

SUU Faculty Senate Meeting: 9/25/03

Summary:

- I. Call to order, approval of minutes.
- II. Officers report.
- III. Provost's report.
- IV. Sovereignty of Faculty Senate discussion.
- V. Academic Administrative Position Descriptions Policy.
 - a. motion to reword the last sentence to say" upon the 2/3rds vote of the faculty, the president will initiate the evaluation process – passes.
 - b. motion to clarify "president" as president of the institution – passes.
 - c. searching for a chair outside the university discussion.
 - d. motion to accept policy as put forth with the above amendments – does not pass.
- VI. Faculty Professional Responsibility Policy.
 - a. motion to strike the last sentence in 1d "if faculty members find it pedagogically useful..." – doesn't pass.
 - b. motion to accept the policy as it – doesn't pass.
 - c. motion to accept the document up to section two – doesn't pass.
- VII. Motion to see originals of policies along with the revised document – passes.
- VIII. Faculty Senate Committees Discussion: Chairs, vice chairs, rotation schedule.
- IX: Committee bridging between the faculty senate and dean's council.
 - a. motion to form a joint committee to address minor changes in policies made after the policy was passed by one group - passes.
 - b. motion to form the committee but add specifications on situations in which policies would come back to faculty senate.
- X. The faculty constitution.
 - a. motion to accept as written – passes.
- XI: Move for Dismissal

SUU Faculty Senate Meeting: 9/25/03

Present: David Lund, Virginia Stitt, Darin Wadley, David Rees, Rea Gubler, Ty Redd, Steve Barney, Martha Hyder, Steve Heath, Elise C. Leahy, John Ault as proxy for Luciane Berg, Wayne D. Williams, Deb Hill, Provost Abe Harraf, David, Kenny Landra, Kathy Black, Richard Eissinger, Mike Grady, Seth Armstrong, Elise C. Leahy, Marty Larkin, Doug Morash, Mike McGarvey, Roy Johnson, Roy Jones.

Excused: Curtis Bostick

I. Meeting Called to Order at 3:34

David Lund: Motion to approve the minutes

Steve Barney: Item 5 old business, refers to the faculty evaluation document instead of the constitution document.

Steve Heath: Steve Heath on conversation with Provost report on enrollment, item 6. (Steve Heath correction).

Steve Heath: *Motion to approve minutes as they will be amended. Wayne Williams seconds. 17 in favor, no abstentions, none against.*

II. Officers Report

David Lund: Utah Board of Regents priority issues for budgeting. This is what the Board of Regents has proposing to the legislature. A tuition increase is necessary to offset reduced state support, want to deal with the point at which students are priced out of higher education. Also asking for state wide priorities, like legislature to look at compensation for faculty and staff at universities, since we haven't had increases in two years, they are very concerned that our salary equity is in jeopardy, and that the cost of living increases may take away from the kind of money that we're earning and cause hardship on institutions being able to recruit and retain quality instructors and professors and meet needs of students. Also concerned with unfunded growth last two years. How to fund and adequately helping new students get into universities and to stay. They also want to make sure that they come up with way that base budget across the state is always adequate to meet the needs of students.

The resolution is: (add as an appendix)

Other faculty senates in the state of Utah would like us to vote in support of this resolution. We are the last senate to vote on this. All those in favor of supporting the Utah state Faculty Senate Leaders in sending their resolution to the governor and the Utah state legislature, *18 in favor, none against, no abstentions. Passes unanimously.* This document has already been sent to the governor and state legislature.

Rea Gubler: Financial report: The campus two account: \$1,658; savings account - \$1,576; the CD \$10, 384; the quarterly report will change that a little bit; checking account \$3,027, that means we increased our membership by 12, that's still about 97 out of 220.

(Time discussion)

David Lund: Other business we need to be focusing on, getting and retaining faculty, salaries, policy should just govern the way we work. Come prepared to propose motions, rather than to have so much discussion. Make motions on substantive change, rather than on word-smithing. There are too many policies from before 1990 we need to revise, and there are also too many other crucial issues. Policies should just govern how we do business.

