

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, August 29th, 2002, 3:30 p.m.
Board of Trustees Conference Room

I. Call to order, 3:33 p.m. by President Brian Heuett. Attending: Senators - Brian Heuett (President), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Steve Barney, Ken Laundra, Terry Blodgett as proxy for Sara Ann Smith, Rea Gubler (arrived 4 p.m.), Ron Martin (arrived 4:36 p.m.), Ty Redd (also has proxy for Robert Eves), Steve Evans, Boyd Fife, Roy Johnson, Jerry Bowler, Kay Andersen, Darin Wadley (arrived 4:25 p.m.), Bonnie Bishop as proxy for Rea Gubler until her late arrival, Bonnie Mitchell as proxy for Curt Bostick, Kathy Black newly elected as replacement for Greg Colf, and Scott Lanning. Visitors: Tasha Williams (University Journal), University Provost Abe Harraf; excused: Curt Bostick, Martha Hyder, Marty Larkin (semester proxy for Steve Heath), Deb Hill, Eric Brown, Robert Eves (President Elect)

II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of April 25th, 2002. Boyd Fife moved that the minutes of April 25th, 2002 be approved with minor corrections in spelling and punctuation as submitted by Brian Heuett and Steve Evans; Virginia Stitt seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 14 in favor, with 2 abstentions, and 2 votes against. The dissenting votes were made as they felt uncomfortable voting to approve something they had not read.

III. Officers Reports

A. President: Brian Heuett gave everyone a minute to introduce themselves and tell which college they represent.

a. Committee Assignments: Brian Heuett indicated that the Faculty Senate needs an updated and completed list of University and Faculty Senate committee assignments. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is encouraging each senator to accept two Faculty Senate committee assignments in order to spread the responsibilities more equitably; however it was noted that it was not expected that both committee assignments would be on highly work intensive committees. He then passed around a list of committees, and asked the senators to indicate on which committees they currently serve. There were no other comments on this matter from the senate.

b. Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws Review: A proposed and revised constitution and by-laws have been written for some time; Steve Barney has agreed to chair the committee to look at the revised by-laws and constitution. His committee will get a proposal to the senate in time for the senate to vote on it; and then send it to the faculty for final approval by the end of this year (2002).

c. Policy Preparation: Robert Eves is now the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (formerly policy review committee), with Brian Heuett, Rea Gubler and Robert Fass as committee members. Robert and Brian would like to have 8-10 people on the committee to review policies--this would allow subcommittees to work on specific policies, thus covering more in a shorter period of time. He urged senators to look at revised policies when they are asked to do so, in order to facilitate a more efficient process. The most pressing policy to be reviewed at the moment is the Leave, Rank, and Tenure policy. The committee intends to review policies as quickly as possible and bring them to the senate for a vote. If there is too much discussion or the policy changes/recommendations are voted down, the policy will go back to the committee/sub-committee for further revision. With a larger committee broken into sub-committees, this process should be more efficient, allowing the senate to revise and pass more policies on to the reviewing entity. Brian again plead for senators to come ready to discuss policies. Joe Baker asked for a list of the most pressing policies. Brian reiterated that the LRT policy revision is the top priority, revision of the Faculty Senate Constitution and by-laws is the number two priority, and then listed others--academic positions, faculty evaluation, academic rank, and dates for tenure and application. Kenny Landra wanted to know if there is a choice of specific policies on which one might work; and he also wanted to know about the status of the Internet policy. Brian indicated that the internet policy reviewed and passed by the Faculty Senate last year is now in place and that he would leave it to Robert Eves to decide who works on which policy. He then listed other policies in need of review, including sabbatical leave, final exams, and faculty responsibility to students.

B. President Elect

a. Robert Eves (Academic Affairs Committee) : Brian Heuett spoke for Robert Eves, who is excused today, making another plea to get on committees, especially to help Robert with the enormous responsibility of policy review. Brian mentioned that Robert's number one goal is to have the senate resolve the campus wide morale issue as senators take the lead in working together with the administration and among ourselves in getting the work of the university accomplished and to demonstrate our unity by paying our faculty dues.

