

Faculty Senate November 20th

In Attendance: Virginia Stitt, Richard Eissinger, Luciane Berg, Steve Barney, Ty Redd (also Marty Larkin's Proxy), Rea Gubler, Steve Heath, Kathy Black, Ken Laundra, David Rees, Doug Molash, Rick Lambson (Proxy for Martha Hyder), David Lund, Lamar Jordan (Proxy for Michael McGarvey), Curtis Bostick, Deb Hill, Elise Leahy, Seth Armstrong, Mike Grady, Roy Johnson, Judy Higbee  
Visitors: Abe Harraf, Robert Eves  
3:32 Call to order

Next faculty senate meeting will be a lunch meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup>. Everyone should get it scheduled on his or her calendars. David Lund will see that both sets will be out by the following meeting.

Motion to approve minutes. Several people have not seen the minutes; therefore, they cannot be approved. Two sets of minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

David Lund: A quick report sent out by USFL, Utah Faculty Senate Leaders Council; they held a meeting the day after our last meeting. A couple of meetings ago we approved a proposal from them to take to the Board of Regents supporting the Board of Regents in their efforts to secure money for higher education. They were looking for growth funding and salaries. That was delivered to the Board of Regents and was acted on in that meeting, or at least read, so they know faculty senates across the state were supportive. That was the only significant thing that happened in that meeting. The next USFL meeting will be held here on our campus in conjunction with the Board of Regents meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> of March. There may be a meeting in between if there is something else to discuss. There are a couple of faculties in the state who want to ban all firearms on campuses since they can't control the people that will bring them on illegally. That was one of the things discussed, that and the need to make the Board of Regents understand the need for more money in higher education. Everyone urged to contact his or her senators and representatives. There is a web site that allows you to contact your senators and representatives. You can type the letter up, click submit, and it will send it to all three. David L. has the link information.

David R: Regarding committees, we appreciate the Academic Affairs Committee for the work they are doing. Some other committees need to follow through and get some work done this spring and into August, particularly the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee and the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Committee. Various other committees, i.e. Leave, Rank, and Tenure Committee really have nothing to do right now, or does the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Faculty Publications Committee. For these other two committees, the executive committee of the faculty senate has put together a charge for them to tell the faculty senate in January what progress they are making.

David L: You know which committees you are on and your time will come.

David R: We assigned everyone on this faculty senate two committees and gave the charge to the committee chair to fill in the rest of the committee.

David L: If three members aren't enough, talk to the dean and ask for a nomination from him, or look at the faculty that you think would serve on that committee, ask them directly and have them get permission from the dean. Try not to overburden anyone with too many committees.

Rea: Campus 2-account is still \$1658. Checking \$1506. Savings \$2856. CD \$10455.

David L: We will use money from the 2-account money for lunch on the twelfth.

Abe: Accreditation issues. We just received the first draft of corrections of any errors or misinterpretation. This is not the final draft, because the final draft has to have a rejoinder. It is due today. Another issue is nursing. The commissioner hired two consultants who recommended that SUU should have this program and still they are not listening. We have involved legislators and the Board of Regents, but we are still not being heard. We are still hopeful and are trying to educate people. Our local legislators have done wonderful jobs of lobbying. They keep delaying it and last word was that they want to delay it again. Dean Metten announced his retirement last Monday. We wish him well in his retirement. I have also

received the resignation of Bill O 'Neil. He is relocating to the San Diego so that position will be available immediately.

David L: In case you didn't hear, business got another accreditation in the last few days. Congratulations again. Now they are going for international accreditation. Dale Orton and Newman Duncan are going to take a few moments to talk about faculty involvement with resident living. Please share with your faculty what Dale and Newman tell us about the Eccles Living Center across the street.

Dale: (Passes around the artist's rendition of the new building.) We are very excited about the new 300-bed facility going up. There are three different units of housing. Students helped design this.

Newman: We meet every Tuesday with the construction company and last Tuesday they reported that they are 49% completed. Since Tuesday they are 50% completed. They make about 1/2 % a day. We are on schedule. The end of March we'll be finished. Students will start moving in May. We'll be ready for Maymester. Large universities have gone to theme floors. They advertise that they have an engineering floor or a math floor or a language floor and it has really been popular. That also allows for our living learning title. Theme floors have an R/A hired by us to do programming, but they have an opportunity to live and learn together. Like Dale mentioned, there are 50 apartments, each has 6 students living in it. Some have 5 bedrooms; some have 4 bedrooms so there's an opportunity for shared rooms and private rooms. There are 156 private rooms and 144 shared rooms. We can't give you the prices until they go through the Board of Trustees. The market recommendation tells us only \$200 more per semester than they are currently paying for Manzanita. Manzanita has 743 square feet per six students and these are over 1500 square feet per six students. We will have a model apartment ready in January and would love to give you a tour.

Dale: The first building has a computer lab on the first floor, a recreational facility, pool table, ping pong tables, big screen tv, and an area that can be partitioned off into three different classrooms. Faculty may want to come and teach some classes. The partnership between the faculty and students is important.

