

## SUU Faculty Senate Meeting: August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2003: Summary

### **I. Call to Order** by President David Lund:

In attendance: David Lund (President), Robert Eves, Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), David Rees, Martha Hyder (Secretary), Steve Barney, Rea Gubler (Treasurer), Ty Redd, Darin Wadley, Deb Hill, Kathy Black, Ken Laundra, Eric Brown, Steve Heath, Curt Bostick, Marty Larkin, Wayne D. Williams, Richard Eissinger, Roy Johnson, Kim Kraft, Mike Grady, Seth Armstrong, Doug Molash.

Visitors: Univeristy Provost Abe Harraf, Robert Eves

Excused:

Absent:

### **II. Review and Approval of Minutes from . . . :**

Virginia Stitt moves we accept the minutes as written. Darin Wadley seconds. 13 in favor and 2 abstentions.

### **III. Officers Reports:** Rea Gubler: \$803, \$805 in travel, checking – \$2,595.00, savings \$1,576.00, cd is at \$10,300+

Kathy Black: Is the capital we have in our **savings account** remaining pretty much the same and are we spending all of the interest on the **scholarships** plus whatever the faculty is putting in for the scholarships? Is the interest being applied to scholarships? From a tax standpoint, your check or a stub saying you made the deduction is not sufficient for a charitable contribution. We should send a statement to the faculty from the institution around December 31st, so that they can take the charitable contribution, if it's going to scholarships.

David Lund: Rea would you look into that? And if it turns out that all the faculty dues that are being sent in are being turned back into the scholarships, then we probably ought to do exactly what Kathy is suggesting.

Discussion on providing meeting treats.

### **IV.: Committee reports.**

1. David Reese submitted and withdrew a motion that we have two individuals from the faculty senate serve on each of these standing committees. Kathy Black later moved that we coordinate David Reese's original motion with the constitutional drafting committee to see if we can come up with something that will streamline and coordinate committee work within the senate in the bylaws. In favor: unanimous. 21 voting members.

### **V: Old business - Faculty Evaluation Document**

1. The motion is to take the document that was approved by us [the faculty senate] and they [dean's council] have a document they want, and it's been back and forth enough, that a joint committee from their group and this group, get together and hammer out the details. 2 opposed, 1 abstained, motion carries.

### **VI: Provost Report:**

SUU is only .2% behind on the FTE budget. Our tuition was way under value in terms of student perception. Conversion rate of applicants is good. One challenge we face is the loss of 42% of our students at the freshman and sophomore levels. Student reasons for attrition are lack of jobs and nothing to do here. Discussion on state monies for institutional growth. Desire to get employees to 90% of the national average.

### **VII: Policy votes: Faculty Hiring**

1. H3 would read "the dean and provost authorize the department chair to extent a tentative offer and if the offer is accepted, the department chair initiates the appointment document. 2 abstentions, rest in favor. Policy amended to read that way.
2. the next to last sentence in 3C would read "SUU promotes hiring practices to enhance faculty diversity in all its' forms." 1 abstention, all in favor.
3. e: "the committee will consist of diverse faculty representation". 3 opposed, 2 abstention.
4. G4: striking the word "or", 4 opposed, 2 abstentions, motion defeated.
5. Section G4, #4 reads "each invited candidate should demonstrate high or her teaching and scholarship as applies in their respective field. Passed unanimously.
6. 3C: Drop 'and approval' in the first sentence and add "the final position announcement will be approved by the search committee." Eliminate the word "further" so it just says "for review." 1 opposed, 1 abstention, motion carries.
7. Move to delete "the presentation shall be videotaped" in G4. Passed unanimously.
8. Motion to reword the preceding sentence to "the search committee will provide adequate notice of what is expected" Passed unanimously.
9. #4 – change the word "should" to "will" in "Each invited candidate should demonstrate." 1 abstention, policy passes

### **VIII: Move for Dismissal**

Rea Gubler: moves to table next to next meeting Wayne: seconds, *Unanimously passes.*

Ty Redd: moves for executive session, motion to adjourn Steve Heath moves to adjourn at 5:18.

IV.: Committee reports.

1. David Reese submitted and withdrew a motion that we have two individuals from the faculty senate serve on each of these standing committees. Kathy Black later moved that we coordinate David Reese's original motion with the constitutional drafting committee to see if we can come up with something that will streamline and coordinate committee work within the senate in the bylaws. In favor: unanimous. 21 voting members?

David Reese took the assignment to look at filling and **streamlining committees**.

1) Request for corrections on faculty senate list.

2) University standing committees: Out of date lists. The bylaws state this: "appointment to committees: the following identifies committee length of office and duties and responsibilities for standing committees in the faculty senate. Here's the important part, whenever possible the chair of these committees shall be a member of the faculty senate. What I'd like to propose is that we have two individuals from the faculty senate serve on each standing committee. There are eight standing committees and that would make sixteen posts to fill. And that we would have a senior faculty senator and a junior faculty senator. The senior faculty senator would be the chair of the various committees while the junior faculty senator would then rotate into that position the following year. I think this would greatly expedite the business of faculty senate where we would have contact with the chairs of each committee. It would also be a training type post for the junior faculty members who would come in and continue to work with that committee. *Therefore I'd like to make a motion that we have two individuals from the faculty senate serve on each of these standing committees* X: I second the motion. X: Okay, discussion? X: Would that require that we amend by laws to be that way? David Rees: the bylaws are pretty flexible in what they allow us to do. I've read through the whole thing and it doesn't say how any of the members of the committee are appointed. Whether they're appointed by yourself or the faculty senate or by whomever, it's totally open. I guess they can be appointed any way. David Lund: Aren't some of the members elected? David Rees: Some are elected and maybe we should amend the motion that way to say that wherever membership of the committee is not elected by the respective faculty that then we have members from the faculty senate fill ....Virginia Stitt: Excuse me, we have an amendment to the motion....Steve Barney: In a few minutes we'll talk about the new proposed faculty constitution and part of that will be some new bylaws. Maybe instead of making a motion and following it through with this and then having it go back and review that then maybe we can work together to construct the new bylaws accordingly. David Rees: I would accept that, yes. Does this new bylaws going to change the way that members of the committee are appointed? Steve Barney: Yes, it will certainly specify how they're appointed in much like the same way you're doing with how many members and how many members on each committee and there's actually some new committees that we're going to propose as well. David Rees: Why don't I table my business, I withdraw the motion. David Lund?: *The motion is withdrawn, Rea?*

Rea Gubler: Another thing that concerns me is the size of these committees doesn't really allow for that much... faculty to have two senate members on each one. David Lund: Yes, some of the committees require one member from each college and some from another and as the bylaws are perhaps reworded we'll need to take that into consideration so that if for instance the chair of a committee comes from one college and the junior faculty co-chair should come from another college and then the other members of the committee should come from the other colleges make sure that we appropriately get people to the right colleges and so on and so forth. Some committees are good with six or seven, including a member from the nonaffiliated..... and some need 14.

Kenny: Will we have a problem with some committees like LRT that require tenured faculty only to be able to have junior faculty...like myself? David Lund: I think that's something, the bylaws have not been done, and as the constitution committee redid only the constitution to begin with and left the by laws til after the constitution was done for the simple reason that the bylaws can be done by this body, but the constitution has to be ratified by the entire faculty. We'd have to take that into consideration. Once Steve makes his report...

Erik Brown: I'm just wondering that if the way you envision it, that the chair would only serve one year? Steve Barney: The way I had it envisioned, yes. David Lund: Most of those committees are only 2 year appointments, I've been on one for four years straight at this point. Ty Redd: I get a little concerned, I can see myself on maybe a few committees, but on the other hand, university leave, and rank and tenure and policy, I'd be scared to have to be on them. I would like for us at least to think about this that we leave that latitude for people who are talented in that area to be there. As you go over that, there's the tenure issue and the fact that some of us have zero talent in rank and tenure, I don't even know what that is. David Lund: Kathy. Kathy Black: David's original motion was to try to create some continuity, so we have a chair and somebody, I mean two people from the faculty senate on each committee, and I think the idea of having some kind of continuity, I mean we do it in the presidency of the faculty senate so that, so that someone doesn't come in and suddenly they're president of something and I think the way he has proposed that, it leaves open some of these other questions as to who that's going to be, but it simply says hey, let's try to make sure that we have some continuity. And, I think that's a good thing, and I move the question. David Lund: He withdrew the motion. However, I would at this point entertain a motion from the floor that we make an assignment to the constitution committee that's working on getting that taken care of along with David Reese would look at that and streamline and make that work so that would happen so that somebody would have to.... Kathy Black: I move that. David Lund: Thank you. Okay, let's see if we can put that in words. Can you put that in words Kathy? Kathy Black: I move that we coordinate David Rees' original motion with the constitutional drafting committee to see if we can come up with something that will provide for that and coordinate that. David Lund: Streamline and coordinate committee work within the senate in the bylaws. Yes, with the bylaws. Kathy

Black: Right, in the bylaws. David Lund: Does that sound good? Yes, that does. Martha read that back to us. Martha Hyder: I (Kathy) move that we coordinate David Reese's original motion with the constitutional drafting committee to see if we can come up with something that will streamline and coordinate committee work within the senate in the bylaws. David Lund: We need a second. Steve Barney seconds it. David Lund: Any further discussion? *In favor: unanimous.* 21 voting members? David Lund: A couple of people came in. You are, Kim Kraft. David Lund: David, anything else? Okay,

#### **V: Old business - Faculty Senate Constitution.**

1. The motion is to take the document that was approved by us [the faculty senate] and they [dean's council] have a document they want, and it's been back and forth enough, that a joint committee from their group and this group, get together and hammer out the details. 2 opposed, 1 abstained, motion carries.

