

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

1-11-2010

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, January 11, 2010

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, January 11, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 14.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/14

This Faculty Senate Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
JANUARY 11, 2010
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Ed Heath called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Mike Parent moved to the approved the minutes of November 30, 2009. Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Announcements

Roll Call. Senators, alternates and guests are reminded to sign the roll call sheet.

BFW/Faculty Input Regarding Furloughs - Doug Jackson-Smith. The BFW met with the President in December and discussed the issue of faculty playing a stronger role in budgetary decisions at the university, particularly in response to budget crises and the ways in which faculty views might be better represented. The BFW decided to move forward with discussions on furloughs even though it appears that it may not be an issue this year. BFW's process will include informing faculty about: what went into the furlough decisions last year, what other universities are doing, arguments for and against furloughs, and the structure of furloughs and how they are implemented. This document would then be disseminated to faculty as a starting point for discussion. As Faculty Senators you will be asked to become familiar with the information in the document and actively think of ways to get feedback from your colleagues and come back to the Senate prepared to have a discussion about this issue. The BFW will formulate a set of resolutions to structure the discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting. The Faculty Senate is an advisory body and should be prepared to bring forth their opinions and recommendations on this issue.

University Business – Provost Coward -- The President is in Seattle meeting with NWCCU.

Updates on three initiatives: First, the creation of the Caine College of the Arts. Last Friday the Board of Trustees approved this action and it will go to the Board of Regents this Friday. Second, the LAEP faculty was charged with deciding where administratively they would be best housed in the university. Third, the possible creation of a school for vocational and technical education; Gary Straquadine is chairing a committee with representatives from Engineering, Agriculture, and Education and Human Services. Ed Reeves is staffing the committee. They will explore this and make recommendations to the President.

The Provost opened the floor to questions regarding the President's letter about the budget. Question: Is there any more feedback about what legislative leaders are saying about the budget with respect to the university? Answer: There are two parts of the Governor's proposal that we are listening for feedback on. One is the 3% cut this year and whether the figure will go up. What we are currently hearing from legislative leadership is that until the second quarter figures are in and go to the Joint Economic Committee they simply will not know what will happen. The other part is the Governor's recommendation that higher education will be held harmless for the academic year 2010-11 so that the \$13 million cut might be delayed a year until July 1, 2011. The legislative leaders are not in disagreement with what the Governor is trying to achieve, but they don't buy his plan.

Within the next week to ten days there will be a large gift coming to the university. The announcement will be made after the Regents approve it. It will be the largest gift in the history of the university.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee has begun to look at 39 cases for promotion and tenure. Thirty-one are promotions from assistant to associate, 6 from associate to full, and 2 are promotions from lecturer to senior lecturer. The 31 cases from assistant to associate cover various categories, librarian, clinical, etc.

Enrollment, compared to day 1 last spring semester, is up 8%. Main campus has a 3% increase over what it was on day 15 of last year. The Regional Campuses are up 19.3%. Enrollments continue to be robust and strong; modestly on the Logan Campus but much stronger on the Regional Campuses, which is a pattern that we have seen for four consecutive years.

The Regents have approved the merger with CEU; it now must be passed by the Legislature. If approved, the merger will become effective July 1, 2010. CEU will be renamed Utah State University-College of Eastern Utah. This mirrors our Regional Campus names.

Information Items

Administrators Reviews – President Albrecht encourages faculty input on administrator reviews and a review schedule was included in the senator's agenda packet. Department Heads are evaluated every other year, however, interim or new department heads may not follow the schedule. All faculty members are surveyed for feedback on Department Head reviews, and approximately 84% of the faculty surveyed responded. A 360 degree performance evaluation is conducted on the Deans at least every 5 years. They are evaluated by some they report to, by other deans, by some under them, and input is also solicited from faculty. The number of faculty involved in the evaluation of deans is small compared to department heads.

Budget Advisory Committee Report – John Kras & Vince Wickwar. The committee was appointed almost two years ago. John was appointed as the Past President of the Faculty Senate; Vince came on in the third round as the President Elect. The committee is made up of 8 members; 2 faculty, 2 deans, Past President of the Professional Employee Association, and the Provost. The budget reduction process included presentations by the Vice Presidents and Deans which were evaluated on the basis of four criteria: 1) Did the cuts in one unit affect other units, 2) Make sure that the cuts did not have an impact on students, 3) See that the cuts might leave the unit in a position to advance well when the economy recovers, thus cuts were to be strategic, and 4) Each time there was a cut, there was also an investment fund created to strategically give money back to the units involved. The committee participated in 3 of 4 rounds of budget cuts. Question: "How was faculty represented, were they consulted?" John stated that they were not put on the committee to represent anybody; they were put on the committee to share their knowledge and insights on university processes. The deans and vice presidents had their own autonomy in formulating their budgets and there was a lot of variability across the university on how faculty members were involved in the budget reduction decisions. A lot of the confusion resulted from how the role of the Budget Reduction Committee was perceived. In some cases, the issue of faculty inclusion seems to be a department level issue and maybe a dean level issue. Question: Were the deans asked what kind of faculty involvement took place? Answer: There were lots of questions but it was not the committees place to micromanage their decisions. Question: What is the committee's future? Answer: The committee is not a permanent committee, we hope. But the committee is willing to serve additional time to maintain continuity. The President did address the role of the committee in his State of the University address. It was suggested that the role of the committee be communicated again.

Consent Agenda

Steve Burr moved to approved the consent agenda, seconded, motion carried.

Proposal to form Ad Hoc Committee – Code Compliance Committee

The issue of code compliance was discussed at the Faculty Forum and there were reports of instances where the code was not followed. The issue was taken from the forum to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and a proposal to create an ad hoc committee was brought forward to the Faculty

Senate. The Senate subsequently asked that the proposal be refined and now it is presented in its current form. Ed asked for a motion to have a consensus of the Faculty Senate to move the proposal forward. Vince Wickwar made the motion and Maria Cordero seconded the motion. Steve Burr asked if, because of the last sentence, if there needed to be a mechanism for review of the committee over time. Concern was expressed by Scott Cannon that the committee was being given authority to interpret the code. Discussion ensued and members were reminded that issues needed to come forward in such a way as to protect faculty confidentiality. Glen McEvoy said that the cases presented to the committee might bring insights that there are certain parts of the code that are ambiguous enough that rewrites will need come forward to the Senate. It was emphasized that the formation of this committee was to provide faculty with an informal way of dealing with inadvertent code problems so that issues could be resolved short of formal AFT Committee hearings. This process does not take power away from anyone but actually allows for guidance on an informal basis. It was decided that nothing needed to be added to the language of the proposal. In theory this proposal is good, in practice we will just have to see what happens. Doug Jackson-Smith called the question, a vote was taken and the motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.