III. Provost Harraf: Accreditation folders are being printed, we sent fifteen copies to the board. Thirteen persons will be coming here accrediting the university with Northwest. Eight or nine will meet with only two areas - the bulk will deal with standard two (academic) and standard four (faculty qualifications). One will deal with library issues, one with continuing education issues, one with the business and finance issues, and so on. Take place October 27-29th. Yesterday ACSB was finished, for business programs, it went well, in May they have their national meetings, and will get their answer in the summer. Expecting final decision from in NCATE this October. Enrollment, went up another 1.8%, are up 2.8% in head count. The FTE budget numbers are up. Considering the 23.5% tuition increase, view the increase in enrollment as a major success. The new commissioners of higher education have been selected. Dr. Rich Kendall will be working with the current commissioners. He has been with the governor's office and other places in Utah before. Tuition-

-we are starting to discussion by the mandate to start a truth and tuition hearing. This was our first meeting with the student government representatives, the staff and faculty associations, just preliminary discussion on what it's going to take and what we need and so on. I mentioned before that a 1% increase generates about 90 thousand dollars net value. When you look at faculty needs and the salary issues that are priorities and things like that, it's impossible to cover our needs in one year. If you add them all up, it's about 50%, and there's no way, 23% was a major undertaking for us. So that's a major challenge for us. And we don't know how the state situation is going to be. So far, there's no good news to report there yet. The other issues is the policy & procedures issue, I am concerned, a number of our key policies are bogged down right now; and Oct 27th when the accreditation team comes in, there's no question they're going to have some issues with some of our policies, primarily, faculty evaluation, tenure, etc. When the policy works out at our level, at the faculty senate, it still goes through a change process by other groups- legal counsel, human resource, presidents council, and whatever. I have asked that we need to create some mechanism, that after substantial discussion takes place in different groups, that we have some mechanism to expedite the process. And all of us, including you and me, are in an advisory capacity, that means that none of these are final until it is approved by the board of trustees basically. So we can play the game of each group changing a sentence and going back and forth, and takes about ten years to pass. And then we get hit by accreditation because we don't have a policy in place. Or we start building a little trust in the system, and work together and do it together. In the past dean's council write the policy and we go forward, in fact I insisted that all changes go through academic committee or whatever, but if go to academic committee or dean's council, if they totally rewrite, we're back to square one. So, we have create a mechanism that we move forward, we're just spinning our wheels. We won't look professional, they'll ask how come you can exist as a university for a 100 years and your policies are 20 years old. And that's the challenge we face.

David Lund: We are in the process of trying to draft and create a mechanism, a policy on policies on how they'll work, which will expedite that process, how to get a committee or group together from both of the groups, after each has had their say, a small group together to iron out the differences. If they find the policy is not going to work then it will come back to us, but many times it's a little sticking point, a word or two here or there, and if we had representatives from each group sitting down together, they can inform one another as to why things won't work. There are things that administration is aware of that we're not aware of as faculty and vice versa. The idea is if it's something small that a committee that's representative of both groups can work out, it makes sense.

Abe Harraf: Even some policies at the trustees level, remember these are the governing bodies of the institution. Sometimes they make a motion at the trustees meeting to make a change and they take a vote. And that's done. I have to accept the fact that whatever I say or recommend, that trustees not going to buy it. That's the process we have to go through. We can do our best to get input from everybody, but after that, legal counsel, for example, I cannot push anything on hiring to the President's Council or the Board of Trustees without legal counsel approved. Neither group can just play this game. If that, then someone at my level has to make a decision and say this is it. I have tried not to resort to that level, saying as a chief executive officer I like to have consensus coming from the different groups. But the trustees even are asking us, where are these policies, why are these policies from 1990, 1989, 88?

IV. Sovereignty of Faculty Senate Discussion

David Lund: We will. Kathy Black: It begs the question why we don't have a member of the Dean's council on the academic affairs committee, and just go through it once, and get everyone's input. David Lund: We're looking at that. I think we can facilitate that. We'll come up with a policy on policies. Abe Harraf: Still after that, that's an advisory committee to the provost. Ty Redd: I agree, and I don't think that anybody in here disagrees with the fact that once the trustees get to something and they make a change, that we just have to live with. I do think it's important that the faculty senate is sovereign as opposed to say the executive council of the faculty senate. If there is a change that just isn't substantive, then isn't it easier to bring something back here to vote on quickly here than to have to convene another meeting? Or we can e mail. Abe Harraf: Then what's the job of the executive committee of the faculty senate? Ty Redd: To do the will of the **faculty senate. We're sovereign.** We voted for them. David Lund: We will work on getting a policy through on this. Whatever it is, it will expedite things. There's no question that we want to have shared governance. Marty Larkin: The huge concern, is that if a policy has been put forth here, and we've agreed to it, someone else outside shouldn't be able to say we don't agree with it and make those changes. Policy is our law and we have to live with it. We'll be governed by that. If it isn't within the intent of what was passed here, it shouldn't be changed. Or, we could easily send out in further recommendations, these are the changes that were made, if anybody has a disapproval let us know, and that could be done in between. Wordsmithing (like adding the word "not" here) could change the whole intent. And that's a huge concern. David Lund: We'll take Ty's comments into consideration, that would make it

