**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

October 7, 2014

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Jon Anderson, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown,Kat Brown, Leo Chan, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Doug Gardner, Ryan Leick, Jeff Olson, Dennis Potter, Craig Thulin

***Excused or Absent:*** Matthew Draper, Matthew Holland, Gary Measom, Mallory Wallin

* Call to order – 3:03 PM
* Approval of Minutes from September 23, 2014. Exec meeting. Minutes approved.

Policy Updates

* Brown discussed the annual review form with the Associate Deans and noted it does not have to be passed before the Annual Review policy, but wants to get the non-negotiables addressed. Wants the form vetted by faculty and plans to have the Executive Committee review it in two weeks. Brown also wants the Faculty Senate discussion to focus on what should go into an Annual Review form. Kat intends for each department to specify their requirements, but will fit into the boxes in different ways. Would like the Executive Committee discussion first prior to presentation at senate.
* Brown has provided Jeff Olson the Annual Review and Post-Tenure policies in preparation for Faculty Senate to begin working on them. Textbook policy coming soon. Discipline policy will be separated out into the following policies: Sanction for Cause, Retirement Policy, and Financial Exigency. These should be coming sometime this semester.

SVPAA

* Olson expressed gratitude for the Acute Equity exercise. He is feeding it into several processes such as the President and the Academic Affairs Council to review the ideas. Acute Equity cannot be used to address salary inequities. Brown referred Anderson to Judy Martindale in HR to discuss this issue further. Connelly will make a CUPA salary request from HR and distribute to the Executive Committee.

Policy 635 – Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities

* After resolution of the Carrier situation an ad hoc committee was formed. Committee met last week and made three suggestions which all dealt with 4.6.1. 1) Add language such as “President **or appropriate academic officers,**” 2) “communicated **in written form**,” and add sentence such as 3) “**A meeting may be requested by the unit for purposes of clarification and discussion of the adverse decision if desired.**” The committee proposed having some guidelines in regards to conditions of faculty hiring in order to lay framework around the policy.
* It was recommended the policy be opened as limited scope before President’s Council. Need to think politically and strategically about what revisions we will be proposing. Anderson felt that having some of these criteria spelled out would expedite the process and not do harm to student success.
* Potter noted that part of a previous discussion was to revise the portion of the tenure policy in such a way that would allow an individual to be hired into a different department from the one they were denied tenure. Connelly noted that maybe it could be included in the guidelines and not policy.
* Anderson recommended the first part be put on the agenda for limited scope. Ask President’s Council for approval to begin drafting the guidelines as part of the package. Brown noted that the changes are to get less personality involved.
* Connelly will draft.

Policy 648 – Faculty Separation Due to Institutional Reasons

* Connelly reported that a faculty member has received notification of termination for cause. This results in a Due Process committee being formed. The individual has not made the request to date. There is an initial meeting that can be held to seek informal resolution. The faculty member will have three options: 1) resign, 2) due process hearing, 3) default to not doing anything and the termination would stand. If that does not bring resolve, there will be a pre-hearing.
* Recommendation of a seven- person committee and the need to select a chair. An un-tenured individual could be on the committee, but not serve as chair. Olson recommended someone who has some experience with due process and can be objective. The Executive Committee selects the due process committee.
* Doug Gardner would like to volunteer to serve on the committee.
* Chair recommendations: Gary Measom, Marcus Vincent, Cheryl Hanewicz, Chuck Allison. Think about the individuals for chair and possible committee members. The Executive Committee agreed on a seven to nine member committee made up of tenured faculty.
* Recommend reading Policy 648 for information.

Acute Equity Exercise

* Olson feels faculty still have a voice and would like them to submit their strategic ideas so UVU can make the best use of the acute equity funds. Connelly feels a discussion is beneficial to see if anything has germinated since receiving the exercise results.
* Gardner asked if the innovation models of Kyle Reyes and Luke Peterson are the models of innovation the President is seeking. Connelly noted that Faculty Senate is a conduit to develop innovation and to not rely on the models of Reyes and Peterson.
* Resend Connelly the focus area worksheet.
* In discussion, need to provide examples of what was funded and why it was funded. Identify items that did not fit into an area of focus.
* Gardner provided the example of Learning Communities as an Area of Focus 3. Connelly noted that the ideas need to show how a difference will be made for students and fundamentally alter our structure.
* Anderson responded to Potter’s complaint about IT problems by noting that Ray Walker intends to ask for more PBA requests to address wireless, teaching technology, and technicians.
* Dylan Swarts, Senator from WSB, concurred that faculty are late to classes due to shut down and start up for computer equipment. Kat Brown noted that equipment life currently is a seven-year cycle due to cost constraints.
* Chan asked how much of the operational side is really a legacy problem. For example, a few years ago the Faculty Senate voted to get rid of the Testing Center. Brown noted that the cost for lock down would be $8.75 per exam while we charge $2.78. Connelly responded that the Faculty Senate conversation did spur a new model for the Testing Center.
* Chan asked how much of procedural things are to keep long-term employees around. He feels we are wasting so many resources. Bracken responded that CSH have a lot of faculty that are well over retirement age, but UVU does not incentivize retirement. Connelly noted that part of the problem is a cultural issue. When we switched to university status it created a model.
* Connelly would like to throw out to the group inquiring about the one thing in your department that could change retention? He will craft out.

Curriculum

* Leick/Connelly met with Maureen Andrade last week in regards to the curriculum committee. Two key points: 1) We are way out of policy and 2) the policy is really old. Senate will propose to open policy for revision. The place where the curriculum committee is not functioning is at the college level. Too much stuff is getting to the university level and they have to address editing, etc. This opens the larger issue of service. If faculty wants ownership of the curriculum, they will need to participate on the committees. It is incumbent on the Faculty Senate to make some statement to reaffirm a position that part of a faculty member’s responsibility is service. Olson responded that we are already at 31,000 and are the largest in the state. We have fewer degree programs for our size. Faculty is responsible for the programs and the work involved to be sure we have a viable curriculum.
* Several Executive Committee members feel that service needs to be incentivized and workload needs to be reduced for faculty to serve. Connelly noted that if we are going to take service seriously, we should address curriculum. Potter responded that workloads need to be dropped. Connelly reminded the Executive Committee that the culture also needs to change as there are many faculty members that have gotten away with doing very little service.
* Anderson asked what we can do to incentivize in order to put our money where our mouth is. Potter noted that it could be awarded in rank or merit. He also felt that part of the curriculum committee problem can be solved by convincing department faculty how bad the curriculum committee composition really is. Gardner noted that more administrative help would help alleviate some of the work to allow faculty to remain in the classroom. Connelly said there needs to be a discussion about what really constitutes a faculty member as stated in the tenure policy and rights and responsibilities of a faculty member.
* Will bring proposal up to open the curriculum policy.
* The current curriculum committee has been appointed by deans who have been hand-picked that have had faculty rank. Day-to-day operations have been done by staff members.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm