

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes

August 26, 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: Scott Abbot, David Knowlton, Wayne Hanewicz

Excused or Absent: Matthew Holland

- Call to order – 3:05 PM
- Approval of Minutes from April 8, 2014. Exec meeting. Minutes approved.
- SVPAA
 - Dr. Jeffery Olson, new Senior VP for Academic Affairs, provided an overview of his background.
 - Top priority is to take advantage of faculty expertise and involvement. Hope UVU's growth and flexibility makes it easier to work out models that will help create that voice and make it effective.
 - Draper feels faculty has no voice because of policy. Would like Olson to share information and reach out to faculty across campus and provide specific examples on what was done with the information or concerns faculty provided. Faculty wants feedback. Olson reported that communication needs to be better and we need to identify ways to create that awareness. He also wants to continue the open forums so he hears directly from the faculty. Abbott feels that the structure does not allow for the open dialogue. Olson shared that he is examining the process and how to improve communication.
 - Bracken concerned about funds getting to the dean's office, but not down to the departments. Also, too much bureaucracy creates problems and chairs feel their workload is increasing and they are not seeing the benefits. Olson responded by noting that through acute equity AA is trying to get more funds down to the department level. He reported his research has been the economics of universities. He noted that AA is reexamining their structure and seeking ways to make it more efficient. Bracken asked if a Provost model is something UVU should be investigating. Olson indicated it is too early to comment on the model.
 - Olson asked for the Executive Committee's approval for his intern to attend meetings periodically. Approved.
- UVUSA
 - Mallory Wallin is the VP of the Academic Senate for Student Government. She reported that students conduct approximately 18 surveys per academic year. She noted that if the Faculty Senate would like any opinions or surveys to let her know. The student

samples come from social media, hallways, classrooms, or maybe specific to student's majors. Please provide suggestions for survey improvement.

- Speakers
 - Some of the proposed speakers for this academic year are Kyle Beckerman for the 9/11 Commemoration Event and Makgatho Mandela.
 - Please submit any speaker recommendations to Mallory.
- Some of the senators asked that student government not forget outlying campuses.
- Student government will work on disseminating information in more areas.
- Integrated Studies Hiring Concern
 - Connelly noted that part of the function of the Executive Committee is to vet issues that will be taken to Faculty Senate.
 - Hanewicz is looking to the Faculty Senate for guidance and advice on the hiring of a lecturer. Important for them because they are a small department. Each student is required to work across at least two disciplines and writing is central to the program for theses. The challenge the department is facing is where should the hiring for a lecturer be made. They feel the decision should be made within the department. He wants to make it clear that every effort has been made to resolve the issue informally so the program can move forward and hire the individual desired.
 - Person of concern is Scott Carrier. Problem is that he was on tenure track in the Communications department and was denied tenure in that department and given a terminal year. Integrated Studies (IS) did a search for a Lecturer and Carrier was the search committee's top pick. Yells' supported IS decision to hire Carrier even though he voted to not tenure Carrier previously. Ian Wilson declined to approve the hire based on policy. IS appealed the decision and Abbott asserted that Kat Brown and others provided additional information as to why Carrier should not be hired based on certain information stated in his book.
 - Knowlton noted the issue was already being a little conflictive prior to attending this meeting. He also commended AA for keeping the doors open. Question posed to him is about academic freedom and the admissibility of a faculty member's writings in decision making. One concern is which policy should be governing this issue when a faculty member is denied tenure in one department, but another department wants to hire the individual. He feels that Policy 637 should govern but is ambiguous. Policy 637.4.1.4 states that tenure is to a specific department and not to an individual. AA focuses on a statement that when an individual is denied tenure, the department gives a terminal year and cannot rehire them. Another issue of concern is in not obtaining specific reasons for not rehiring Carrier from AA. This leads to the question of who should determine who gets hired which then leads to another question of the approval process. UVU policy is not 100% clear, but feels the primary right should be with the department. Knowlton wants to argue that there needs to be specific, precise determinations of what constitutes an appropriate hiring process and the need to be able to know that it follows policy. We need to be sure AA is adhering to policy. Three reasons for closer examination are: 1) 637 should be read more closely and carefully by the SVPAA office,

2) the process of dealing with such issues such as hiring someone that was previously denied tenure, and 3) what constitutes appropriate action by the SVPAA.

