

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, October 24, 2002
Board of Trustees Room
3:30 P.M.

I. Call to order: 3:32 p.m. by President Brian Heuett

Attending: Senators - Brian Heuett (President), Robert Eves (President Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Steve Barney, Ken Landra, Rea Gubler, Mike McGarvy, Ty Redd, Steve Evans, Boyd Fife, Jerry Bowler, Kay Andersen, Darin Wadley, Curt Bostick, Martha Hyder, Richard Tebbs as proxy for Marty Larkin (serving as Fall semester proxy for Steve Heath), Deb Hill, Tim Lewis as proxy for Kathy Black, Eric Brown, Mike Grady, Janet Seegmiller, and Ron Martin. Visitors: Provost Abe Harraf and President Steve Bennion. Excused: Sara Ann Smith, Roy Johnson

II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of September 26, 2002. A motion to approve the minutes of the September Faculty Senate meeting was made by Virginia Stitt, seconded by Eric Brown and was passed in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the senate. Steve Barney then moved that the minutes of the special constitution and by-laws meeting held on October 10, 2002 be approved as written; this motion was seconded by Steve Evans and subsequently approved by a vote of 10 in favor of the motion and 4 abstentions.

III. Officers' Reports

A. President - Brian Heuett

a. Deans' Council: President Brian Heuett reported that Provost Harraf and the Dean's Council are looking at the teaching load of all faculty—paying attention to faculty teaching courses out of their field and to faculty teaching courses with numbers that are not in line with the type of course or with the capacity of the facility in which the course is taught. He also indicated that all faculty need to have resumes and transcripts on file in their respective department and /or in the Provost's office for purposes of the upcoming Northwest Accreditation Review. Steve Barney wanted to know why the faculty had to do work that should already have been done. Brian Heuett said he had asked the same question of the Dean's Council. The response was that for recently hired faculty these items were probably on file; but for long time faculty this may or may not be the case. Eric Brown wanted to know why it is either/or as to place where these documents are kept. Provost Harraf said that his office had accounted for only a few more than 60 transcripts for over 200 faculty members. The Provost's office is paying for transcripts that must be ordered. He said they want to have transcripts, resumes, contract letters and promotion letters on file for each faculty member. He reiterated that the purpose of these files is for accreditation committees. The Provost's office is not trying to determine who can teach what class, since the Deans and Chairs have to sign them anyway making that particular determination. Curt Bostick indicated that the template is difficult for the secretary in his department to use. The Provost said he would do whatever was necessary to make the forms easy to use and facilitate the gathering of this information. Provost Harraf repeated that he is asking the Deans and Chairs to be accountable for faculty teaching in appropriate fields. The Provost then reminded us again that this is to comply with Northwest Accreditation requirements.

b. Women In Higher Education (Georgia Beth Thompson): Brian Heuett wanted to know if the faculty senate would like to be involved in the process of nominating women for the Women in Higher Education Awards. He asked the senate to look over the application for the award and if anyone knew of an appropriate candidate, they could make an appropriate nomination.

c. Voting Member on Board of Trustees: President Heuett reminded us that many past presidents have tried to get a voting member on the Board of Trustees. He has made it a goal to find out why we don't have a voting member there and to push for the ability of the Faculty Senate to be involved in this body. He indicated that the Provost is in agreement with this idea. Brian intends to do what is necessary to get this done if there is any possible way to do it. There is some concern that the student body has a voting member on that board and that the faculty does not. Joe Baker moved that we vote as a faculty to support Brian in trying to get a voting member on the board. Ron Martin seconded this motion. In discussion, Eric Brown brought up Utah code regarding the Board of Trustees, 8 members appointed by the governor and approved by the Utah senate, plus 2 ex-officio members—the alumni president and the student body president. Perhaps the legislature looks at this as an outside monitoring body. Provost Harraf thought we might need to go to the legislature to get the code changed. The motion was called to question. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of the senate (3:52 p.m.).

B. President-Elect - Robert Eves

a. Board of Trustees: Robert Eves indicated that most of the meeting centered on the homecoming activities; however, they also talked about the university strategic plan which is on the web and can be viewed. Robert recommended that we take time to look at this strategic plan, even though we would have no way to provide any input.

