetings—no carrying on just for the sake of carrying on! I'll see if I can get something.