incumbent on all of you, if you get a memo from me saying this went to a committee and they made a couple of changes, you've got to e mail back. You'll have to be paying attention. Marty Larkin: If that's done you maintain the integrity of the process. And again, the opinion of is it little or not. David Lund: And it all comes back to if you're all willing to jump right in, if it comes out on Monday, and I say I need your answer back on Wednesday, then we can do that with the small issues. David Reese: You can still reach a point where you have someone who says this is the way it's going to be. Somebody, a smaller group has to come together, in the spirit of compromise and trust, we're going to change this. And we're going to move it on. Marty Larkin: But it needs to go back to the bodies that passed it. It doesn't have faculty senate approval if it's been changed. I would rather delay policy than pass bad laws that will be hurting you down the road. Ty Redd: It's important to note that when the Dean's Council has primacy, we're just consultants. But where the faculty has primacy the Dean's Council is consultants. When it's faculty issues, faculty should have the final say. Abe Harraf: Nobody has the final say. Ty Redd: Except the board of trustees. Abe Harraf: Even your constitution says, guidelines on who is responsible for what. And this is not unique to USU. I gave you a handout last year on AUP guidelines, and I would be happy to bring it, on who is responsible for what. The issue is we're trying to deal with changes after the fact. And that's my concern. For example, our office writes up, we don't do it in a vacuum, looks at, we send it to academic committee, who sometimes totally changes it and sends it to faculty senate. So you're not privy to what the original document was. You're only privy to what the academic committee told you. And the dean's council equally the same, they are privy to what they do. For example, last year I suggested, with the academic committee of this group, let's work together from the bottom, rather than work in silos. And then try to ping pong. Certain members of the executive committee declined that offer. They said no. You guys work on your corner, I work on my corner. And that's where this problem is. You know we have to start from the bottom to look at the needs of all stakeholders, not just the one. Can't look at from just one perspective. Ty Redd: I agree. And the website clearly talked about shared governance and primacy of faculty in certain areas and primacy of other things. There are areas where the faculty has primacy. Abe Harraf: I have no question, they have primacy, but not the final say. We have a prime interest in certain subject areas, and that's by governance of the institution, but it reaches the point that, for example, I've looked at the policy on academic... and hiring. They totally changed anything we did, I can predict certain groups will object to the change, Why? Because if any group writes things from their own perspective, without that collaboration it becomes a ping pong. Ty Redd: Yes, but if it's under someone else's primacy, who cares what we think about it, it's going to be the board of trustees to say, send it back and that's all I'm saying. Abe Harraf: If it reaches the point, I'll take the one that each group wrote, and give my recommendation, and the board of trustees has to vote. I'm trying to help the faculty maintain the primacy. But there comes a point where we might lose that option, or delay everything. David Lund: Yes, we need to move forward at this point. It's an issue we've dealt with for a couple of years, and we're going to try to make it work. As we rewrite the bylaws to the constitution, we'll try to make them all fit together to make this thing happen. Rea, let's move on to policies.

V: Academic Administrative Position Descriptions Policy

Rea Gubler: The **first policy is academic administrative position descriptions**, I don't have the original descriptions with me, but I want to clarify for this body, we voted to give you clean copies, we want you to see where it came from and what the changes are so you have a good perspective on it. So, we can address going back to that. It's really hard to manipulate it, and it slows down the process to show the strike outs. Abe Harraf: There are issues.....No one has signed off on that. There are things that have been inserted by whomever that are totally against any policy. Rea Gubler: And it's a good thing you're here because... because I didn't see an agenda going forward. You weren't there at the point when this one was drafted, but you do need to know that two or three phone calls along the process were made to human resources along the way, so we don't operate in a vacuum. David Lund: Are there any motions in the particular part of the policy? David Lund: Yes, we'll try to move from the top of the document to the bottom, which starts with the provost. Richard Eisinger: The minimum qualifications are different for every one of these positions, as far as time, as far as administrative experience. Some are very specific and some are very general, in terms of time. I just wondered why? Rea Gubler: I think it was embedded in the original. Do you have a copy of the original? If you look at the date on it, it's April 3rd. Abe Harraf: I don't recall. Richard Eisinger: And the reason I interjected that, is it's very hard to treat one position at a time, with that kind of background. Rea Gubler: I don't remember anything specific saying they should be treated differently. David Lund: I suspect the minimal qualifications came from documentation from other universities. Abe Harraf: Yes. David Lund: Were there any substantial things we needed to look at in terms of the provost? Steve Barney: On procedure of appointments, it says a search committee will be established, but there's no specifications on how. Is that something that needs to be addressed in policy, are there bylaws to this? Abe Harraf: It depends on level, particularly with provost, is the president and board of trustees appoint the search committee. Steve Barney: Would it be helpful to specify that in the policy? Abe Harraf: They don't. David Lund: I know it does state here with respect to the