Steve Barney: We were given the charge last year to **review and revise the faculty senate constitution**. We met with several administrators on campus, we met with the chair of a committee that had previously submitted a revised draft of the constitution and we reviewed that document they submitted and got some really good ideas from them. We...entire year to come up with a new faculty constitution that reflected a shared governance focus. That included going back to the president and having the president give us a charge to create a faculty senate in the first place, and then charge to create a faculty senate constitution, we did some research and found that had never been done, we'd never been authorized to actually do that. So, we took care of that, got all the legwork taken care of, and we came up with what we thought was an awfully good document to serve as a faculty senate constitution. I've got one copy here and I think David e mailed everyone a copy last year, and as opposed to having another special meeting last year, we elected to defer any action on this new proposal of this constitution to this year. So that's where we stand. Following the procedures in the old constitution, we collected signatures from 24 faculty members that read the proposed constitution and recommended a change in the current constitution. So we have that document and those signatures, and we're ready to move forward with action on the faculty senate's part. I realize it's been a long summer and most of you probably haven't read or... well it's been a short summer, you probably haven't had a lot of time to review this document, and I propose that we take some time as a senate to review the document and come back prepared next time and take some action on whether we accept or reject this constitution. The problem is, it comes as a whole package, there's not a lot of room for changing substantive things about the constitution, if we do change something substantive, we'll need to go back and seek 24 new signatures from faculty members on campus with the changes that we've proposed. And we're willing to do that if that's what folks here want to do. As far as word smithing and things like that, I think we can do some of that, and I will be happy to contact all the people on this and see if they're in agreement with changes that we made, but as far as substantive, we'd probably have to go through this entire process again.

David Lund: In light of that one of the things that's been brought to my attention as we had a chance to look at this over the summer, one of the things that we intended to do as a committee, .... Virginia, Rea, Kenny, Eric, one of the things we wanted to do was to have the **faculty senate be made up of more than half tenured faculty**. I've come to realize that that may not work in some places because even though, we can't really force the issue, if all the tenured faculty in a college say, no, we don't want to serve, then, I guess we can't force them to serve. I guess we'd like to see more tenured faculty serve, we'd like to have seen that happen. I don't remember if there's any leeway for that. I think we wrote it so it had to happen that way, it had to be tenured faculty, however we comprised that to be. Steve Barney: What do we comprise that to be? All tenured faculty of one college? David Lund: Yeah, we have some leeway that way. But we did have some things in there that if the number of tenured faculty from a particular college went below half they would have to make sure that the next election elected a tenured faculty person. There may actually be some areas where that can't even actually happen because they don't have enough people who are tenured. So that's one place as you look at this to think about this carefully. We have two options: 1) we can pass this document as it is and then by the document have an amendment proposed, by 24 or whatever faculty we decided would have to do that and then amend the brand new constitution or 2) or we could quickly go through the process one more time, make that change, but we do need to take that into consideration, and I'm just bringing that to your attention, because I think that's the only feedback I have. Have you had any other feedback from anywhere Kathy?

Kathy Black: No, in my...same thing, we then have the election of officers limited to tenured faculty, which means if you have have a school that couldn't get tenured faculty, they can't be represented in the, and that's a problem for me because we're not getting fair representation at that point or an equal opportunity thing. So, it's the same issue. David Lund: I would urge you to think very carefully about that issue as well. X: What is the percentage of tenured faculty now? David Lund: I have that in my office and I forgot to bring it, it was well over half last year. We couldn't have done that if the distribution across campus was perfect, but it's not, and if in fact the tenured faculty would accept the opportunity to be elected to the faculty senate, which some of them are not, so we ran into that problem in that regard. I would ask you to consider Kathy's comment about the faculty senate executive committee. I don't know how other people have felt, but you all have been here the last few years and Steve Barney did not want to be the faculty senate president having not being tenured at that point. The previous two were not tenured, and seemed to work out okay. That's a consideration. I would have been reticent to run this year had I not been tenured at that point. I would have been wary of being the president, not necessarily of being on the committee. It's something we need to consider as we.... Kathy Black: I'm not saying that's not a good idea. I'm just saying I have a problem with the fact that one college cannot have any officers, so they don't get that kind of representation, and that's a problem. David Lund: And perhaps we need to look at, perhaps the thing to do is say that the president and president elect need to be tenured, but that the other three officers don't necessarily have to be. Steve Barney: And that's a good idea, but the intent was that if the president's not available, then the vice president serves as faculty senate president, and if the vice president's not available, then it falls to the

