**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

September 9, 2014

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Jon Anderson, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown,Kat Brown, Leo Chan, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Matt Draper, Doug Gardner, Ryan Leick, Gary Measom, Dennis Potter, Craig Thulin, Mallory Wallin

***Visitors***: David Knowlton, Wayne Hanewicz

***Excused or Absent***: Matthew Holland

* Call to order – 3:03 PM
* Approval of Minutes from August 26, 2014. Exec meeting. Minutes approved.
* UVUSA
	+ UVUSA is hosting a 9/11 commemoration event from Noon to 1:00 pm in the Pope Science Courtyard. President Holland will be speaking.
	+ Student Voice – This is UVUSAs way of branding student feedback. A website has been created to get the word out. Student Government plans to conduct 15-18 surveys every semester ranging from departments, schools/colleges, and university-wide. They are currently working on one on the bookstore.
* SVPAA
	+ Founders Day Celebration is Wednesday, September 10 from 3:00-5:00 p.m. in the SLWC Courtyard.
	+ Discussing with Connelly on ways to improve faculty voice within the university and to communicate more effectively.
	+ Acute Equity requests are under discussion. Bracken expressed that science lab fees are much higher than other USHE institutions. He will follow up with Fairbanks to determine if a request is on the list to address this issue.
	+ PBA sessions will be held based on the following schedule:
		- September 24, 1:00-5:00 p.m., SC 206abc (Phase I, Areas of Focus 1-3)
		- October 2, 1:00-4:00 p.m., SC 206abc (Phase I, Area of Focus 4)
		- November 18, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, SC 206abc (Phase II, Areas of Focus 1-3)
		- November 19, 9:00-11:00 a.m., SC 206abc (Phase II, Area of Focus 4)
		- November 19, 1:00-5:00 p.m., SC 206abc (President; University Relations; Development & Alumni; Student Affairs; Planning, Budget & HR)
		- November 20, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SC 206abc (Finance & Administration)
		- December 2, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, SC 206abc (Academic Affairs)
		- December 3, 1:00-4:00 p.m., LI 120 (Academic Affairs)
		- December 9, 10:30 a.m. – Noon, SC 206abc (Post PBA Conversations)
	+ Connelly encouraged faculty to attend PBA discussions. The more faculty that attend demonstrates interest and dedication to the university and provides the opportunity for faculty to hear reasoning and justification.
	+ It was recommended that Faculty Senate send out an email the week prior to discussions.
* Integrated Studies Resolution
	+ Connelly reviewed his assessment (handout) of the process and resolution
		- Due Process
			* Regents Policy 120.3.3 refers to the President of the University having final say for hiring.
		- Previous Hires – provided data on the number of faculty members denied tenure and then not being rehired as a non-Tenure Track faculty member. Potter asked for Policy 637.5.6.8 for “terminal year” language. Jeff noted the context is the AAUP 1940 statement. Need to include mid-term data.
		- Where does tenure reside?
	+ Potter recommended rewriting the ambiguity in the policy regarding the “terminal” year and “rehire” of terminated faculty; however, an alternative is adding a memo of interpretation of policy.
	+ Knowlton commented on the language of AAUP. He feels it is problematic in regards to continuity. He inquired if Carrier’s case is a possible third category. He believes AAUP is not closing the door, but leaving it open for continuity issues. What constitutes continuous employment or a break or leave? Knowlton noted that in this case he believes it is referring to contractual continuity. He notes that this is a good thing as it opens other ways to approach the issue. Bracken asked if Knowlton is defining “contractual continuity” as to him the contract is with the university. Knowlton indicated it is to the university, but you can also break and start a new contract with the university that is not continuous, but he is not an attorney. Connelly wants Senate to consider the conversation to sit at that level. Jeff noted that his review of the statement refers to the “institution” and he needs to review for “continuity” interpretation.
	+ Connelly asked for clarification that is if everyone is in agreement that if a faculty member was denied tenure in department X, they are not eligible for rehire in department X. Knowlton noted that UVU does not have a hiring policy in place, so we are using the tenure policy to provide context for rehire when denied tenure. Olson reiterated that this is an issue.
	+ Knowlton noted that the real threat to tenure and academic freedom is not about hiring Carrier, but adjuncts.
	+ Hanewicz noted people will differ on interpretation of policy. Need to make a decision and live with the consequences good and bad. If this is a mistake via interpretation of policy okay and let’s deal with it, but not at the expense of the students.
	+ Chan commented that he feels the hiring decisions should stay with the departments. Department Chairs make the decisions when hiring an adjunct instructor and while he might not like the decision for his own reasons, he will live with it. However, if a department decides to hire that adjunct into a tenure track position, he would have a problem with it.
	+ Hanewicz noted that if Carrier is not approved, then the responsibility will fall back on department faculty that is already carrying a full load.
	+ Olson noted that Wilson was consistent in his denials of faculty that were denied tenure and not approved to be rehired for a non-tenure track position.
	+ Knowlton wants to know what the obligation is of the SVPAA. What are the costs of not hiring Carrier? One cost is change around the culture of the departments with decision making and limits the grounds.
	+ Gardner noted that many issues are pushed down to Department Chairs to make the nasty decisions. He believes departments need to be validated based the discussions that have been brought forth in Faculty Senate.
	+ Brown noted that Wilson tasked her with interviewing candidates, but she felt it was never her position to approve or deny any candidates and now try and throw out all of those interviews over the last several years because we are in a new era of tyranny in problematic.
	+ Connelly noted last portion of resolution was highly problematic. Two responses for senate in regards to third category in terms of policy and then a resolution constructed that senate can vote up or down either to grant Carrier or deny Carrier. Policy should have been interpreted in such a way as to hire or not hire Carrier. Then have larger conversation. Olson expressed concern on how we handle it and recommends against a resolution mentioning Carrier name. Keep it abstract. Hanewicz is concerned that maybe we really don’t need a resolution and asked Olson if he has reconsidered his position. Olson would not commit to a decision right now, but noted it is highly unlikely he will change his mind based on policy, but is mindful of the 20 students currently enrolled.
	+ Knowlton felt the resolution was to request a reconsideration which has not been demonstrated.
	+ It was recommended that language be added to Connelly’s review of the resolution that the voice of the departments needs to be respected.
	+ The Executive Committee did not recommend a new resolution.
* Salaita Case Resolution will be added to the agenda for senate discussion.
* Field Trips and Guns – Kat Brown has spoken with Val Peterson and Robin Ebmeyer regarding the issue. Connelly asked her for a write up on the issue.
* Linda Makin will provide update on key issues at the next senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.