C. Secretary - David Lund: No business this month.

D. Treasurer - Joe Baker

a. Financial Report: Joe Baker reported that our account balance is \$12,898 and that faculty association dues collected had increased from \$93 to \$123 per pay period.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee: Robert Eves indicated that unapproved portions of policy 6.8 regarding the curriculum committee (a long term process) are now ready for Faculty Senate review. The policy will be made available to senators next week; Robert exhorted us to review it as soon as possible. Four more short policies will also be made available to the senate for review—transfer credit, final examinations, faculty resignations, and faculty preparations for teaching assignments. The new process will be to have the Academic Affairs Committee work through the policies when they come from the Dean's Council; they will then come to the Senate for review and approval. Policies will then go back to Mike Richards, and if there is no significant difficulty or difference between the Dean's Council recommendations and the faculty senate, they will go on to the president.

B. Steve Barney – Constitution and By-laws revision Committee: Steve Barney reported on the work of the committee to date. The committee met with the former revisionists. The biggest issue was to bring the faculty into a situation of shared governance. Steve then asked Eric Brown to explain the Utah code in this regard. Eric indicated that the code gives the President of the University universal power to decide what will be done at the university and who will have power to do it. Steve Barney indicated that the next step in the process is to get, in writing, what the president authorizes the faculty to do in this regard in order to follow proper channels and meet Utah code at the same time. Eric then indicated that there was committee discussion on how we want to approach the president—with a list of what we would like in the constitution or to just ask him what he thought we ought to be doing in this regard. Brian Heuett thought the committee ought to take the lead and take a list to President Bennion and ask him what he thought the Faculty Senate should be doing, then present to him the list of perceived Faculty Senate responsibilities the committee had created. Robert Eves brought up a document created by the Board of Regents listing the responsibilities of the faculty. The documents said some of these powers were listed somewhat indecisively using the word may, rather than something more concrete like shall. Steve Barney indicated that the executive committee members on his committee—Virginia Stitt and David Lund volunteered to go with him to meet with President Bennion. Janet Seegmiller moved that the senate support the committee in approaching the president to clearly define the role of the faculty in shared governance. The motion was seconded by Robert Eves. There was no discussion. The ensuing vote was unanimous in the affirmative with all 23 senators in favor of the motion. Steve Barney then indicated that once we have clarification and understand what it is the faculty needs to do, the committee should be able to revise/rewrite the constitution quickly and in an appropriate manner. Robert Eves reminded us that this has been approved by a previous administration and that the authority already exists and thus the senate exists defacto. Janet Seegmiller reminded us that there has been a senate since 1983; Richard Tebbs indicated that prior to that time the body existed as the faculty association and included the entire faculty.

C. Provost Abe Harraf: Provost Harraf had a number of things to share. He has prepared a calendar for the university for the year. The calendar has been approved by the president's council. He explained that the change from quarters to semesters created an incorrect calendar date for contracts—dropping calendar contract time from 9 months to 8.5 months, in violation of law. They have adjusted this for the next year and reminded us that we need to be here on Aug 16, 2003 and that the contract goes to May 15, 2004. He reminded us that we need to be available during that time for university activities. Richard Tebbs wanted to know about instructional days, and the Provost indicated that when finals end we have 73 days of instructional contact per semester. Ron Martin wondered if we couldn't make our fall holiday coincide with UEA. The Provost indicated that for various reasons this may not be possible but would be looked into for future calendars. He then explained that classes will start on Mondays instead of in the middle of the week. Robert Eves wanted to know if we could post this to the web. The Provost said he could do that. David Lund said he would post the calendar to the Faculty Senate web page. Janet Seegmiller wanted to know how students can see this and that maybe it ought to go on the university home page.

Provost Harraf then brought up two other issues his office is considering. There are concerns in accountability and in finances. They are looking at many things. There are faculty members that call the registrar and limit class size, sometimes as low as 10 in a lecture class where there are 40 seats in the class—in fact, there are often several sections of the same class with several different class size limits. These limits have been established directly with the registrar's office without the input of the appropriate deans or department chairs. Class size is a faculty decision, and if there is a pedagogical reason to limit class size, it should be done; but faculty cannot do this alone; they must follow the proper channels getting input from their deans and/or department chairs. Eric Brown wanted to talk about ceramics. Provost Harraf broke in and said it is not his decision, but needed to be made by peers, chairs and deans. He indicated that we have 61 courses in the current semester with less than 10 people in them, a violation of policy. Also, there are 9 overload classes with less than 10 people. He will not make the decision, but we need to be responsible and reasonable. Once decisions regarding class size are made by faculty, deans, and chairs; the information will be made public. He also indicated that we have faculty teaching 18-21 credit hours—this is a form of self-abuse. We need to be fair to faculty. All size limits are to be removed, then the faculty, in conjunction with deans and department chairs, need to revise and set the limits appropriately through the correct channels. Eric Brown said that there are some problems with accounting of the numbers of students in classes.