C. Secretary: David Lund had nothing to report this meeting.

D. Treasurer

a. Financial Report: Joe Baker indicated that we have approximately \$11,000 in our account after paying scholarships for this year.

b. Faculty members \$1.00 per pay period donations to faculty association: Joe Baker then informed the senate that only 87 people are signed up for the automatic deduction for Faculty Association and he was not yet sure of how many have paid or pay with checks of \$24. Joe would like to see at least 125 faculty members on automatic payroll deduction plan. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is trying to find a way to get everyone to join the faculty association. Possible methods discussed include a letter from President Bennion and Brian Heuett to let faculty know that the money is mostly used to support scholarships. Terry Blodgett thought it might be an idea to repeat an old practice and send out of a list of those who have not joined. Joe then indicated that we are currently spending more money than we bring in.. Brian reminded the senate that we are paying full tuition and fees for two students this year. Our intake is less than half of what we need to meet the scholarship need. Joe indicated that letters encouraging faculty to join the association will be sent out again this year. Brian said that the letter needs to strongly communicate that most of the money is used for scholarships. Ty Redd wanted to know if we had a good idea of why dues were not being paid; maybe we need to push the fact that this is a way to unify the faculty. It was mentioned that we might need to change the name of the contribution from dues to something else. The question was then raised of how payment of faculty association dues might play into Mark Barton's plea to the faculty to donate to scholarship funds. Boyd Fife indicated that we might double the dues amount from \$1 to \$2. Joe Baker echoed Boyd's question and asked if we might want to ask for a doubled amount. The question was then asked if we needed to vote on a change in dues. Then someone asked if we should make it a write in amount on the form letter. Brian asked if we should draft a letter for the senate, to ask for more. Virginia reminded us that we had moved into new business. Steve Barney said we really need to know why the faculty don't pay. Then we could make a plan to cure the problem. Ty Redd said he had asked for his money back at one point because he felt it did not show the unity of the faculty.

IV. Old Business: The discussion of dues continued, now under old business, as Kathy Black said the we need to make it clear if the contribution of dues is to give the faculty power and/or for scholarship. Ty Redd said it is both; we show unity by being involved, and by helping students. Kay Anderson said we can't call it a scholarship fund when we use it for other things. Kathy Black reminded us to remind the faculty that contributions are tax deductible. Brian wanted to know if we want to vote or leave this in Joe's hands for the moment, including some of the ideas we have discussed. Bonnie Bishop thought it might be wise to mention how the money is spent and to know that some goes for things other than

scholarships. Bonnie Mitchell said the language in the letter ought to be a little stronger than just faculty unity. Boyd wanted to know if we could do more with the money if all faculty paid, and what we could do if everyone paid. Joe said it is about \$1140.00 per semester per student. So if everyone paid, how much would we have? Joe said he could figure that out. Steve Evans said that we should communicate to the faculty that some senate funds come from university budget funds. Steve Barney asked if alumni and other contributors had been contacted to match funds. Terry Blodgett wondered if we might want to spread the money a little farther by offering less money (1/2 tuition) to more students. Brian indicated that in the past the size and number of the scholarships has been dictated to some extent by the number of applicants. Brian indicated he'd like to leave it as it is for now to allow for such flexibility. Brian asked if we should make a motion to have Joe and he draft a letter with all of this information. Steve Evans moved that Joe Baker draft a letter, revised based on the preceding discussion, to the faculty with information regarding the disposition of the faculty association dues and requesting that all faculty join the association. Steve Barney seconded the motion and the motion was then carried in the affirmative by a unanimous vote of the senate.

Brian passed out the schedule for upcoming Faculty Senate meetings noting the change of location for the November 21st meeting.

VII. New Business

A. College Elections and Faculty Senate Representation: We have a new college, the College of Applied Science and Technology. They have already elected senators: Boyd Fife was elected for a 1 year term, Rea Gubler for a 2 year term, and Mike McGarvey for a 3 year term. Brian then went through the current policy regarding senators and how they are elected. Elections are to be conducted by the senior faculty member in each school. Each college has 2 senators plus additional senators based on the number of full-time faculty in the college (full-time faculty are defined in the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws as instructors and professors with full-time positions, and do not include adjuncts, lecturers or clinical faculty). The constitution is not completely clear on the matter of numbers and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has interpreted the section regarding additional senators to mean that if a college has between 8 and 21 full time faculty, they will be able to elect one more senator, if the number of full-time faculty is between 22 and 35, the college will elect 2 additional senators, and so on--36-49 allows election of three additional senator, 50-63, 4 additional senators. The problem is the interpretation of the current constitution and by-laws. Each college needs to look at their current, full-time faculty, based on the above definition and make sure that elections are held where necessary. Bonnie Mitchell asked where these numbers for additional senators came from; no one knew. The question was asked if we are clear on this. Brian asked for a motion that

each college make certain that they have 2 representatives; then elect additional senators as follows: one more for the next fourteen full-time faculty or fraction thereof over 1/2, then one more for each 8 full-time faculty over 28 or fraction thereof greater than 1/2. Colleges need to look at the numbers of full-time faculty and hold appropriate elections in light of these numbers. Joe Baker moved that Brian's motion be accepted; Kenny Laundra seconded the motion; the motion carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the senate.

Brian then discussed the faculty senate elections within the colleges and how we might adjust them to stagger senatorial terms so that approximately 1/3 of the senators in office would be new each year. The new College of Applied Science and Technology has already done this by electing their three senators for three different terms of office--one year, two years, and three years. Brian has asked Robert Eves to look at this and to make suggestions to each college to adjust elections so that the terms will be staggered. Robert will have this information ready for the September meeting, this may mean that some senators may be asked to serve an additional year to facilitate this. Colleges need to do this after we get Robert's report, and then vote on how they can make the appropriate adjustments.

Brian gave a final reminder, that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be trying to get committee information updated and assignments equalized. Brian also indicated that Ben Davidson will be asked to chair the Leave, Rank, and Tenure policy committee. He again plead for volunteers to be on the policy review committee and for senators to read policies in preparation for discussion in a timely manner.

V. Motion for executive session was made by Joe Baker, seconded by Ty Redd, and carried in the affirmative by a unanimous vote of the senate.

While we waited to see if Abe Harraf was going to be able to come in and take his 10 minutes, Kathy Black wanted to know if the Faculty Senate would become too big if we started to grow like Utah Valley State College. She indicated this was something to discuss in the future.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Provost Abe Harraf : Provost Harraf listed a number of things his office is looking at, retention of students, overloads, class size, recruitment, a web committee to revise the university web site and make it representative of what we do at SUU--the look needs to be more appealing since more than 30% of our incoming students use the web to apply. He is working on accreditation issues; especially aligning Northwest Accreditation standard 1 with assessment and standard 4 of faculty resume. He is seeking a new line item in the budget for adjuncts, which would remove them from the overload item--our number of

adjuncts is too high in many areas and we need to get more in line with national norms. We can't correct all problems but we can make a plan. His office is also looking at faculty development--we need to provide more and better opportunities for travel, etc. He promised the deans that all money saved in overloads would go to faculty development, then we don't need new funds for this important item. He has listed 10 budget items that need immediate attention in a meeting with the Presidents Council--the two top items were salary and faculty overload. He also indicated that we should attempt to replace adjuncts with permanent faculty. The Provost's office is also looking at policies: independent study, and others. He is collecting data to resolve issues. He is also committed to moving policies forward as fast as we can, keeping in mind that we need to do those for Northwest Accreditation, including assessment, as required, as fast as we can. He is looking forward to working with the faculty; he has committed to do nothing without consulting the faculty. He said we also need to improve faculty morale, the relationship of the faculty with administration, and develop a workable model of shared governance. We can't deliberate forever; we need to bring closure to our work. He hopes to build trust and work together. Kenny Laundra asked about student advising. Dr. Harraf indicated that advising is one item in his list of 65 topic items that need to be addressed. The Provost expressed concern with the Registrar's office and academics and the need for a real honors program that students can find and become involved in. He indicated that accomplishing some of his projects will require moving some offices to appropriate venues, for example, the Grant office should be moved out of library, and the Honors program moved in. He wants to make life easier for the faculty so we can serve students better. The Provost's goal is for his office to serve the faculty, not for the faculty to serve the Provost's office. Bonnie Mitchell wanted to know if we could have anthropology and philosophy degrees. Dr. Harraf indicated that the Board of Regents has placed a moratorium on new programs, but a loophole is there for interdisciplinary programs. New residency requirement will hurt SUU--half of those affected will not come back. We have other difficulties in getting student numbers up--the Nevada tobacco settlement money has made it possible for more students in Nevada to stay at home. The difficult economy has caused all higher education in Utah to look at programs; those that need to be cut will be cut. The biggest request from SUU to the state is for new building for education; but there is no knowledge of how the state budget will look next year. Tuition is going up nationally, as states are not funding higher education to the previous extent. Provost Harraf needs us to help retain students and keep graduation numbers up; both numbers are well below peer institution numbers--student success courses such as ours bump up retention and graduation numbers by 10%. He has asked the deans to look at making the success course required. Finally, Dr. Harraf said, that we have lots of challenges. One major focus for this year will be recruitment and retention. He is thinking we might want to institute a 6th-week report on students in all 1000 level classes to allow faculty and advisors to do preventative work to keep students on campus.

IX. Motion to adjourn was made by Joe Baker; adjournment at 5:10 p.m.