

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 1, 2011
4:00 pm in Hunter Conference Center Whiting Room 211

Senators in Attendance: Alan Hamlin, Steve Barney, Robin, David Berri, Wayne Roberts, Emmett Steed, Steven Irving, Nichole Wangsgard, Jim McCoy, Lee Montgomery, Derek Hein, Bruce Howard, Richard Cozzens, Artis Grady, Randle Hart, Rachel Kirk, John Howell, Michael Ostrowsky, Kyle Bishop, Shobha Gurung, Lynn White, Rheana Gardner, Andy Marvick, Christine Frezza, Lynn Vartan, Richard Cozzens.

Guests: Brad Cook, Ginny Romney, Garrett Strosser, Grant Corser.

- 1) Call to Order: 4:03
- 2) Approval of Minutes: Minutes approved. Shobha Gurung motioned, Lee Montgomery seconded.
- 3) President's Report: update on parking and event planning issues; handouts-calendar committee result, letter from regents, SUU 5 year assessment plan.
 - a) Another bill up for tenure issues. We are ahead of the curve. 6.1 is a big effort to deal with this issue. Alan will hold a meeting with other universities next month to educate people on tenure issues. Alan will get us more information after they meet.
 - b) Calendar issue. Committee met regarding schedule alignment with schools. They decided classes will not be held Monday and Tuesday, but will be held the previous Thursday and Friday. This is closer to alignment with the Iron County School District, but not perfectly concurrent. The reason, this break is a major time of recruitment. SUU needs to capture students when we they are at school (Tuesday). Another reason, day to start school will change to Monday, 27th. Therefore, total academic days will be reduced by two days, 143 to 141.
 - c) Regarding LRT. There is pressure being exerted by the Legislature and Regents on all colleges and universities to tight up tenure, and post tenure review procedures.
 - d) 5 year assessment report. Breaks how schools will be assessed. Bill burns is in charge of this. Just an Fyi.
- 4) Vice President's Report: Trustees did not meet so no report today.
- 5) Provost Brad Cook:
 - a) Space utilization policy. On campus space is leased out. How do we come to a better way to allot and charge for space? Not cost free. Looking forward to committee to fix it.
 - b) Cause for optimism. State revenues are up, funding from one time sources for projects is gone, but new monies are being generated by the growing economy. Priority is compensation. First time since 2008. State may be able to help state employees.
 - c) State of academic affairs strong. New faculty coming on board is helping weaknesses. We have become a poster child of the experiential learning model. Standard methods of

delivery are not working. We will continue in this area. The experiential learning model committee gave a paper at Snowbird and presentation created a lot of electricity.

- d) Embarking on a plan for IT. What are we doing about technologies on campus? Brad is starting a rational plan on where we need to be with IT. We are behind and have an opportunity with the way we harness technology. Where do we want to go? That is the question.
- e) Application for phi kappa pi is close to being accepted.
- f) USF secured rights for Les Miserables for next year.

Questions for Brad?

- a) How 6.1 plays out. We will see today (Alan). Alan stated that what we got so far is looking good.
 - b) What is status of parking (Alan)? Message was strong. Brad will bring up with Donna. FYI...more additional parking has been created.
 - c) Is convocation hour official? Yes...next fall. Spring optional. Exceptions are built in. We don't want to put students at risk. Only 50 minutes. Tues and Thurs 12-12:50. Brad asked if this moving okay? Scheduling moving labs has been hard for science department. Students are asking about it. Science department stated that they have so many students that work and the athletes that have to be done by 2. Brad commented that we have students that need to work in afternoon as well. As we grow, we have to move further into the afternoon. Science department stated that if we have the demand great, but if just 2 or 3 student show up that's bad. Brad stated that we are trying to elevate the caliber of speakers with less convocations. Problem is that science department must hold three hour labs (Senator). We voted to approve concept (Alan), so this will be an experiment. Alan stated that faculty senate can look at it and see if it needs to be changed. Brad stated that we need this hour so there is time in the week were university business can be done. Time where all committee members can meet. Space will be used mostly for university business.
 - d) Why didn't we get an Easter holiday? Two days extra in the fall. The committee does their best to balance everything (Alan).
- 6) Revisions of 5.5, 5.34 and 6.39: Deleted policies. Most policies are not sunseted. Some are redundant and unnecessary. Deans deleted telephone policy, building security, and small deletion in 6.39 which means hard copy no longer necessary. Motion carried to accept deletions by Kyle Bishop, and seconded by John Howell.
- 7) Committee Chair Report: Katy Herbold is here to report on where we are at and she would like our feedback on current version of the Academic Affairs-Policy 6.1
- a) Alan stated that this policy goes back to 1990s. Good additions. When they finished Katy's committee immediately looked at it. The draft we currently have is what the deans agreed to. Katy offered to recast document and make it clearer. She moved sections around to help policy look clear such as tenure track, charts, etc. We would like to recast whole thing. Alan gave us a copy of letter justifying why we asked for recasting of document. Deans accepted letter and will allow significant changes to happen. We are lucky to have approval to do this. Academic affairs is in the midst of doing this.

