

Faculty Senate
Agenda 3/11

Attending: Joshua Aaron, Jeremy Aber, Rafet Al-Tobasei, Larry Burriss, Lando Carter, Leigh Anne Clark, Roberta Chevrette, Douglas Dabbs, Elizabeth Dalton, Laura Dubek, Michael Federici, Samantha Johnson, Kristi Julian, Rachel Kirk, Francis Koti, Phil Loubere, Patrick McCarthy, Janna McClain, Richard Meeks, Lei Miao, Kay Murphree, Kari Neely, David Nelson, Suman Neupane, John Ouellette, Shannon Randol, James Robertson, Robert Rogers, Jim Rost, Dianna Rust, Philip Seagraves, Raj Srivastava, Suzanne Sutherland, Shannon Hodge, Sam Zaza, Carmelita Dotson, Kyle Kennedy, Keely O'Brien, Patrick Richey, Andrea Georgiou, Preston MacDougall, Jim Rost, Sam Zaza, Martha Norkunas, Lisa Green, Jeannie Harrington, Kyle Kennedy, Preston MacDougall, Joseph Morgan, Timothy Nelson, Sharon Parente

Absent: Jacob Avila, Carmelita Dotson, Andrea Georgiou, Jack Purcell, Joan McRae, Stephen Salter

Kari called the meeting to order at 3:31pm and gave the President's report.

1. Approval of Minutes
2. President's Report – to include survey information
 - a. Incentive committee has met and will wrap up in June
 - b. Good meeting with SGA. May set up a way to work together more in the future, perhaps including a faculty mentoring an SGA member.
 - c. Workload Survey – getting the word out. We need a high response rate. Please ask your departments to complete the survey.
 - d. AI survey – will be released after the workload survey.
3. Reorganization Resolution
 - a. Sam Zaza motioned and Martha Norkunas seconded to bring the resolution to the floor.
 - b. The 5th WHEREAS needs to be moved to the 3rd position.
 - c. 38 voted in favor, 0 opposed.
4. Sustainability Resolution
 - a. Jeremy described the resolution. Over 80% of our peers have a dedicated office of sustainability.
 - b. Sam Zaza motioned and Leigh Anne Clark seconded to bring the resolution to the floor.
 - c. Question asked about the administrative opposition. Jeremy explained that administration has acknowledged that we have a weakness here and should address it in some way.
 - d. SGA is supportive of the resolution.

- e. Questioned asked about the “external hire” language. Does it have to be external? Jeremy responded not necessarily, but we don’t believe the ideal candidate is on campus.
 - f. Comment that Arizona State has the #1 ranked sustainability program. So this could become a recruitment tool.
 - g. 38 voted in favor. 0 opposed.
5. Trustee’s Report (Mary Martin)
- a. February 27 committee meetings. Next meeting is March 19.
 - b. Board is conducting their self evaluation.
 - c. Question was asked about the program reviews. THEC has asked for reviews of low producing programs for years. The legislature is currently discussing the role of THEC. Are LGIs going to control themselves? When they are marked as low enrollment, you get 5 years to show appreciable change in the trajectory. Comment about Mary’s explanation to the Board about how little cost savings is gained from cutting programs. Mary mentioned designing internally as majors with several focus areas helps avoid being marked as low producing.
 - d. Is dance in danger? It is “being looked at” but they are doing OK right now.
 - e. The other two programs are Religious Studies and Fermentation Science.
 - f. What counts as low producing? It is a fluid number. It varies in terms of programs.
 - g. Does THEC consider minors? Their focus is on the BS and BA, not particular focus areas and/or minors.
 - h. Mary suggested the Senate ask to see the THEC guidelines.
6. Committee Reports
7. Senate representation of non-tenurable faculty
- a. Should we invite the FTTs to Senate? Either as members or observers.
 - b. Comment was made to form a committee to get FTT involved.
 - c. Can we even do this if we want? Is it classified as service for them?
 - d. It would be difficult to get them a course release and if we allow volunteers to participate, perhaps it become the expectation.
 - e. Michael Federici moved and Laura Dubek seconded a motion to move this to a committee to discuss and report back to us. The motion passed unanimously.
8. Incentive Pay discussion
- a. Comment that one set of metrics for all employees is not ideal. Kari stated faculty and staff will have different metrics as well as differences among departments.
 - b. We need transparency.
 - c. Question about how many/few should be awarded incentive compensation. That is not decided yet.
 - d. Need to be able to “tell our own story.”
 - e. Flexibility in what you receive. Travel funds, load reduction, salary, etc.
 - f. How long of a time span are we evaluating? One year, more, an entire career. Kari said ideally it is one year, but finding sustaining money is a problem.
 - g. What is the criteria? We don’t sell widgets.

- h. There is some confusion within the university. Celebrating the R2 status without the R2 support. What about the conversation about moving to R1?
 - i. The “recurring funds” argument is troubling. This money came from a bucket that could have gone elsewhere.
 - j. We should not rely on one evaluator (dept chair or dean).
 - k. There was a 2003 plan that was written but not implemented.
 - l. There is discussion about how to include FTT.
 - m. Will we reward the top 100 faculty across the board or give something to each department?
 - n. Should we present a Faculty Senate resolution?
 - o. Is this whole exercise worth the effort expended? Likely the answer is no. But we cannot do much to stop it.
 - p. Will a Faculty Senate resolution go to the Board?
 - q. When will the criteria be shared with the faculty? It will be in place by June.
 - r. The “incentive to stay” should be considered.
 - s. Whatever incentive structure we decide to use should not disincentivize.
 - t. What would be helpful to you (Kari) as a member of the committee? Opinions and vetting opportunities about nuances of the system.
 - u. Josh – we already have disincentives. It is called the market (equity) raises.
 - v. Michael suggested that we do nothing now but wait and react once we see the system in place.
 - w. Kari – the committee is open minded and working hard to work well within the parameters laid out by the Board.
 - x. Can we “opt” out?
9. FS Election information – nominations
- a. Kay Murphree of Nursing volunteered to join steering for the remainder of Spring 2024.
 - b. Michael Federici and Sam Zaza were nominated for President Elect.
 - c. No one volunteered for Recording Secretary.
10. New/Old business
- a. Why is the faculty longevity pay capped at \$3,000 for 30 years?
 - b. Patrick has the THEC definition of low producing programs.
 - c. The issue of student union costs continues to be problematic.
 - d. Dianna Rust secured student activity fee money to assist with some of her events but later found out that collaborating with other classes disqualified her from that money.
 - e. Lando Carter pursued the Middle Half but McPhee said he was not interested.
 - f. The faculty advocacy committee will meet on April 4.

Jeremy Aber moved and Raj Srivastava The meeting adjourned at 5:22pm.

