

**USU FACULTY FORUM
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 7, 2011
Taggart Student Center Auditorium**

The Faculty Forum is convened in lieu of the regularly scheduled November meeting of the Senate. This annual scheduled meeting of the Faculty Forum is open to all faculty members to attend and speak, with the exception of the President of the University, the Provost, the presidential appointees, deans and department heads, or the student members of the Senate, unless specifically requested by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum... Participants may discuss subjects of current interest, question and debate any policies and procedures, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate...The Faculty Forum Executive Committee sets the agenda for the November meeting...The agenda includes all items raised by the petition(s) of faculty, together with items deemed pertinent by the Executive Committee. (Code Section: 402.9.1 & .9.2)

The forum was called to order by Faculty Senate President Glenn McEvoy at 3:01 pm

Welcome and review of the outcomes of last year's forum discussion - Glenn McEvoy

Follow-up from Faculty Forum 2010:

- A Benefits Advisory Committee has been established to work with Dave Cowley and BrandE Faupell to obtain faculty input into benefits processes. It was important to have faculty involved at the beginning of the process rather than after discussions had already been held.
- Faculty Salaries. BFW produced a survey and published it in March of last year relating to faculty preferences for salary increases when and if any salary money became available. This information can be found on the faculty senate webpage.
- Dealing fairly with Promotion and Tenure at Regional campuses and USU-CEU. The concern is primarily from faculty who do not have role statements that are predominantly research. Much of last year's efforts in the Faculty Senate were devoted to revising the Code so that we could merge with our colleagues at USU-CEU. In that process we tried to change the Code related to external review letters, but that particular part of the change was set aside because it was controversial and needed more careful consideration. Work is currently being undertaken to redraft that part of the Code. Such a change will most likely have external reviewers look at teaching in addition to--or instead of--research for faculty whose role statements are predominantly teaching.

Forum Discussion Items:

- 1) How can the quinquennial post-tenure review process be made more effective? What possible rewards or consequences should be used in a revamped process?**

It was stated that there is a concern as to "What 5-year post-tenure review process?" How do we implement it and make sure it happens? In this particular college, the process has been suspended altogether. The concern is that the process is implemented unevenly around campus.

- 2) Should there be more faculty involvement in campus design and planning activities (e.g., new student recreation center, road 700 N., parking issues and concerns)?**

A statement was made in favor of more faculty involvement. There is currently a project to build a student recreation center on the west side of the HPER field. The project is being spearheaded by VP of Student Services and Campus Recreation. It is felt that the field is part of HPER's academic space. HPER would be losing over a quarter of their open space because of this project. Faculty are not opposed to the center, just the process which seemed to ignore faculty input. A question was asked about the nature of the committee and it was stated that it was the ARCC committee organized by the VP for Student Services and only one member was from HPER. It is not the overall Campus Planning Committee.

3) Should faculty be able to continue receiving extra compensation for overload teaching? Clarification of Human Resources policy on overload teaching.

According to the Provost, there are no new changes in overload policy. It is simply a commitment to implement policy that has been in existence for quite some time. Personnel Policy 376 says that no faculty can make more in overload compensation than 20% additional above the 12 month base, and that overloads should be provided on a temporary basis for things that come up from year to year that are outside the faculty member's primary role assignment.

A number of faculty and administrators from RCDE have been told that as of July, 2012 there will be no extra service compensation beyond the annualized salary. Clarification is needed regarding this policy. Can individual units or colleges implement policies that restrict overload pay when it says in Code that overload is possible under certain circumstances (Policies 376 and 404.1.2)?

How do we determine what is overload? Is there any way to specify overload? In some parts of the university there are annual role assignments that are more specific in terms of how many credit hours and how many courses individual faculty will teach. Role assignments are negotiated with the department head. But one faculty member said s/he was new this year and taught 13 credits and was told by the department head that all were part of load.

There is concern about the timing of more assertive implementation of a policy that has been on the books for a long time. Why now, especially since there have been no raises in three years? Timing of this issue is in question. The Faculty Senate needs to address this.

Do role statements need to be reformulated? Role statements are now over five pages long but still lack specificity as to how much teaching is "in role" and how much is "out of role." Colleges may or may not implement an annual work plan. It is disconcerting when we are talking about overload when we don't have a definition of load. With current budget constraints we are limited in the amount extra compensation we can garner, but one of the immediate consequences of a cut back in personnel is that the workloads get spread over less people. We need to define loads and overloads. The Faculty Senate needs to investigate this with the Provost's Office.

We need to find out the number of individuals who are on extra compensation. This is going to cause some significant issues with faculty and morale, if we start to take away the only aspect of additional income that faculty has had over the last four years.

There is a problem when faculty have been recruited with the promise of overload and get on campus to find a new fervor to implement a policy that has been on the books for a long time and largely ignored.

This policy is being implemented in some colleges and departments very strictly and other colleges and departments haven't even heard about it. This policy should be implemented equally across the university.

4) How should faculty compensation be approached during hard economic times? How can faculty voice about compensation priorities be more effectively expressed? What is the role of BFW in these processes and are their recommendations followed?

No comment

5) How can we facilitate more effective integration of faculty on the Eastern campus with their home departments? (Similar issues may exist in parts of RCDE.)

It was suggested that faculty in RCDE be listed on the department websites.

USU-CEU is getting conflicting direction from department heads in Logan and administration at USU-CEU. For instance, the Logan department head says teach 9 credits and save some time for research, but the local administrators say all faculty at CEU teach 15 credits. And it is expected that the local administrators will be the primary drivers of annual performance evaluations. Faculty members are suffering from this. There needs to be consistent direction between USU-CEU and Logan.

Many departments have made great strides toward integration (e.g., broadcasting department meetings). There needs to be more communication between departments and USU-CEU.

6) Open forum for the discussion of other topics of your choice (e.g., the use of external review letters in P&T decisions when research is not the predominant faculty role; university wide purchase of important software such as TurnItIn, SPSS; communication between USU faculty and Board of Regents; the reduction in financial support for graduate assistants)

What is the role of RCDE broadcast and online classes that originate from the Logan Campus? Why does a broadcast class get paid differently than an online class? Some department heads are not interested in distance education as it is perceived that they do not get anything from it. The person said it was nice of the department head to let him/her teach a distance education class since s/he gets a little more money but the department doesn't get anything. The department head feels like distance education is freeloading since they aren't paying for any basic infrastructure resources (office, phone, computer etc.). How do we integrate the growing online component of classes and broadcast classes into people's role statements? Uniform pay structure was suggested. What benefits might departments receive from allowing faculty to teach distance education?

There is confusion that exists with graduate student compensation. It was suggested that we become more deliberate in our planning as to what we want to do, who we want to be and how we want to execute (relative to graduate education). We can't be talking about having international impact and give no break to international students. Many grants don't allow us to write tuition into the grant and some grants have funding caps. As we plan, what do we want from the graduate program, how do we want to do it, and how are we going to fund it? It was suggested that this is a good time to address this with a new person in the role of Dean of the School of Graduate Studies.

The meeting adjourned at 3:36 pm.