- b) What Alan would like to do? Allow Katy to express what committee has done and take note on concerns, if any. I (Alan) think document is better and soon it will be fantastic.
- c) Katy stated the following:
 - i) Evaluation of committee members is no longer in there.
 - ii) Sabbatical... deans have added another column for sabbatical leave. We drafted a section that points to 6.5 to tell faculty where to find policy.
 - iii) Post-tenure review language changed by beefing up language by adding rigorous. That strengthens it ever so slightly.
 - iv) Administration rank advancement addressed as well.
 - v) Continue a fifth year review for post tenure, not 3-4. Wording in there that post tenured faculty does not do 3 year review.
 - vi) Administration ranked advancement addressed as well. At this stage, reorganization.
 - vii) If you were a newly appointed chair. Would you know what to do when you look at this policy?
 - viii) Katy stated that there were concerns expressed on not being allowed to use Boyer model for scholarly. They added that departments can adapt any model. Continuing contract is when you have a contract that establishes you for certain positions.
 - (1) Overall, faculty has to perform the job. If we don't the difference is that tenure we have the right to be told why we are being fired and review evidence. If you are probational or non-tenure you have no due process. Tenure language is clearly in there.
 - ix) Service... what do you want? Here are my contributions. Value statement in new policy. There is a value statement up front and center. We could add a place for experiential education.
 - x) Non-tenure track clarification. They are not being hired to be scholars. We have tried to distinguish difference.
 - xi) There is concern that there is not consistency for merit pay fund. Without guidelines they can be distributed unfairly. This concern has not been addressed yet.
 - xii) Confusion with exceptional. The levels of voting will be addressed. They agreed to look at this. As soon as document is final we will forward it on to senators for feedback. Katy stated that committee wants a document that we feel strongly about.
 - xiii) Currently, there were two conflicting statements on tenured faculty. Based on 4 areas but some flexibility. Which is it suppose to be? Tenure criteria is departmental. Department needs to develop criteria. Katy will try to clarify this.
- d) Brad stated that outside of standards, department decides tenure. All four areas of evaluation are departmental criteria. Katy stated that committee is making an effort to clean this conflicting section up. Katy will put something in and we can change it.
- e) Any Questions for Katy?

- i) Lynn...boyer model. We need more detail on how the committee will be formed. Representative faculty member, etc. Boyer or the other. What other models are expected and what criteria?
 - (a) So far, wide open. They want to allow latitude for each department. Boyer does not answer a lot of questions...just a structure. Faculty will understand what tenurable criteria for their discipline is expectable. They want to see that word (boyer).
 - Alan stated that deans have given us a chance to work together and make this policy better. We would like to get into it in January. But we want to do this right so time is not an issue. Send Katy as much input as possible. Katy would love comments.
 - Steve told senators to go to their faculty and see if there is anything they want changed in the current policy.
- ii) Service what more do you want? Four committees on average.
- iii) Adding exceptional.
 - (1) Provost ideas in terms of post tenure. We suffer from salary compression. There is not mechanism for review. Every five years there is an opportunity for base salary increases and merit money. There has got to be a more transparent way. Put it through LRT process and let colleges have a say. There should be some incentive. There should be a consistent view on what is exceptional. Anytime you distribute merit money there is a risk. There should be some mechanism.
 - (2) Katy is putting in policy that there should be criteria.
 - (3) Andy stated that in one of his faculty meetings a faculty member stated we all seek excellence...we already are excellent. Exceptional could create competition. Will there be acceptance every year?
 - (a) Is it unrealistic to assume we all perform the same? Adding exceptional does put pressure on department chair. As long as everyone is aware of rules of the game (Alan). Katy has added that faculty must describe what activities they think they have done that could be considered exceptional.
 - (4) A senator asked about stating they meet the standard. We need another level. Katy told us to think about changing the language.
- f) Alan stated that Katy's committee is creating another version and they will highlight additions. New sections highlighted and commit on side to why.
- g) Alan reminded senators to talk to faculty tomorrow. Nicky will send new version today.

8) Other Business? No

9) Motion to Adjourn: Michael Ostrowsky, Lee Montgomery seconded.

