

Faculty Senate Minutes  
Thursday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2003, 3:30 p.m.  
Board of Trustees Conference Room

- I. Call to order: 3:33 p.m. In attendance at this meeting: Senators - Brian Heuett (President), Robert Eves (President Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Steve Barney, Rea Gubler, Ty Redd, Steve Evans, Darin Wadley, Curt Bostick, Martha Hyder, Steve Heath, Deb Hill, Kathy Black, Eric Brown, Mike McGarvy, Roy Johnson, Sara Ann Smith, Kay Andersen, Mike Grady, Scott Lanning, and Jerry Bowler; New Senators: Wayne Williams, Richard Eissinger, Marty Larkin, David Rees and Lionel Grady. Visitors: University Provost Abe Harraf, Dr. Tom Cunningham, Dr. Ben Davidson; Excused: none; Absent: Boyd Fife, Ron Martin, Ken Laundra.
  
- II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of March 27<sup>th</sup>. Move to approve by Virginia Stitt, second by Joe Baker, unanimous vote for approval with minor corrections.
  
- III. Officers' Reports
  - A. President – Brian Heuett
    - a. Final Report to the Faculty Senate: Brian Heuett passed out his report and give electronic copy to secretary to be included in the minutes. Brian had 4 goals he mentioned briefly; 1 new constitution, 2 pass policies, 3 improve shared governance, and prepare for accreditation, 4 improve morale across campus and in the senate. He felt these goals had mostly been reached. The letter discusses some challenges facing the senate in the next year.
  
  - B. President-Elect – Robert Eves: no information at this time
  
  - C. Treasurer – Joe Baker
    - a. Financial Report: \$13,747.46 in the CD. There were some bills outstanding in the 2 account which still has over \$800.00. It was recommended that a motion be made to buy CD in order to keep funds from being swept. No motion was made, as it was not necessary; but the incoming executive committee should look into the possibility.
  
- IV. Committee Reports
  - a. Faculty Portfolio for Evaluation – Tom Cunningham (**10 minutes**) A motion to accept this policy as written was made by Robert Eves, Scott Lanning seconded. In discussion, Steve Barney wanted to know which version we would vote on. It was indicated that the emailed document did not reflect the changes from the last consideration by the senate. Robert wanted to know if departments could still use their own evaluation vehicles, since initially the committee had no intention to supercede individual department guidelines. Tom Cunningham

indicated that for service and scholarship, the department would have leeway to use their own evaluations as much as possible, but that teaching should be evaluated in a standard manner throughout the campus. Robert wanted to have it in the document that individual departments should have the right to use their own documents. Steve Heath indicated that his department would also be opposed on this basis. Tom reiterated that in terms of teaching, the intent is to evaluate teaching consistently. Marty Larkin was concerned, as well. The question is still, must we use this document. Tom said he thought that was the proposal and that this portfolio would provide a common ground for evaluations. Marty wanted to know if this was going to be used every year. Robert reminded us that this was not a set of forms, but rather a document providing a method of providing evaluation materials. This document is to be the guideline for all faculty for all leave, rank and tenure issues. Curt Bostick, who was on the committee, said they followed their charge to create a common system for evaluation for the campus. Kay Andersen wondered about which document would be in effect at which time. Scott clarified this question by asking directly if this document was passed today, would it then be used for the coming Fall semester for all faculty evaluation. The answer is yes, but we may need to work through this. Provost Abe Harraf had some concerns regarding the definition of scholarly work and the role of the department chair. The motion was called to question: there were 13 votes in favor of accepting the document as written, 6 vote in opposition, and 1 abstention; the motion passed in the affirmative.

- b. Leave, Rank, and Tenure Policy – Ben Davidson **(15 minutes)**: A motion to accept the document was made by Joe Baker which was seconded by Jerry Bowler. Ty Redd wondered why the attitude of the faculty member was no longer in the policy document. Robert Eves said the committee removed it because it is hard to quantify, and it might become a political issue to get rid of someone. He thought it might be good to make a statement with the required signatures on the document stating that the signatures of those approving leave, rank, or tenure implied agreement to work with the applicant. Kay Andersen also indicated that his department wanted to have a clause in the policy regarding collegiality. Eric Brown thought it might be a good idea to add a statement that brought in the faculty portfolio in 6.6.4 to clarify how it was to be used in the evaluation process. Robert Eves indicated that this is each model for specific sections in the document. Ty Redd wanted to know what the phrase “national prominence” means in 6.3.2. Ben Davidson indicated that it applied to someone who is held in high regard by peers in his/her field; for example, someone who has not been in the academic community but is moving into it. Eric thought we should strike the phrase between the commas, starting with “for example . . .” and ending with “. . . academic discipline”; the motion was seconded by Ty Redd. Robert said it was there for the business folks. Joe Baker agrees with the removal of this phrase and Jerry Bowler agreed with this notion, as well. Still discussing the collegiality issue, the numerical ratings are

the basis for the status change or denial of tenure and the committee doing the evaluating still has the role of saying yea or nay. With or without a statement of collegiality, the committee could deny the desired status. Kathy Black told a story of a “quirky creature” who was very good, but denied tenure because of strange attitudes—he sued and won. We must be careful. Kay Andersen indicated that on occasion we must work with people who have very large egos and working with them could be difficult; especially, if contact time with the egomaniac is long and the he/she is too hard to work with. The motion was called to question: 17 in favor of acceptance with the motion as amended to strike the indicated phrase, 2 opposed, 2 abstained; the motion passed in the affirmative.

- c. Faculty Senate Scholarships – Brian Heuett (**2 minutes**): The faculty senate has awarded 2 scholarships for next year to Kathy Cieslewicz and Jonathan Richtsteig. Both are good candidates. There was a concern from the committee that too few people know about these scholarships and the committee has a plan to improve the visibility of the scholarships so that more applications will be made.

## V. Old Business

- a. Faculty Senate Constitution (**1 minute**): It is too late to get this task completed prior to the end of this semester, and it will be the first order of business next Fall.
- b. Faculty Satisfaction Survey (**1 minute**): Dropped out of existence because faculty did not participate. Brian is recommending that the senate along with the provost have a 3<sup>rd</sup> party do this survey.
- c. Faculty Appointments and Contracts - III.C.4 (**10 minutes**): Robert made some amendments after our last meeting, and deleted the part about consulting and other contracts. He wanted to know if we wanted a statement there in that regard. A motion to accept this policy without the contract/consulting jargon was made by Steve Heath and seconded by Steve Barney. In discussion, Deb Hill, said that the policy regarding the 2 days time is somewhere else. Provost Abe Harraf indicated that all other universities have a policy with information regarding this issue. He said the issue related to situations in which a conflict of interest might exist. If some of our faculty were to start to engage in activities that directly take income from the university, there is a problem. Darin Wadley wanted to know about gigs that fine arts faculty might take for extra income. He was concerned that this could be a problem because of the amount of time that might be spent engaging in this outside activity. Robert proposed that it be amended to allow the faculty to consult, but only to report the nature of the time spent consulting to their immediate supervisor. Steve Barney wanted to know if this change would meet the need of the administration and keep the university job as the primary one for each faculty member. Robert Eves moved to add item 4 as amended above, Joe Baker seconded this motion; Steve Heath and Steve Barney

- agreed to the amendment. The motion was called to question and passed in the affirmative, with 22 vote in favor, and 3 votes in opposition.
- d. Academic Program Review Policy **(10 minutes)**: This amended policy was very different from the one that came to the senate; however, it has been reviewed extensively using the guidelines and information from the regents and is now friendly toward the faculty. Eric Brown moved to accept the amended policy, Ty Redd seconded the motion. With no further discussion coming forth, the motion was called to question. There were 24 in favor of acceptance and 1 abstention. The motion to accept passed in the affirmative.

## VI. New Business

- a. Joe Baker proposed to buy a CD with the extra 2 account money, the motion was seconded by Ty Redd. The ensuing vote was unanimous in favor of this action. Joe Baker will look into the appropriate process.
- b. Academic Affairs/New Faculty Senate Presidency – Summer Policy Review: Brian Heuett thought it might be wise to keep the current academic affairs committee in tact through the fall semester for purposes of accreditation. A motion to this affect was made by Ty Redd and seconded by Steve Heath. This motion passed in the affirmative by a unanimous vote.
- c. Provost Abe Harraf **(10 minutes)**: Provost Harraf thanked the senate for moving towards the concept of shared-governance and reminded us of the increased communication that has occurred in this past year. He is not trying to make us Utah State, but we have to meet certain criteria to be a university that is accredited. There will be some pains in the process of growth, but all employees will remain important to SUU. He indicated that the only way we can move forward is as a united SUU community. We need to put forward a very positive and united front to continue to grow and progress in the university. He saw an interesting sign or saying, “Paradigm shift happens.” We need to increase our representation throughout the state and surrounding areas. Again thanks to the senate and the executive committee. We must move forward. He gave Brian Heuett a plaque recognizing him for his service.
- d. Appreciation to Outgoing Senators, Installation of New Senators **(5 minutes)**: Brian Heuett thanked the senate again. He has enjoyed being involved in the senate. He thanked Robert for all of his help and gave some tokens of appreciation to the Provost, and the other members of the senate executive committee. He expressed thanks to Joe Baker for his service as treasurer for three years; then to David Lund as 2 year secretary in senate. He then thanked Virginia Stitt for her work as parliamentarian. And lastly, he thanked Robert Eves for his service as Vice President and also Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. Joe Baker then presented Brian with a briefcase in appreciation for all of his

work as President. Brian then excused the outgoing senators. The new senators were welcomed in by Robert Eves.

- e. Election of Faculty Senate Officers 2003-2004 (**unknown**): Brian Heuett started the election, he explained the process.
  - 1. Nominated for President: David Lund by Steve Barney; David Rees by Cathy Black; Steve Barney by Curtis Bostick. With no clear winner a run-off between David Lund and Steve Barney was held. David Lund was elected President.
  - 2. David Lund took over the election as the new President. Nominated for Vice-president/President Elect: David Rees by Ty Redd, Ty Redd by Steve Barney, Cathy Black by Deb Hill, with encouragement from Robert Eves and Virginia Stitt. Ty declined the nomination, as did Cathy. David Rees will accept the nomination. There were no other nominations and the senate voted unanimously to accept David Rees' for this office.
  - 3. Nominated for Treasurer: Rea Gubler by Ty Redd, Lionel Grady by Virginia Stitt, Cathy Black by Deb Hill, and Eric Brown nominated Virginia Stitt. Steve Barney moved nominations cease: Cathy declined the nomination, Virginia also declined the nomination. Rea accepted the nomination as did Lionel. In the ensuing vote Rea Gubler was elected the new treasurer.
  - 4. Nominated for Parliamentarian: Ty Redd nominated Virginia Stitt. It was immediately moved that nominations cease by Deb Hill. Virginia indicated that she would accept the nomination and the senate voted unanimously to accept her for this office.
  - 5. Nominated for Secretary: Martha Hyder by Steve Barney, Deb Hill by Kathy Black, Steve Barney by Rea Gubler. Wayne Williams moved the nominations cease. All nominees accepted the nomination. In the first vote, no one received a clear majority and a run-off vote was conducted between Martha Hyder & Steve Barney. Martha Hyder was elected as the new secretary.

VII. Motion for Executive Session (**5 seconds**) Curt Bostick made a motion for executive session, Wayne Williams seconded the motion; the vote was unanimous.

VIII. Adjournment 5:30 p.m.