Newman: If any of you are interested in these theme floors, please let us know. We would hate to advertise something that doesn't have your blessing. If you want something we would love to do that, it would be in the benefit of all our students.

Newman: The classrooms are wired, but are designed for multi-purpose. They will not be scheduled by the university unless the students want it in the future.

Dale: In each one of these units they each have their own internet connections. It's home away from home.

Newman: There are now excellent opportunities for R/A's. We currently have 15 and we can double that. We welcome any opportunities for any living/learning experiences. This building will also benefit the residents of Manzanita and Juniper. There will be 600 mailboxes for residents so they will all end up over here.

?: How many upperclassmen do you have living in housing? My guess is that most of them are freshmen.

Newman: The majority are freshman, but these are apartment style and we'd just as soon have upperclassmen students live here because they aren't going to have the opportunity to interact as much. We want to recruit and retain students for these units. This comes with a pretty good-sized price tag. It's an eleven million dollar project and it has a pretty good-sized bond payment on it. Because of the donation from the Eccles family, we can offer a decent rate.

Dale: We are not doing away with Manzanita and Juniper. We need to keep them filled as well. This is a wonderful retention tool.

David L: Thank you for coming. We appreciate that information. Robert, you're on.

Robert: You've probably noticed that course fees, academic development, grant resources, academic scheduling, and retention of student records by faculty are available on the web site. We have started to work with the IRB policy. David L: The original policy is on the web. Robert: Let's begin with academic administrative position description. This is really a landmark policy for SUU. We have snatches of this policy distributed through our current policy. There's a separate policy currently for evaluating department chairs, there's an academic administrative position description policy that includes position description for the provost and deans and so on, but this policy tries to bring that all together under a single heading. We haven't had a policy for evaluation of deans for the 16 years I've been on campus. This policy has that in it. The Academic Affairs Committee has taken some criticism for this, but we have tried to utilize campus practices wherever possible. The first substantive change is in 1A: The provost selection committee constitutes a legal review for candidate's tenure and academic rank at the University. The LRT committee of the department in which the new provost is to receive tenure and the ULRT committee review the qualifications of the candidate and make a recommendation to the provost selection committee. The original policy made no provision for review of qualifications for granting rank and tenure to an incoming provost. That was the first change we made.

Virginia: Moves that we accept the changes as outlined by the committee. Rea seconds. Discussion. Kathy: Does that mean that if the department LRT committee doesn't want the provost to have tenure, that the selection committee can override them? Robert: 1A, 3: *The department and university rank and tenure committees will conduct a review for candidate tenure and academic rank at the university. Prior to the selection committee's submission of the list of final candidates, the chair of the university LRT committee will forward tenure and rank recommendations, with rationale, to the chair of the search selection committee. The department and university LRT committees will screen out for tenure and rank only, not for selection.* So basically, you'll get a short list for LRT that will be forwarded to the selection committee to be part of their consideration. Kathy: The selection committee can override your vote and give them tenure anyway? Robert: That's conceivably possible, however, the LRT policy states that the provost, or any administrator has to have tenure in a department. Kathy: Aren't you giving the selection committee the right to overturn the department? Shouldn't we say something binding that the LRT gets to make that determination. ?: It's the Board of Trustees that makes the decision. Abe: The selection committee only looks at the merits of the candidate for the position. The tenure ability has to be with the department or the college. ?: Page 15, item 2B, talking about the procedure for appointing an associate dean. *In consultation with the provost, the dean will form a search committee, chaired by a department chair outside.* That's my question. If we're getting an associate dean for a particular college, why are we looking outside the college for the chair of the search committee? I make the motion that the chair should be from within. David L: Virginia, is that okay with you and Rea if we make that change? Agreed. Bob: The language change I'll insert there is a department chair inside the college. David L: Steve will second that motion. Calls for a vote. 20 in favor. Unanimous. Passes. Kathy: I'm looking for clarification. If we have a department chair or dean who steps down but wants to stay in the department, what if we don't have a position available? Robert: Any department who accepts somebody as a faculty member does so with the understanding that if they return to the teaching side of things, they will be working with them through that transition period. Kathy: What if we have a bunch of department chairs that step down. How do we handle that financially? Robert: Typically it's the deans that are sought externally and department chairs internally. Kathy: Here it says the position will be advertised. On department chairs, E2D, it says the position will be advertised simultaneously internally and externally for 30 days. Abe: If the position is available, naturally, .....Current policy prohibits such options. Kathy: I think we should write it "if the budget allows". If there's no money, we shouldn't violate our policy trying to get a department chair. Robert: Anybody who's currently tenured and professionally qualified, that would allow them to serve. In the policy coming down, they will not be hired in a tenure track. At least if that's the way you all see it. ?: If you need a policy in your own department you go for it, but the university doesn't need one. David L: That's a good point. We still have Doug's motion on the table with no term limits. Robert: Our perspective in our department, we just passed a policy that you can serve one term, and under extraordinary circumstances, two terms. ?: Perhaps what we should be saying then is no term limits, but reviewed after every term. Abe:.... Robert: In a shared governance model, at the dean or department chair's level, there needs to be some accountability to the faculty. Abe: Absolutely, but the accountability could go both ways. Robert: Take for example a dean who gets an 80% vote of no confidence but continues to serve. There's no evidence of faculty accountability there. Abe: The deans are responsible to the provost, the chairs to the dean, the document says that 2/3's of the faculty say they don't want that person, it doesn't matter what the supervisor says, they have to be removed. I'm saying there should be a valued input, but not the only