Second, the Provost reiterated the issue of faculty overloads. Policy 6.9 says the faculty member may teach a maximum of one class of 5 hours or less. This policy is not being followed. There are faculty teaching as much as 12 overload hours in a semester, and administrators on 12-month contracts teaching large overloads, as well. Switching directions, the Provost then indicated that Robert Eves had also indicated that we could actually limit class size by choosing a specific classroom. Provost Harraf indicated that his office will also address this issue. He indicated that he does not want to micromanage, these decisions must come at the lowest level—the department. Ron Martin wanted to know if the policy affected summer semesters; Provost Harraf indicated that it did not.

V. Old Business

A. Faculty Members Dues: Brian Heuett initiated a discussion on faculty association dues, since he hears about it from many faculty. He talked about Steve Barney's last email in this regard. The question was raised of why we fund student scholarships rather than putting that money to use for the faculty and faculty development. Darin Wadley reminded us that funding a student's education is less than funding a faculty member's attendance at a national meeting. Joe Baker indicated that at the current rate of dues, we could fund 2 faculty trips per year, if all faculty paid five dollars per pay period, we could fund 8 such trips. Janet Seegmiller read the minutes, and found that the institution has a budget item allocating some money to the senate to conduct its business. The figure for this year is \$1700. The staff does not pay dues, since they get a line item budget amount each year with which to conduct their business. Maybe we should do away with dues and invite faculty to contribute to other scholarships. Richard Tebbs indicated that the original dues were set primarily to provide scholarships. Steve Barney said that one of the things he had thought about was to increase

dues to fund release time for senators who will be taking on more responsibility. Curtis Bostick said he liked the idea of the release time, but others in his department were concerned that dues were being used for people other than faculty, as well—namely students. The Provost indicated that faculty development should be an administrative responsibility. Most institutions, give release time to the Faculty Senate President and President-elect, but the bill to do so for others would be too expensive. The general discussion then made several points—maybe we need to look at not giving too many responsibilities to senators. Most senate committees are made up mostly of senators. Joe Baker indicated that we needed to decide to either continue funding the scholarships or to use the \$3000 per year in some other area. Robert Eves said we might want to put some of the money into a substantial prize for outstanding scholar, etc. The current prize is \$500 for distinguished educators, and \$1000 for the outstanding educator. Generally, the comment was made that it might improve morale if the money was used for faculty. Brian Heuett asked us to all go back to our departments and get feedback on how this money should be used. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the senate has received a great deal of feedback from the faculty, that they will not donate, but reasons for this decision are few and far between. The senate is to find out what the faculty feels about this issue. Brian Heuett indicated that other institutions give much more release time for the work of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Brian indicated that he is released from only one course per term. Eric Brown wondered about mandatory dues—that is forcing faculty to spend their money on dues. Janet Seegmiller said it should not be called dues, since it really is not being used as dues. The general comment was made that maybe we need to look at the nomenclature. Ty Redd wanted to know where the money for the goodies at each senate meeting comes from—Joe indicated that this was funded through the line item in the university budget.

VI. New Business

A. Faculty Senate Committee (Recruitment & Retention): This is the committee for the month, which we will be dealing with on a monthly basis. Kenny Laundra has been asked to chair this committee. Brian Heuett asked senators to volunteer to serve or to get college members to serve with him. There is only one member on this committee so far—Kay Andersen. Ron Martin wanted to know if we were looking for senators or non-senators on the committee. Brian Heuett said we were trying to get committees composed of all senators for our standing committees where possible.

B. POLICIES: Brian reiterated that policies would be in senators' hands next week. David Lund said they'd be on the website, as well. Senators can expect to see five or six policies for review at the next meeting and at least 2-3 policies per month thereafter.

VII. Motion for Executive Session was made by Robert Eves; the motion was seconded by Joe Baker; the motion for executive session carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the senate

VIII. Adjournment: Motion for adjournment was made by Ty Redd. Adjournment at 5:03 p.m.