provost that a search committee will be established with representation from each college or school. And other academics of the university. There's no specific way that that's put together, as there is no way in our departments.

David Reese: Under provost, section 5, evaluation of provost, item e, *I make a motion that the words "faculty senate" be changed to "faculty" so that it reads "faculty may request formal evaluation of the provost when a 2/3rds vote of faculty" the president will initiate the evaluation process.* Doug Morash: *Second.*

David Lund: Discussion? Steve Barney: To whom does the word president refer? Of the institution or of the faculty senate? David Lund: Because the provost serves under the direction of the president of the university, it would make sense that that's the president of the university. Rea Gubler: I think it's implied in all the text ahead. David Lund: If that's the case, then ... Deb Hill: I see getting 2/3rds of the vote of the faculty as a challenge, whereas getting the vote of 2/3rds of the faculty senate... Marty Larkin: And the other question is who are the general faculty, does that include adjunct, full time? Kathy Black: I think there's that kind of dissatisfaction that should take that kind of effort to get... otherwise just the faculty senate could get irritated at something and do something that wasn't generally felt. When we get to votes of confidence at the level of the provost or president, or whomever, at some point, it shouldn't be something that we could do easily. Because we change our mind frequently here. Kenny Laundra: Presumably we represent the faculty of our department.

David Lund: Any other discussion? Call the motion to question. Restated motion, *reword the last sentence in section 5e in the provost, to say in the last sentence, upon the 2/3rds vote of faculty, the president will initiate the evaluation process:* *In favor: 11, against – 6, 4 abstain. (21 here) 11 is over half, motion passes.*

Kathy Black: Since we know that there is a difference in what was originally submitted and what we are being presented, there is some uncertainty as to whether anything we do will actually be valid. Provost Harraf has already told us we have some issues.

Steve Barney: *I move we clarify every time it states president that we clarify as president of the institution.* Marty Larkin *seconds.* David Lund: Okay, Steve Barney moves that everywhere it says "president" meaning president of the institution, that it be changed to say "president of the institution", any discussion? Call to question? *20 in favor, 1 opposed. Motion passes.*

Ty Redd: *With those two changes, I move that we accept it as written.* Virginia Stitt: *Seconds.* David Lund: The entire document? Ty Redd: Yes.

Richard Eisinger: I have a question, under the provost area, what's a minimum qualification for the provost? It says administrative experience in the academic area? What academic area? David Lund: 4b. Administrative experience within the academic area. Rea Gubler: An academic area. David Lund: Is that a typographical error? Rea Gubler: It could be. I would accept it as that. Or take it as a motion. David Lund: If we take that as a typographical error, we don't have to have a motion to add, we can just change it. Let's call that a typographical error, if that makes sense, because we don't know what the academic area is. Doug Morash: I have a problem when we get down to department chairs, or a question, because there's no provision or clause about **searching for a chair outside of the university**. It's all internal. Abe Harraf: The show stopper will be, if you put a limit on the chair, no one will take the chair's job. Another issue, it says that the dean and chair will rotate out, it implies that the dean serves at the pleasure of the whole college, not the supervisor. That's not going to happen. Rea Gubler: Rotation of the chair was definitely changed on purpose, by that committee, to have it rotate. Darin Wadley: I don't like that. Rea Gubler: That should probably be a discussion of this body. The feeling of the committee on rotating of the chair is that it really isn't something to aspire to. It's something that nobody has an agenda to promote, so that in fact, nobody really gets there, and stalemates are to have a whole lot of control over their constituents, because they come from, under this particular spin, the constituents. Darin Wadley: But if you have a chair that's doing a wonderful job, why do we have to force him to leave? Rea Gubler: Well, we can put it in, but that was our intent, let's go from this angle and let the faculty have input on where we want to go. Abe Harraf: It takes two years just to know what he or she is doing. I think, if there's a faculty line available, we owe it to ourselves to make it a competitive process both outside and inside the department. Our inside people should compete, so we get the best people. If the line is available. Some departments don't have a tenured faculty, or every tenured person is in the administration. So, it must be the most qualified person willing to take that task, not to become the exclusive right of certain group of individuals. David Lund: We have two choices. We can discuss further or call for a motion. Or we can withdraw the motion and deal with this other situation. I wouldn't want to be a department chair under these