input. Robert: The problem is the supervisors tend to ignore, and have done so at every level of this campus, the input from the faculty. We state in this document that the deans serve and answer to the provost. We've tried to include a mechanism whereby, if the faculty can't work with the dean, the provost has an obligation to work with the faculty to try to resolve those issues and put somebody in there they can work with. Abe: Yes, they should work with the faculty to resolve the situation, but the answer isn't to remove. Robert: On the department chair level, the problem we have encountered is under the former policy, we submitted a name to the dean and, inevitably, that particular dean would choose the weakest candidate as perceived by the faculty, and that would be the department chair. Abe: But I'm saying because of one experience the policy should be much more.. Robert: I think this is more of a campus phenomenon than anyone would like to believe. Because that makes it much easier for the dean to operate when that's the situation. ?: I don't understand why the superior position is 2/3's of those of the faculty thought that this person couldn't work with, that to me seems like such a strong vote from the faculty that the dean or associate dean or the provost would say that person is unworkable. Abe: Just the vote itself, you have to be accountable, so that we can verify that the faculty's claim or accusation of that person, there should be a process. ?: Do you have a problem with the original process of finding a chair? Abe: I have a problem. If a chair leaves and there isn't another tenured faculty to take his/her place, under the current provision, it says we can't hire a chair from outside. ?: If the provision is in there and we do hire a chair from outside, do you have a problem with that? Robert: This isn't a matter of paranoia, it's a matter of experience. Let me comment on your question of legality. If the provost decides, based on a 2/3's vote from the faculty, that it's an unworkable situation with the dean it's as simple as the provost saying this just isn't working out. David L: This is going on way too long. There's still a motion on the table. ?: I would like to withdraw the motion. I would like to make another motion. 2D Faculty members appointed as chairs serve 3-year terms and may be reappointed following the original appointment procedures for one or more terms. Abe: More might imply 2 additional at the same time. ?: For additional terms. ?: If we do the procedures then it becomes another search. David L: Do I have a second? Faculty members appointed as chairs serve 3-year terms and may be reappointed following the original appointment procedures for additional terms. David L: Any discussion? Called into question. In favor: 17. Opposed: 3 Abstention: 0 Conflict discussed regarding who serves who in terms of faculty and administration. ?: My question is why is tenure-track not allowed a chair position? ?: They don't have the ability to represent the tenured faculty adequately. Kathy: What if you only have two tenured faculty and you didn't like either one of them? What do you do? Do you go with the tenured? The non-tenure track? Open it up for a search? Doug: I would like to add an i. to section 4. Something to the effect that in consultation between the dean and department faculty the chair position may be open to a search for off campus applications. Seconded. David L: Restate the motion. Any discussion? Curtis: I think it's only fair that we be allowed to go outside and search for a chair. New people bring in new blood. Restated: In consultation between the department faculty, the dean, and the provost may open the search to off campus applications. Robert: It would fit better at the end of B. David L: We have a motion on the table. It can either be withdrawn or voted on. All in favor of adding that sentence without a qualifier. In favor: 8 Opposed: 10 Abstention: 2 Defeated. Doug: If the above outlined procedure fails, then in consultation between the department faculty, the dean, and the provost may open the search to off campus applications. Rea seconds. David L: All in favor of the wording with the new phrase added in: 16 Opposed: 3 Abstention: 1 Passes. Further discussion on the main motion, which is to approve the entire document as amended. The motion has been called into question. In favor: 11 Opposed: 3 Abstention: 4 Motion passes. ?: Evaluation of deans. In a recent evaluation of the dean, a lot of the faculty felt like they raised substantive questions that were never addressed. In 5C it says results of the evaluation will be submitted to the provost. The faculty would like some feedback as well. Are these evaluations simply for the provost to evaluate the dean, or a mechanism whereby faculty concerns may be addressed? David L: Propose specific language. David r: I suspect that after the provost and dean's council have a chance to look at this, that this arbitration committee will have a chance to go through it. Ty: I think we as a faculty senate should lay out some ground rules for the arbitration committee. David L: Based on the vote we had to create that committee, there is now a policy on policies, which talks about that committee. It has already been approved by the dean's council. Last meeting we agreed that we would have our sentences lined out, and each person would have 2 minutes. We need to stick to that. ? moves for executive session. Curtis Bostick seconded. Vote was unanimous. Steve Barney moved to adjourn the meeting.