parliamentarian, so for that purpose we need to decide if it would be better if they were all. And the secretary it doesn't matter because they don't serve in that administrative capacity. Kathy Black: Yes, but shouldn't that be the decision of the individuals? If they're representing their college and they feel like their college really needs representation, they can run, but if not, they can always say I decline. Steve Barney: The fundamental purpose behind the changes that we're proposing is to get more faculty tenured people on the faculty senate, that have a broader representation from people who have been around the institution, understand the institution, and know the ins and outs, rather than new faculty in here trying to build their vitas. We don't see this as a body where that's appropriate. Kathy: That'd be great if the tenured faculty weren't required to serve on a lot of committees. David Lund: We realize that it's a difficult thing to set up, that's one of the reasons why David (Reese) took the responsibility to look at committee work and try and streamline it and set it up a little bit better and I know that provost is going to throw some more committees at people, they come all the time, and I think it's not an easy thing to get out of. I served on 3 adhoc committees this summer I am sure that many of you served on various committees, there are things that need to be done, and the best way to do it, I appreciate the fact that the administration is pulling together faculty so that there is some representation instead of just doing it without letting us know what is going on, that's been a good thing, but it does cause a burden on many of us. So, just look at that, our 10 min is up. We'll need to make a decision at our next meeting whether or not we vote on the current one that is in front of us, or whether we vote to have the committee quickly revised and get 24 more signatures. Keep in mind we must get this taken care of, we have to get it done before the end of this semester. It's been back and forth for too many years, and we're at the point where I think we can wind it up. Eric Brown: Where can I get a copy of it, is it on the web? David Lund: Yes, it is. I'll make sure that the copy that Steve sent me is the same one on the web, it's on the faculty senate web page. The link to the senate is on the very first page. If you're on the main page of the college and if you click on faculty and staff, you'll see a link to faculty senate in the index that's on the next page, and if you go there, the faculty senate web page has an index of policies. It even has a link to the committees. We'll get those.

David Lund: Old business that we're not going to do this meeting, faculty evaluation lrt policy. Robert did you get the one that Mike Richards put together that was different from the one that Anne? It was partly our request and partly the dean's request, nothing against Tom and the work that the people who were on that committee did, but it was kind of cumbersome, and when we were talking about it in our meeting, everybody was confused about what it all meant. X: I want to be clear about this because this is our next item of business in academic affairs, the faculty senate, by a very narrow margin, approved Tom's document. So when you say it was partly our request, I don't remember a request from faculty senate. I just want to be clear. David Lund: Yes, that's true, we did approve it. The dean's council felt like it was too cumbersome and wanted to streamline. At their request, Mike Richards pulled together another completely different document, and that's what you (Steve) got to look at if I'm not mistaken. X: And the faculty senate has not seen that document or whatever? David Lund: And we have not, we have approved the other by a narrow margin, which was not bad anyway. Marty Larkin: Because it was not approved by the deans, it's not all the way approved yet? David Lund: No, remember that the process is, for things that to do with both us and the administration, they have to gain approval from both groups and they then go to the provost who gives it to the president's council, and then eventually to the board of trustees. And, it's not gone to the provost yet. Robert Eves: To clarify, there's nothing necessarily immoral about what's happened here, we just start the process over. Academic affairs will bring it back to faculty senate. It'll go around and around until we reach a compromise that works for everybody. Curtis: To me, being on that committee, I would almost use the word immoral, because we spent some 4 years on that document, countless meetings, countless hours, and for, as you put it, Mike Richards to just pull something together, that stinks. Abe Harraff: Mike Richards was just the catalyst. We had calls saying they did not approve. So, then Mike Richards, the dean's council, because of ....start hashing this over, and then they ask Mike Richards to do. (conversation that I couldn't hear on the tape) Curtis Bostick: I understand that, I would just add that the committee working over 4 years had representation from all colleges and all departments. So, it doesn't seem correct that a department would call you and say ... Rea Gubler: Robert, according to your recollection, during that spring meeting, that the document that this committee worked on, would either be adopted or not adopted by each college or school. Was that the charge in the beginning? Robert Eves– That was the initial charge but when Tom was here he said that was no longer, Rea Gubler: and then we passed it, I think that's when a lot of the angst surfaced between the colleges, so we might be able to rewrite some policy that says, each college or school has to propose one that is accepted by either the senate or the deans council if they choose not to use it. That might not waste all the time and effort. Abe Harraff: if you have an approved plan, fine, if not here is an approved plan. (conversation not on tape). David Lund: The point of bringing that up was to let you know that we need to be aware and what Robert ... is up to his committee. It may be Tom's work with some revisions that seem to be more in line with some of the questions that were out there. I think there were some questions in the Dean's Council, and you can all read their minutes, there's a link on our web site to their council meeting minutes, I think the question came from several deans, that perhaps the definition of scholarship and some of those things had gotten a little blurred and perhaps provided a little too much leeway for people to do weird things, and they were worried about that, in spite of the fact that the document specifically said that each department needed to determine what was scholarship in their department. That was the main hanging point from the dean's council. And there was one other one. Abe Harraff: If department chairs weight of faculty evaluation was smaller than the students' weight of faculty evaluation, if this is true, why need a chair? David Lund: Yes, that was the other sticking point was that the distribution of weights had been shifted perhaps overly one way or the other. Steve Barney: A philosophical question, if this sets a precedent, where does that leave the faculty senate in terms of the power that we have over issues that are faculty driven within the faculty? Robert Eves: Let me just say, and that's a really good question. I don't think this lessens our power in any way. Basically what they've done is they've trashed this policy and there's no way it will be in place for accreditation. That's a decision the dean's council has made. Cause they're starting from square one. Okay, academic affairs is answerable to faculty senate and we're going to bring forward a document that the committee feels good about, and it's going to be a process. It's going to be a longer process now. And that's a decision that was made. Evidently they didn't like the direction things were going, so they decided to start a new direction. Steve Barney: I agree with Curtis. We put all this time and effort, everyone had opportunity to review it. Tom Cunningham is the most