circumstances, a department chair could be voted out for making a tough decision. Abe Harraf: The intent is to make a chair a caretaker. Just sit there and babysit. Rea Gubler: That's the opposite of our rationale. Ty Redd: I disagree, we love it in our department. It's not a dynasty situation. He hits every division and takes care to make sure that he's advocating for us. And we're not going to vote him out, because we've all had a big say in the very difficult questions on who gets cut and who doesn't get cut. In a dynasty, it can be, I'm going to protect my own concentration at the expense of the other two, because I'm going to be here for five years. Kathy Black: The flip side of that is, we decided we needed to go for ACSB accreditation, which meant everyone had to suddenly start doing research, which meant everybody hated the deans and department chairs, because they were pushing for accreditation. Ty Redd: It's an issue of a strong department chair. David Rees: I disagree with Kathy's comment, we did have several votes, it was overwhelmingly the majority that wanted to go through the accreditation. Kathy Black: I will retract my comment, to the extent that, depending on the issue, it may be stronger than just that. Doug Morash: What you're saying is that departments feel we should have a voice in being able to keep or get rid of a department chair if they're not right for the department, but I don't think it should be mandated. Abe Harraf: The current policy is actually pretty good policy, every three years the faculty has a chance to evaluate the department chair and give a recommendation to the dean. We didn't change that. It has to be a balance based on the qualify, on the need of the department and how well he/she is doing in that capacity. But just forcing out after two years, you can't even accomplish anything in two years at department chair level.

Virginia Stitt: Could we call the question? Marty Larkin: Calls the question. David Lund: *All in favor of accepting the policy as it has been put forward to us with the amendments we have previously made, regarding the president and the vote to initiate action in terms of the provost, please raise your hand. 8 in favor, 9 against, 4 abstained. Does not pass as written.*

David Lund: It will go back to the committee. Keep in mind the questions that have been addressed here, specifically the things to look at, are the automatic rotation of chair after 3/6 years (two terms). Seth Armstrong: 2d and 4a are contradictory. David Rees: External applications opt to apply for dept chair. David Lund: And consider whether can have a person outside the university have the opportunity to apply for department chair. Kathy Black: I would suggest we get the provost's input as to any areas that are problematical if we pass it and then it is submitted, so that the committee would look at those. Abe Harraf: I would be more than happy to do that. Rea Gubler: Could we quickly take a straw poll and see what the feeling is on external applicants for department chair. David Lund: Those who think that external people should be allowed to apply for department chair. Twelve would vote in favor, five against, three abstentions. Roy Jones?: I've been asked to make some comments on the dean's section of this. Do I approach the committee with this? David Lund: Yes, I would do that.

VI. Faculty Professional Responsibility Policy

David Lund: Let's move onto the last policy, **the Faculty Professional Responsibility Policy**. Any there any motions? Seth Armstrong: *On policy 1d, "if faculty members find it pedagogically useful..." I move that that be stricken from the document. Strike the last sentence in 1d. There's no way to measure that and it seems somewhat useless in that.* Marty Larkin seconds.

David Lund: Is there discussion on that motion? Kenny Laundra: Does that line refer to advocating a position or your position? Rea Gubler: Your position is addressed later. Seth Armstrong: I think the 1st sentence gives freedom to do that. Rea Gubler: F is your position. If it doesn't get stricken. Kenny Laundra: I mean, in social sciences, opinion discussions are a good chunk of what we deal with, we need the flexibility to do that, somehow. Marty Larkin: The comment from Kate is that the sentence in question is phenomenally vague. Virtually any topic could be considered controversial. My comment on the document as a whole is that things are extremely vague. In addressing this question, I also felt, I know we were talking about section d, like in c the same thing, that's a very vague statement, part a the same thing. What are considered valid reasons? I think much of the wording in here are very vague and the whole document needs some work. Ty Redd: Many of these are curricular issues, which follow under the guidelines of faculty, so maybe having them vague is a good idea.