- Bracken noted there is an appeals process; can that process be used to deal with a denial of hire? Hanewicz reported that Yells did support the Communication department's denial, but noted that he did make comments to support his hire within other departments at the university.
- Potter's interpretation of policy between 632 and 637 feels there is tension between the two. He feels that tenure denial is tied to one specific department. He provided an example of one individual that has two PhDs and is denied tenure in one, but is stellar in another discipline it would be foolish to not hire them in another department.
- Bracken provided an example that there might be some circumstances that justifies individuals not being hired.
- Knowlton feels that academic freedom takes precedence in the classroom. We need to define "detrimental." Second, he feels that a tenure decision in one department is not necessarily relevant in another department. Feels that Policy 632 indicates that the hiring decision should be left up to the department.
- Bracken noted that if there is reluctance at what point should information be disclosed?
- Abbott noted that if there are additional reasons for not hiring an individual, the hiring committee needs that information.
- Hanewicz noted that the search committee made no judgment about the tenure decision in the other department. The committee did examine his SRIs and they showed a pattern that they started as mediocre and got better. The committee did not ask anyone in Communications as to why he did not get tenured. They did ask the candidate questions about why he wanted to come back to UVU, do you like teaching, etc.
- Potter feels this issue is bigger than Scott Carrier. Decisions made now are important. Point is that one of the principles of shared governance means that decisions that should be handled in the department are really handled in the department.
- Connelly shared that the hiring process should be a funnel as the process progresses.
- Knowlton feels there needs to be constraints and limits on all areas.
- Anderson noted two separate issues: 1) how do we bridge the divide and 2) the broader question of what are the limits at each level? Recommend creating an ad hoc committee to examine the issue.
- Jeff Olson noted he agrees pretty much with everything that has been said. The decision is really primarily over the concept of tenure and what does it mean. It really is a question of how the policy is interpreted. Does the relationship end with the university or does it end with the department. Jeff noted that tenure information is confidential and should not be litigated. He agrees that appointment has to come out of faculty because they have the expertise. Knowlton wrote a really good analysis on the blog.
- Abbott questions why would administration risk and undermine the department decisions? He referred to two departments (Exercise Science and English) for breaching policy.

- Potter noted that one issue is the policy is not clear. The second issue is how this issue should be handled.
 - Knowlton argued that policy is important for academic freedom and for legal reasons. Agrees with the statement Jeff made about tenure and is written in UVU's policies. We are governed by the policies as they are not as we wish they are.
 - Clay Brown noted two shared governance issues 1) faculty member speaking mind and 2) hiring committee.
 - Hanewicz noted that collaboration across disciplines is important and that Dennis' example was important. Important about how the process to resolve this issue matters. Need to ask what do we want it to mean in the best interests of the university, departments, etc.? If we rustle too much about what it says rather than what we want it to mean, we need to be careful we don't lose sight of what we want to accomplish.
 - Chan noted that faculty needs to follow policy.
 - Anderson brought up Regent's Policy R481 regarding "substantial reduction in status" which he interprets as dropping from a tenure track position to a lecturer position even if it happens before the year of termination. Olson said he would review the policy.
 - Connelly proposed discussion of two issues: 1) specifics of case and reconsideration and 2) interpretation of policy. Proposal is that we get a fairly precise conversation of basics to provide overview. Then lay out grounds of why denial was made. Need to keep the focus on interpretation of policy and let the senate make their recommendation. To avoid a bigger conversation, he proposed creating an ad hoc committee with a specific charge to examine what needs to happen to clarify the position of a department and university.
 - Measom proposed that Integrated Services present/propose the resolution to Senate. Connelly noted that the resolution needs a response timeframe.
 - Executive Committee feels there needs to be a limit on the discussion. Jon Anderson will motion after Integrated Studies has made their presentation.
 - Thulin apologized for being late and noted that he will be late every week due to teaching schedule.
- There are a few other items on the agenda that will be postponed.
 - Adjourned at 4:55 pm