Faculty Senate Minutes  
September 29, 2011  
4:00 pm in Cedar Breaks


Guests: Christian Reiner, Joan Fitton, Julie Simon, Ginny Romney.

1. Call to Order (4:02 PM)

2. Approval of Minutes: One change regarding FDSF grant. I removed $500.00 request. Not applicable. Lee Montgomery motioned…Wayne Roberts seconded.

3. Vice President’s Report:
   a. Capital Improvement Projects- Any questions? Information only. Randle asked about exterior pocket travel. We are not sure.
   b. Cardstock name tags will be provided for next meeting.


5. Christian Reiner:
   a. Results of HERI survey-
      i. Faculty are more civically minded.
      ii. Diversity..we are perceived as less diverse.
      iii. Women…in survey notable difference in responses. Female faculty see a greater need for diversity. There is a need for more dialog in this area.
      iv. In peer institution comparisons, we are behind our peers. “Trend, we get less from the state and have to make more of our own money. We are at 53%. Constant challenge…making sure we have enough money.”
   b. Response rate was in low 40s. There was a small statistical difference.
   c. On the positive note, SUU managed to grow with resources we have. “We did well with little.”
   d. Retention rate. Harder to retain students who are have lower index scores. SUU is currently working on retention model. Several questions need to be addressed.
      i. Tracking students on missions, military, marriage, changing majors,
   e. Fall to fall retention….“we hope to see increase.”
   f. Question (Rachel Kirk) Do we have numbers about good students who start with us because of low cost then leaves to attend Utah/BYU? “Good question…we
have not looked at that. This years numbers and next years numbers will be more telling.”

g. Christian will be soon asking faculty to participate in survey for his dissertation. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

6. Julie Simon: Ad Hoc Committee
   a. Making a request for a formation of a committee. Committee in response to HERI survey and concern with diversity and gender on campus.
   b. Not a surprise that women were not as satisfied as leadership opportunities. Julie has been at SUU since 1989 and has not seen a lot of improvement.
   c. Provost reported that women are asked to serve and they don’t. So purpose of committee will be to formulate a study/survey that explores these issues further. Example question. Are women seen a barriers?
   d. Goal:
      i. Gather data and compare data to the literature.
      ii. Discover was is going on at SUU. Explore possibility of shadowing program.
      iii. Once committee gathers information they can make some recommendations.
      iv. Results will possibly be publishable. In house research.
   e. “Would you be willing to serve? Ask your college for people willing to help.”
   f. Randle motioned band Shobha 2nd.
   g. Steve reported:
      i. Faculty :Men 171/254 67.3% Women 83/254 32.7%
      ii. Academic Deans: 5 Academic Colleges/Schools Men 3/5 60% Women 2/5 40%
      iii. Department Chairs 23 Departments (Provosts Count=31) Men 25/31 80.6% Women 6/31 19.4%
   h. Majority in favor, 0 apposed, 4 abstain.

7. Joan Fitton: Sponsored Research and Grants
   a. Joan’s background
      i. From Massachusetts. Formerly in charge of 40 million dollars in grants at public school. Pitch our office. Hoops to jump through.
   b. Goal: Work on helping improve the grant writing process. Taking back some of the fiscal responsibility. Rumor: grants office keeps half of every grant.
   c. Example.100,000
      i. 20,000 to office 80,000 to you.
ii. In actuality...8,600.00 goes to office. Breaks up into 10 categories
(finance, provost, library, dean, dept head.) Office gets 5.16% of grant.
Department gets 3.4%.
d. Joan wants to get involved to help that faculty are not getting cut back on money.
Petitioning for post award....alerts, etc. There is not a system in office yet.
e. Any issues in the grant writing process, go to Joan. So she can help fix issues.
Email her. She wants to hear from us. They are ready to help.

8. Proposed Language change for 6.15: “Should a faculty member not perform satisfactorily
or should a faculty member desire to not return to the University to serve for the length of
time required (equal to the length of the sabbatical taken) after a sabbatical leave, he/she
will be obligated to repay to the University the amount of compensation (salary and
benefits) he/she received while on sabbatical.”
   a. Deans are talking about 6.15, but since they did not meet this week, policy will be
discussed in next meeting.
   b. Wording is not clear. Wording in agenda most current. Express concerns to Katy
      Herbold.
   c. “We are not clear on performing satisfactory when during or after sabbatical.
      Procedures and objectives are not clear.”
      i. Length of sabbatical is how long you must stay after. Mike Carter will
         review policy.

9. Policy 6.8-Undergraduate curriculum: Look at and be prepared to discuss later. Right
now information only.

10. Policy 6.41- Academic Program Review: Policy is information only at this point.
Schedule for which programs will be voted on and when. “Lynn how does that go along
with national reviews.”
   a. Two reviews one year (Internal and external).
      i. Committee is responsible for integration of reviews. Deans will vote on
         this next meeting. Internal accreditation.
   b. Forward any of your concerns or views to Katy Herbold.
   c. One comment
      i. HSS “Don’t see purpose of this, level of exceptional ...is that a new
         norm? This could hurt collaboration.”
      ii. Questions on merit pay.
         1. Merit pay becomes part of base. Merit pay has to be approved by
            the dean. Talk to dean about your concerns.
d. Steve advised everyone to talk to dean and Katy about your concerns now. “Think of things we want to adjust.” Draft copy. “Great opportunity to craft a document.”

11. Report from Katy Herbold on Academic Affairs: Next meeting.

12. Other Business?
   a. Nichole handed out copy of proposed post tenure review policy. Review and be prepared to discuss later.

   a. People are against how merit pay is being implemented. Concern with model and dean was asked to not divulge information.
   b. Currently private model is being implemented and there is no way to know who got what. Chair and deans know.
   c. Model is different by colleges and departments. “How do you pick one person over the other.” Some issues with that and no one knows who is getting merit pay.
   d. Dean level made decisions.
   e. What are numbers on survey? What percent when to equity? What when to merit? Tier one went to equity and tier two when to merit. Seems weird that students influenced this decision. “Good faith effort to be partners with students.”
   f. Stew on recommendations. Draft a resolution next meeting.

14. Motion for Executive Session-Lee Montgomery

15. Motion to Adjourn-Robin Boneck