David Lund: *Any other discussion on the motion to strike the last sentence of section d? Call the motion to question. 10 in favor, 6 against, 4 abstained. Does not pass.*

Abe Harraf: I do have a concern that office hours are not specified here. Some faculty members are telling department chairs I don't want to have office hours or I don't want to post my office hours. Rea Gubler: This would be a good place

to put it. Abe Harraf: I think as a student-oriented, focused institution, we must have some guidelines. Rea Gubler: It wasn't stricken, it just wasn't there. Ty Redd: It already is a policy. Abe Harraf: It says a minimum of 5 hours. Most institutions I look at average 2 hours per course they teach. Just saying they must have office hours, is very vague. Rea Gubler: We usually cross reference it. David Reese: I have a question, on disciplinary actions, number three, paragraph a and the procedures, recommendations for disciplinary action are made through the department chair & dean to the provost and president, but later on the department chair and dean are given the opportunity for disciplinary action. I think that there is disagreement there in the policy itself. I'm thinking clarification needed somewhere, 3a1, it seems like the department chair and dean have no power for disciplinary action. But then under item three on the next page. There's a disconnect there for me. Marty Larkin: Other issue on the through, is who is making the recommendation, after being on the sexual harassment committee, I don't see the due process set up as to who is eliciting the discipline. This is a huge issue as to who is it that can make these accusations and that there is a due process hearing to make sure that things are valid. *I make a motion we accept this.* Rea Gubler: The way it came to us was as anyone, that's why it says through. But we could rewrite it to be specific as to who goes where.

Marty Larkin: *So my motion is that we accept this document as it is.* Ty Redd: *Seconds.*

David Lund: Discussion? Kathy Black: It sounds like the disciplinarian will be the department chair or the dean and will do verbal, written or reassignment, with nothing else happening. When it says disciplinary action conducted by the department chair, include these things, it seems to me it should be the disciplinary action which can be taken by the provost, if we are recommending it through the department chair and dean to the provost or president, it should be the provost and president that do the disciplining. Rea Gubler: That's number 4. Kathy Black: Yes, then what is 3? We're allowing just anybody to do it. I think the untenured people also ought to be able to discipline other people, if we're going to do the whole group. We've got a whole group of people any one of which can do it? Richard Eissinger: In section 2, we ought to defeat the motion, simply because when you look at section two it's poorly written, and should go back to the committee to be properly stated. Why pass a faulty document?

David Lund: *Call the motion, to accept the document as it is written - 0 in favor, 21 against. Motion doesn't pass.*

Virginia Stitt: Who wants to take my place on this committee? David Lund: Section 2 seems to be where things fall apart. Rea Gubler: We apologize, there seems to be something going on here, the wrong copy may not have been brought forward.

Steve Barney: *I move we accept the document up to section 2.* Ty Redd: *Seconds.* David Reese: I would like to do this document as one entire entity. It seems to have some problems throughout. David Lund: Would you be willing to withdraw that motion Steve? Steve Barney: I don't think we've had problems up to section two. Marty Larkin: I do. I felt like the whole section one was extremely vague. David Lund: Other discussion? *Vote: 4 in favor, 12 opposed, 5 abstentions. Resolution does not pass.*

VII: Motion to see originals of Policies

Virginia Stitt: Okay, everybody forward your suggestions to the committee, or we are not going to spend any more time. Rea Gubler: We can't do it, we need your input. The committee meets on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 8:00. Robert will need it the night before at least, specific language suggestions. This is the best thing that could happen, because what we really want is your input. David Lund: I'm going to recommend to the committee, when we get the documents, I know it's a hassle, I think we better see the original. Rea Gubler: Want to vote on it again, because I think we took it out by a vote? You might be able to see originals, but not a stricken version. David Lund: As long as we can look at the original, I think that's appropriate. Can I have a motion on that?

Marty Larkin: *I'll move that.* Roy Jones *seconds.* David Lund: *Those in favor of having the ability to see the original and what has been done in whatever form works for the committee, would you so indicate? 5 abstentions, none against, 16 in favor. Motion passes.*

VII: Faculty Senate Committees Discussion

David Rees: I sent out by e mail, **proposed faculty senate committee services**. I have received two responses, for example, the second page, distinguished faculty lecture. I have the chair down as Curtis Bostick. I'm selecting senior

faculty senators to serve as chairs. That would be people in their third year. People who are in their second year of faculty senate service, I selected as vice chairs. I also tried to distribute them amongst all colleges so that every college has a person who was serving as chair of a committee and a vice chair who would then also be serving on that committee the next year. So, Curtis Bostick e mailed and he will be on sabbatical, and therefore won't be able to serve as chair. The second change was Michael Grainey on the finance committee, he said he doesn't know anything about that, but would like to serve as the outstanding educator. So I penciled him in as the outstanding educator science representative. That was the two changes. I would suggest Seth Armstrong as distinguished faculty committee chair.

Steve Heath: That committee was originally set up so that the people who were chosen as distinguished faculty lecturers, some of those people would belong to that committee. Thinking in terms of qualifications, as chair of the faculty publications committee, I'd disqualify myself immediately if I wanted to publish a paper. Where, as a former faculty lecturer, I could easily go on as chairman of that committee. David Rees: Why don't we approve just switching these two individuals? On the same page, distinguished faculty lecture chair would then be Steve Heath, and under faculty publications committee the chair would be Seth Armstrong. Seth Armstrong: I'm first year. David Rees: Would everyone be willing to serve? David Lund: Is there anyone who totally objects to serving? The whole purpose here is to set up the committee so that we have a chair, the vice chair would become the chair the following year, and another second year faculty member would move into the position of vice chair so that the committees are continually rotating, so that these committees will be functional and working right at the first of the year. The chair and vice chair at the first of every year will constitute the committee, based on the guidelines of that committee. They may come from people who served before or wherever, but it would be their responsibility to make sure the committee is up and running. And if there are no objectives you now have those responsibilities. David Rees: The chair and vice chair will now have the responsibility of forming the committee. I suggest you contact David before you invite the individuals, so we don't ask the same person to be on three different committees. If we start seeing the same person over and over again David can get back to you and say please select someone else. Rea Gubler: Who'd you come up with on finance? Still empty then.

IX: Committee Bridging Between Faculty Senate & Dean's Council

David Rees: Also, part of my responsibility was streamlining committees. We have talked about some kind of **committee that would bridge between the faculty senate and dean's council**. *I would like to make a motion that after the dean's council has seen a policy as we have done it, and when they make changes, not major changes, that the committee then that looks as this document and brings the compromise idea together, be composed of the president of the faculty senate, the chair of the academic affairs committee, the provost, and one dean of his [the provost's] choosing.*

David Lund: Do we have a second? Steve Heath: What committee is this for, the streamlining committee?

David Rees: Last time we met we passed the policy for one situation, that when the dean's council would look at a policy that we had passed, that there would be a committee that would then meet and hash out the differences. I'm suggesting that we now make this a formal motion for all policies. That once we have determined what we want to do as a faculty senate, and the deans then take a look at it and have made changes, that what we then do, is that policy come make to the faculty senate in it's entirety, but rather that it goes to this compromise committee, and those four individuals meet and hash out the policy document. Steve Heath: Why not add one other faculty at large? It's a two to two vote? Oh, you don't vote? David Lund: David has talked to Robert Eves about this and he is in agreement that this would be a good way to do that. If that group can't come to consensus. Wayne Williams seconds. Kathy Black: It seems policies are proposed, that goes to academic affairs committee. Why doesn't it come here first to see if they need to be written? Abe Harraf: We've been told that all policies have to go back. Kathy Black: It seems if we put David's committee first instead of last, there seems to be a great deal of frustration, to put in lots of time only to find out the policy won't work, is there a way to streamline this? David Lund: That offer was made by provost. Abe Harraf: I have done this last year, but that was rejected. Rea Gubler: That suggestion seems to fly in the face of the philosophy of faculty sovereignty Ty was talking about. If the committee is your representation, then you see it before it goes anywhere, and our biggest problem is not getting the kind of input that we're getting now. If you'd read them and send them to us early, or at least have your rep, because you each have a rep on this committee, but that interjection level, at this point, based on the committees past experience, would slow down rather than expedite. Kathy Black: But if we saw it before we had the committee spend a lot of time on it, we could give input before you drafted it and avoid two or three months of time. David Lund: Have the policies come to both Robert and I'll put it on the web immediately as a policy that has now been sent to the academic affairs committee, please read, give your input to the committee. X: Would this compromise committee be the last stop, it would not come back to the senate? In other words the senate would never see it again. David Rees: That's my motion.

David Lund: But the committee could recommend it go back to the senate. Marty Larkin: So we may not know the changes that were made. David Lund: That was a question Ty brought up earlier, and if we look at the policy on policies, we may want to address that issue. Abe Harraf: If there's substantial changes, it has to go back. David Lund: Yes.