conscientious person I know in getting folks aware of what is happening. The process was absolutely stellar, in my opinion. And, if people had problems with it, it was because they didn't take the time to review it. And to pull it at the last minute because of concerns they had ... X: But there were substantial numbers of people who didn't agree. Steve Barney: But it passed faculty senate. Whether everybody agreed with it or not, we have a constitution set up with rules and once we vote and agree on something then we all have the responsibility to jump on board and support it. Abe Harraf: people...have to share... process...with the department. Robert Eves: That policy was on the web for the entire faculty to review for an entire year. David Lund: It was there, I remember getting e mails from Tom Cunningham for a long time, saying this is on the web, please go look at it, we need your feedback and he sent those to the entire faculty. We all heard from him frequent. David Rees: It seems to me that the biggest break down is some faculty were not accept the responsibility to look at the policy and give input along the way. I think what happened as far as the administration saying let's take another look, is good. I don't think we as a faculty can say, hey we're in control of everything that deals with faculty. But just like any shared governance, whether you're talking United States government or faculty governance here at the university, there has to be a system of checks and balances. There has to be an appeals process, and that's apparently what happened here. It's too bad that some faculty didn't take the responsibility of looking at the policy earlier and giving the feedback earlier. David Lund: And I think that responsibility includes faculty who are absent or are in administrative roles as in deans or department chairs, because I know some of the feedback that came and stopped it and it was big concern, I know a dean who had some concerns. Why didn't we hear about those twelve months before we did? That was a problem. And, so we're back at square one, know that we're going to have something here. We're not going to be prepared for the accreditation. Steve Barney: I agree with everything that's been said, and the breakdown in the faculty; but, from a psychologist's point of view, how do we train people to do anything differently? What we do over and over again is we reinforce their irresponsible behavior and expect the administration to catch things and then make us change them. The only way that we're ever going to get faculty really committed and looking at these things, is follow through with our recommendations, and see how miserable it if for a while, and let the consequences fall where they may, and then if we want to go back and review things, hey let's go back and review things and do it again, and maybe this time people will be a little more invested in the process. X: I think we've done that with the curriculum committee. Wayne Williams: I was on that committee with Curt, and when I first became aware of the withdrawal of this proposal we'd been working on for four years, I was pretty amazed and I was offended. I felt like I was not communicated to. We communicated this process on faculty development committee, what we'd been working on..., throughout the campus, Tom did an excellent job with that. And I found out after the fact that the dean's council cut it, just like that. To me, I perceived that, whether it's true or not, as being arbitrary and capricious, and not keeping with SUU's mission. And I'm still a little bit taken back that it happened the way it did, because I felt as a committee member, involved in that, I was deprived of knowing that that was even in the process of happening, it was a complete shock and surprise, when I was made aware of it a week ago. David Lund: Provost Harraf will you make sure that I have some time on the next dean's council to at least bring this up with them? Abe Harraf: Yes, part of problem is that we all huddle in separate rooms to work, not fair to blame one group or the other, these policies eventually have to be approved by trustees, not get offended, can't say are arbitrary or capricious, shared governance. If one group goes on it's own, we can't play ping pong with these policies. This is the challenge we have. We are all in different roles, different levels of advisory, eventually all of these checks and balances goes to trustees. That's the challenge we have.... (only part of the conversation, too faint on the tape). Kathy Black: It sounds to me as if we might benefit from the way tax laws are done. The House will propose something, the Senate finance committee comes up with something else, and then they have a joint committee that resolves the issues. And it seems to me, that if we spend four years on a policy, and the deans don't like it, the deans should have to propose something, and then the two committees should meet and resolve it and present it to both bodies again. That way, at least if there's a veto they come back together as a joint committee and both will have input as to what the final product is. David Rees: Maybe what you suggest, Kathy, it's not too late to do. We have the recommendations of the committee. We take Mike Richard's proposal as the recommendations, maybe it's time to get the committee together because they understand all the thinking and all the rationale of their product, along with Mike Richards and they can jointly come up with another proposal that they can bring back to the senate. Kathy Black: I second. David Lund: the motion would be that at this point since we have a document that was approved by us and they have a document they want, and it's been back and forth enough, that a joint committee from their group and this group, get together and hammer out the details. So moved by David Reese, seconded by Kathy Black. Is there any further discussion? Marty Larkin: If we don't do this motion where does it go? David Lund: At the next meeting....and vote on that in council, but I'll bring that up and let them deal with it, I think Provost Harraf will you... Abe Harraf: .....Propose to work together, but was rejected by this group.... Would welcome. David Lund: Any other discussion? Call the question, Those in favor: 2 opposed, 1 abstained, motion carries. Let's move on.

## **VI: Provost Report:**

SUU is only .2% behind on the FTE budget. Our tuition was way under value in terms of student perception. Conversion rate of applicants is good. One challenge we face is the loss of 42% of our students at the freshman and sophomore levels. Student reasons for attrition are lack of jobs and nothing to do here. Discussion on state monies for institutional growth. Desire to get employees to 90% of the national average.

Provost Harraf: I want to give you some good news, that as of this morning, we're only .2% behind on FTE budget. I think we're going to be over. Our head count might be a little below, ours is different from Dixie, we report FTE, 95-98% students are full time students. Every day there's a 1-2% drop. From a budget, we are only a negative point this morning. There are over 600 courses in continuing education we haven't registered yet. So, this -.2 is not point in time. We are doing well, not be over the last year. Hopefully we'll gain some we lost last fall. X: What is the enrollment number? Abe Harraf: ....will e mail you. Hope to be over by another 2-3%. Steve Heath: Do you know the distribution of that? Is that seniors coming back? Are we up in freshman? Abe Harraf: I can tell you we are up

in junior level, we are up in the senior level, we are down in freshman level, and we are slightly down in graduate level. There is no correlation with increase in tuition to any of the numbers. That basically tells us that our tuition was way under value in terms of students preference or perception. Steve Heath: If junior or senior is up that doesn't tell me that. Abe Harraf: Freshman is down, inquire poll, you have to look at the conversion rate, ours is very good, 70%, of students who apply, 7/10 come here. The challenge we have is two fold, pool and attrition (biggest problem of this campus). We're losing 42% of our students at freshman to sophomore level. So when we ask them why they're leaving they don't say the faculty is bad, or the staff, they say I can't find a job and there's nothing to do in this town. X: What's the likelihood of a tuition increase? Abe Harraf: There is a likelihood, I don't know how much. Two areas are very important from state level – one is growth money, is zero percent. Those institutions are crying, and are complaining that places like SUU do not grow, their enrollment goes down, and their budget is not cut, and we grew and you don't give us money. So that's one challenge we have. The other challenge, from a salary standpoint, we are falling behind in terms of national norm, we are falling behind, benefits, etc. We want to get everybody to 90% of the national average, need 1.8 million dollars. Every 1% increase in tuition generates 80 thousand dollars. So, you can do the math.

David Lund: Robert, the rest of the meeting is yours.

## VII: Policy votes

### a. Faculty Hiring

1. H3 would read “the dean and provost authorize the department chair to extend a tentative offer and if the offer is accepted, the department chair initiates the appointment document. 2 abstentions, rest in favor. Policy amended to read that way.
2. the next to last sentence in 3C would read “SUU promotes hiring practices to enhance faculty diversity in all its forms.” 1 abstention, all in favor.
3. e: “the committee will consist of diverse faculty representation”. 3 opposed, 2 abstention.
4. G4: striking the word “or”, 4 opposed, 2 abstentions, motion defeated.
5. Section G4, #4 reads “each invited candidate should demonstrate high or her teaching and scholarship as applies in their respective field. Passed unanimously.
6. 3C: Drop “and approval” in the first sentence and add “the final position announcement will be approved by the search committee.” Eliminate the word “further” so it just says “for review.” 1 opposed, 1 abstention, motion carries.
7. Move to delete “the presentation shall be videotaped” in G4. Passed unanimously.
8. Motion to reword the preceding sentence to “the search committee will provide adequate notice of what is expected” Passed unanimously.
9. #4 – change the word “should” to “will” in “Each invited candidate should demonstrate.” 1 abstention, policy passes

Robert Eves: Faculty hiring is the first one we'll do. I think it currently reflects a good shared governance approach. Are there any concerns or suggestions? Kathy Black: I was on a committee last year and H3 played out on a scale on 1 to 10, we had one candidate was a 10, and we had a whole bunch of candidates who were ones, ten being the high. The ten happened to be a female, unbelievable credentials, and she wanted to come here. We offered her almost \$30,000 less than her current job. So she didn't even respond to the offer. We turned around then and offered to a male who was a one, 25,000 more than we offered her, and got him. I propose we say something like the dean after consulting with the provost, authorize the department chair to extend a tentative offer, otherwise we've got defacto discrimination, and there's no point in even having these committees. David Lund: I don't quite understand. Kathy Black: Okay, what happen was, the committee. H3: The dean, after review by the provost, authorizes the department chair to extend a tentative offer. I'm saying that the dean shouldn't have complete control over how much is offered to the candidate, or, in essence, the dean chooses who the candidates are. X (Rea?): So, that's a good point. Do you want us to reword it or do you have substitute words? Kathy Black: No I was just saying, I mean suggesting. Robert Eves: So you want the dean or the provost to authorize the department chair to extend the offer? Kathy Black: Right, I don't want the dean doing it by himself, otherwise there's no point... Robert Eves: do you want faculty buy in or approval by the committee? Kathy Black: I don't know, I just know that I don't want somebody to be able to take what the committee has done and then choose what they want. Robert Eves: So then, in the form of a motion, “the dean and provost authorize the department chair to extend “ will that do it? Kathy Black: That would be great. Robert Eves: Is that your motion? Kathy Black: Yes. Robert Eves: Is there a second? Marty Larkin: I second. Robert Eves: So, **H3 would read “the dean and provost authorize the department chair to extend a tentative offer and if the offer is accepted, the department chair initiates the appointment document.”** X: That's it. David Lund: Further discussion? X: Could that be in and/or with consultation with the committee chair? Kathy Black: they suddenly came up with 25 thousand more to someone less qualified David Lund: we have a motion. Robert Eves: point of order. David Lund: motion and possible amendment, is that accepted? Kathy Black: yes, Marty Larkin: yes. David Lund: call the motion to question, 2 abstentions, rest in favor. Policy amended to read that way.