Steve Barney: *I suggest we go ahead and form this committee, but in the bylaws for that committee we specify those situations where the policy would come back to the faculty senate.* Wayne Williams: *Seconds.*

David Lund: Would you agree with that amendment to the motion? David Rees: I would agree with motion that we stipulate in the bylaws when a policy will come back to the faculty senate. Wayne Williams: I agree. Kathy Black: I'm a little worried, because we're forming this committee and we've got one member of the dean's council, two members of the faculty senate, and the provost isn't going to vote. And we would like to enforce this upon the dean's council. If the motion is that we have it be the last spot, but I'm looking at it thinking, if we've got shared governance, and if they could trump us anyway, perhaps what we should be looked at is two members of the dean's council, two members of the faculty senate, and possibly a tie breaking in those instances where it doesn't go back to either the dean's council or the faculty senate, because otherwise the dean's council will never approve it. You've got one dean and two... Abe Harraf: Even that group recommendation id to me, I can vote on something coming to my recommendation. Kathy Black: All I'm saying is I'm worried about two members of the faculty senate, one member of the dean's council, and we're telling the dean's council we think this is fair. David Lund: It's possible they would recommend to us that we include one more person on that committee from that group. Steve Heath: That sways the vote the entire other way, because generally speaking, most provosts are with the dean's council, most of the time, then it would always be 3 to 2 on any controversial issue. David Lund: I think we need to go back to the original motion. His motion was, I didn't hear that it was a voting committee, this is a committee that would work out a compromise between the two groups, so that it could move forward or come up with a determination of when it needs to go back and be reworked, not a thing to vote on, but a place where we can both have our say, and they're going to try to put it in a from that makes both of us happy, with representation from both groups. David Rees: And if we end up making major modifications, it has to go back.

David Lund: I call the motion to question, those in favor of the formation of that committee. The members of the committee would be the provost, the chair of the academic affairs committee, a dean chosen by the provost, and the president of the faculty senate. *17 in favor, 3 against, no abstentions. (20 present). The motion passes.*

X. Faculty Senate Constitution

David Lund: Steve, what's happening with the constitution? Steve Barney: **The constitution** has been presented to this body, we have 24 faculty signatures recommending that we amend the constitution with the proposed constitution. And, at this point we're ready for a faculty senate vote. It is a wholesale vote, either we accept it or not. If we choose not to accept it, I'll make the changes you want, I'll get 24 more signatures and come back to you next month with a new proposed constitution so we can get this through. David Lund: The question that came before this body last year was that there are colleges who could not have half their faculty tenured. Either because people refused to do it, or because they just didn't happen to be there. And those people who were involved in making the original signatures, the word "ideally" was put in, so if couldn't have half of your members be tenured, it was okay, but ideally we'd like to have more of the tenured faculty. Steve Barney: I tried to get communication from all 24 faculty who signed this petition, but only heard from about half of them. But if we want to make that change, I'll have to go back and get some more signatures. David Lund: Our choice is to vote on it as is today, without adding that word, or wait and see if Steve can get the other few votes taken care. If Steve can get the other people, well, do we want to vote on it today? Motion? Steve: *I move we accept it as written.* Virginia Stitt: *I second it.* David Lund: Any other discussion? Kathy Black: I have 2 basic problems, the first is the idea of tenured faculty, and if have reps on faculty senate who aren't tenured faculty, they don't have the opportunity to run, and those colleges do not have representation. The second issue is we have not followed the definition of academic freedom exactly. I don't think we can have a policy on academic freedom, and have a constitution saying we're upholding a different idea of academic freedom. Once we have a statewide policy and definition, we ought to be following it. Abe Harraf: Not signed off to by legal counsel. Steve Barney: this statement on academic freedom is from university policy. I'm not sure where the concern is with it, but I would be happy to talk to you about that Kathy and address concerns.

David Lund: *accept as written: 13 in favor, 3 opposed, 3 abstained. The constitution carries.*

Steve Barney: Now, we distribute it to the faculty at large. David Lund: There will be a site on the web where the faculty can vote to ratify or not, takes 2/3rds of the faculty to make it happen. We'll know the results in the next two to three weeks. Kathy Black: Since we voted on a policy for faculty rights, and we just voted in a faculty const.

XI: Move for Dismissal

Steve Barney: **Moves for executive session.**

Virginia Stitt: Seconds

Steve Barney: Moves to adjourn at 5:15