Kenny Landra: decided on policy c to include “sexual preference” there at the bottom. I would motion that we remove etc. and insert sexual preference. Abe Harraf: Utah statue is not accepting that and we can't accept that. Robert Eves: We put it in and it was scotched by the legal council of the university. Robert Eves: do we have a motion? Kathy Black: We want these hiring practices to enhance faculty diversity.... You ask a question as to whether or not we're getting diversity, we can be sued. Steve Barney: I move that we eliminate everything in the parentheses and add “in all its' forms.” Seconded by Rea Gubler. Robert Eves: So the next to last sentence in 3C would read “SUU promotes hiring practices to enhance faculty diversity in all its' forms” Steve Barney: Yes, that was my motion. David Lund: Any discussion? Eric Brown: It doesn't specify any way that they're going to promote faculty diversity, so, whoever's

hiring can take that any way they want. I don't understand the value of even having it in there, except as a vague moral statement. Robert Eves: That just says that we're in legal compliance. That's all we're trying to say. Steve Barney: That's a legal statement, not moral. Eric Brown: In Michigan you have to document what's happening to say that you're having a problem in order to try and fix it. I guess we're just going to leave it vague. (some conversation missing). Kathy Black: I think vague is better legally than specifically wrong. Virginia Stitt: Call the question, *1 abstention, all in favor*.

Marty Larkin: Before we leave this particular one, I do have a concern, I would like some assurance in there that if the committee, that the position description doesn't completely change by the time it's advertised. I don't know where it fits in. There are some things that get changed as it goes down the line that the committee doesn't know about. Kathy Black: When I was at CWU, when we were drafting the description, we had to meet with human resources representative on wording at CWU. No search committee commenced without a representative. ...Marty Larkin: I don't know the solution. Robert Eves: if you want to propose some language. Marty Larkin: go on to something else and let me think.

Steve Barney: On e, why do we need faculty of both... on the committee spelled out. *I move that we strike that*. Robert Eves: on practice go outside your dept to get someone on the search committee. Abe Harraf: not let happen. Robert Eves: second? Rea Gubler seconds it. David Lund: discussion? Eric Brown: did I hear right that Abe is going to have a man and a woman on the committee regardless of what we.... Abe Harraf: yes, the problem I'm having, some areas we need to have, the statistics on this campus for enrollment, 54% women. Faculty numbers are opposite, 75% men. My direction to deans is make sure there is representation in your colleges. Saying there are no role models. Richard Eissinger: maybe we should address that item like item c. I get tired of political correctness of language. David Lund: 2 choices. Vote on motion made and then a second motion to change the language again. Richard, would you make a proposal, and would Steve and Rea be willing to accept that change? Richard Eissinger: *diverse faculty representation be present on the committee period*. "Steve Barney: I will accept the amendment David Lund: Robert Eves: *the committee will consist of diverse faculty representation*. David Lund: is acceptable to Steve & Rea? Yes. Curtis Bostick: under G4, ...David Lund: wait a minute. *Call the question, X in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstention*.

Curtis Bostick: G4 – 2 presentations, scholarship should be included 'and' rather than "and/or" X: this is for full time Who seconded? David Rees: I'm not really in favor of that I don't think it should be mandated that every candidate in every dept do it. Kathy Black: we have a hard time getting faculty to show up to one, if we have them show up for two. X: add on to the end "as determined by a hiring committee?" David Lund: Discussion on that? David Rees: I'm not really in favor of that motion because it requires or mandates that every candidate has to present in both teaching and scholarship. I think the way it's presented right here, that opportunity is given. But, I don't think it should be mandated across campus that every candidate in every department has to do that. Kathy Black: If they're requiring "and," it looks like we're requiring two, and we have a hard time getting faculty to show up to one, let alone if we make them do two presentations. X: Okay, maybe it should say "as determined by the hiring committee"? David Lund: Okay, we do have a motion, is there other discussion?

X: I was just on a search committee. We had an emergency hiring situation and there were great budget constraints and bringing in your best candidates. I think if we have "and/or" you're going to lose opportunities for your best candidates to come and be looked at because of those extra requirements. So, I think that's something that needs to be taken into consideration. Marty Larkin: So which way are you leaning? X: Leave it "and/or." We've already talked about what the salary opportunities are and to try to get the best candidates to come, is just adding on to the requirements, and then sometimes traveling from across the country, how much do we have available to bring them here and then if do all this...it's probably going to be a burden on both sides. Kathy Black: We do some hiring by telephone interview, without bringing people on campus if we don't have the budget, so, have we provided for that? Curtis Bostick: Wayne has made a good point, their attitude is we're trying to send a message not only to our faculty in that we're so lazy that we won't come to both but we're not going to make it easy on them. Secondly, it tells a message to the candidate that when you come to this school we are going to require this of you, the schools is going to require this of you, so it's a message to the candidate need to be prepared for both, how you will demonstrate your expertise to students, but also to your colleagues. David Lund: Just a point, as I look at this, if were to make it "and," what's to prevent the college from having both of those done at the same time? Because when I came, I did a scholarly presentation as part of a teaching demonstration. Perhaps you can't do that in every college, but they asked me to do it that way. They wanted to see both, but they didn't want to give me two days, but they couldn't afford to keep me here. There's nothing here that precludes the college from doing it this way. Abe Harraf:...because they just hired a dance faculty member. They had a video tape of ...to look at the audition....So you ask me if...program and I had to...faculty member David Lund: "And/or" does not preclude any department from doing that?...X: If the necessity of your program, or the faculty member, you can't do that, that leaves the option open. Steve: I'm wondering if maybe issue could be addressed by saying each candidate should give a scholarly teaching demonstration? Kathy Black: No. (Dance discussion.) David Lund: We're quibbling over a word and we need to move on. Call the question. Those in favor of striking the word "for" from section G4, *X in favor, 4 not in favor, 2 abstentions, the motion is defeated*.

Eric Brown: *I make a motion that the word in that section, number 4 reads: each invited candidate should demonstrate their scholarship and teaching*. Richard Isinger: seconded. David Lund: Any discussion? Kenny Laundra: add "in their field." David Lund: Is it okay to add "in their field" at the end of that, Eric? Eric Brown: I would switch and put teaching first, each invited candidate should demonstrate their teaching and scholarship as it applies to their field. Robert Eves: *each invited candidate should demonstrate his or her teaching and scholarship as applies in their respective field*. David Lund: Is that okay with you Richard? Richard Isinger: yes. David Lund: Any other discussion? Call the question, *pass unanimously in favor*.

Marty Larkin: Back to c, the first sentence drop “and approval.” Add “the final position announcement will be approved by the search committee.” Virginia Stitt: seconds. Marty Larkin: So, eliminate the word “further,” so it just says “for review” period. David Lund: Any discussion? Kathy Black: Would you also consider adding “the search committee in consultation with human resources”? Would that be necessary? David Reese: It’s not necessary David Lund: It’s already part of the process. David Lund: *I opposed, I abstention, motion carries, rest in favor.*

Ty Redd: G4 – the presentation shall be videotaped. Move to delete. Marty Larkin: Seconds. Richard Eissinger: The only reason we videotape interviews is for those members who are not there. Ty Redd: can still do if want. David Lund: There is a *motion to remove the last sentence of G4*. Discussion? Abe Harraf: must get permission. David Lund: have to record for phone interviews. Call the question. *Passed unanimously in favor*. This doesn’t preclude video taping, it just means we don’t have to do it. If it’s left here, we have to.

Roy Johnson: Sentence right before that, still keep? Robert Eves: search committee chair will provide adequate notice of the candidate...presentation is expected. Ty Redd: seconds. David Lund: There’s a motion on the table to strike that sentence as well. Any discussion? Kenny Laundra: Change “that” to “if”. Instead of striking it, just change it from candidate that to candidate if a presentation... Deb Hill: No that’s part of 4, that says we will. Each candidate should...So we’re already doing it. X: change word presentation to demonstration. X: We just didn’t include the word presentation in the first sentence. X: Now we’re requiring a presentation. X: Change the word presentation to demonstration. Roy Johnson: I don’t like that. Kathy Black: What if we put in, “will provide adequate notice to the candidate of what is expected”? Richard Eissinger: could we just read what the amended number 4 was?. Robert Eves: each invited candidate should demonstrate his/her teaching and scholarship in their respective field. That’s what we approved. Richard Eissinger: We’re getting hung up on this word “presentation” in the second sentence. David Lund: the *motion is still to remove that sentence*. X: We have to say that we need to notify them of what is expected of them. It should be in there because right from the beginning we’re saying we’re inviting them to come do something, we need to tell them what we want them to do. Richard Eissinger: It could ready, “The search committee will provide adequate notice of this requirement”? X: “of what is expected?” David Lund: Would you agree that rather than striking the sentence that the “search committee will provide adequate notice of what is expected?” David Lund: *call the question, unanimous in favor.*

Ty Redd: In number four, can we change *Each invited candidate “will” demonstrate, instead of “should” demonstrate?* Steve: second. David Lund: Discussion? Call the question, *2 opposed, 1 abstention, passes*. David Lund: Another other discussion? Ty: *move to accept as amended*. David Rees: seconded David Lund: Any discussion? Call the question, all those in favor of accepting this policy as amended? *1 abstention, this policy passes*.

#### **VIII: Move for Dismissal**

David Lund: are there substantial comments to be made on the faculty professional responsibilities policy? (yes) Robert, can we move this to the next discussion? Robert Eves: Yes. David Lund: We’ll put this policy to the first of next time. Do I have a motion that we table the next two items on the agenda to the next meeting?

Rea Gubler: *moves to table next to next meeting*. Wayne Williams: *seconds, Unanimously passes*. Ty Redd: *moves for executive session, motion to adjourn* Steve Heath *moves to adjourn at 5:18.*