

Meeting Minutes – Seaver Faculty Association

Meeting Information

Date:	12/02/2015	Location:	Elkins
Time:	8:30 AM	Meeting Type:	Regularly scheduled
Called By:	Karen Martin, President	Note Taker:	Kindalee De Long, Secretary-Treasurer

Announcements

- Devotional: Regan Schaffer, honoring everyone
- Minutes from September meeting approved
- Treasurer's Report: Kindalee De Long, account balance is \$6,370

Agenda Items

1. Title: Payson Library Renovation

Presenter Mark Roosa, Dean of Libraries

Summary M. Roosa reports on plans to renovate Payson Library, with the goal of a 21st century library. Currently in the design phase, the project is based on research: gathering data, visiting libraries, talking to users on campus. The goals are to create more spaces to support learning, teaching, and research. They plan to made collections and new acquisitions more accessible. As the oldest building on campus, Payson also needs updates to basic infrastructure, plumbing, etc. M. Roosa shows schematics. The first floor will feature a more inviting entrance, more accessible elevator, reconfigured service center, digital media experience (a knowledge map of resources), offices of research librarians at the front, café in the corner to the right, high-speed hard-wired computers with quick access to electronic materials, formal reading area with ocean view, living room type study areas including fireplaces, and a sustainable preservation environment (pending funding from NEH proposal), reference collections, double the number of study rooms. The second floor will include academic center for excellence (ACE) (including Great Books rooms; ACE lab; new a math/science work space with 3D printers, data visualization, etc.; student success center, a new entrance from the second floor bridge, study rooms, special collection wing with reading room, digitization room, and surf board room, continuing as space for gatherings. During the closure, there will be three locations: lower campus hub, School of Law, Drescher. All materials and services (e.g., interlibrary loan) will be available. Ten percent of the collection will be housed on campus, with ninety percent in Calabasas, physically browsable if desired. Resources can be requested daily and will be received within a day. Some collections may stay in Calabasas after the renovation.

Discussion *Are the PLC classrooms being renovated?* Yes, but as part of the Seaver project to build more classrooms and office space. It will not be part of the library. *What about study space for students while the library is closed?* It is one of our key concerns. We would like such spaces to be near the librarians and on-

campus resources. Some will be at the Drescher campus library, all available to Seaver students as well as grad students. Plans are in process for the lower campus, including negotiation with all the various partners.

Will there be physical space in the new library for reserves, etc.? Yes, they just haven't gotten down to that level of detail in the design.

What about energy efficiency? It will be very close to LEED certification standards: few air exchanges, good insulation, new duct work, automatic shut offs for lights.

2. Title: Faculty Governance and SFA

Presenter Karen Martin, President

Summary K. Martin shares her vision for faculty governance. The SFA is collaborative, inclusive, and works together to solve problems. We have seen significant past successes. We now have a faculty development committee that uses faculty-developed criteria to award sabbaticals, which in the past were awarded by the dean. The faculty-led Seaver Research Committee now awards grants for faculty scholarship based on an open application process, whereas in the past faculty made requests one-on-one with the dean. Faculty award endowed chairs and professorships; RTP procedures have been clarified greatly, especially in last few years; only faculty now comprise the recently reorganized university tenure committee; parking issues have been addressed by SFA; university-level committees now include an elected Seaver representative (e.g., university planning, university tenure, university management, university housing). K. Martin is grateful to all who have worked hard for this progress, which is a big step for Seaver faculty and the university as a whole. Things are moving in a very positive direction. Members of every division have been involved in this process, and it's a powerful statement that Seaver faculty members care about the future of the university. K. Martin values collaborative leadership, while recognizing that we will not always agree. Her goals for the year are to increase faculty voice and collaborative efforts within the faculty.

3. Title: Visiting Faculty Proposal

Presenters Karen Martin, President (introduction); Ron Cox, Past President (proposal)

Summary Karen Martin: Visiting faculty comprise about one-fourth of the faculty at Seaver College. Currently, visiting faculty have one-year appointments, no set schedule for raises, and no steps in salary increase. Their concerns are employment security, titles that may not reflect the reality of their long-term employment, lack of review process, and no formal process for renewing contracts. The SFA launched a collaborative effort to address these concerns.

Ron Cox: All members of the SFA should have received a draft of the long-term visiting faculty proposal in September. The SFA collected feedback and made edits. A resolution went out by email on Monday morning. In the April 2014 SFA meeting, an earlier proposal was discussed. R. Cox and an ad hoc committee worked these comments into the proposal. They talked with dean of Seaver College and divisional deans. They sought to hold together competing tensions within the SFA, which includes both visiting faculty and tenure-track faculty, seeking to preserve the autonomy of the SFA and to ensure that all faculty are treated as they deserve. Our

thanks go to the many people who have worked hard on this proposal and all those who provided feedback/comments.

Discussion *Question: Visiting positions have 3/3 loads at aspirational schools. Is the teaching load not a concern?* That point has not come up in the discussions with long-term visiting faculty that have been going on since 2010. The significant feedback focused on salary.

Question: Does the new proposal incorporate lengthy feedback that was provided by divisions to the ad hoc committee? There were two specific proposals from divisions. The ad hoc committee looked closely at them but decided that the current proposal better addresses the issues in question. The SFA Executive Committee believes that some of the things proposed were significant but in terms of this proposal, addressing new issues would take us back to square one. It seems better to go forward with the current proposal, which better meets the three goals: titles, evaluation, and salary.

Comment: Providing salary raises without addressing the base salary, isn't going to solve the problem. If we present in the proposal that salaries for visiting appointment go up across the board, it would hold up the proposal. Rather than try to bundle the two issues, we've created another ad hoc committee to address the issue of base salary.

Question: Will the proposal address other issues, such as support for research, consideration for open tenure-track positions, and professional development? We are concerned not to create a de facto tenure-track process. Each track has different expectations with regard to research. We are taking care not to blur the distinction between tenure-track, visiting, or long-term appointments.

Question: This concern makes sense in regard to research, but visiting faculty members engage in service, assessment, and mentoring and they write letters of recommendation. Will that be part of the discussion? Yes, within the proposal, there is a directive to form a group to come up with guidelines for promotion of long-term visiting faculty, including what activities should be considered. Currently, there are differences across divisions, and the proposal seeks to make it more consistent across the college and to increase the voice of faculty in developing guidelines.

Comment: As a former long-term visiting faculty member, I support this proposal. Is it enough? No. There's a whole host of things that need to be addressed. Is it a great first step? Yes. It creates job security. I urge you to vote for it. I have confidence that it is a solid first step.

Decision The resolution will be submitted to the faculty for an electronic vote before the end of the year.

4. Title: Old Business

Presenter Karen Martin, President

Summary Changes to the Seaver Course Schedule: There has been plentiful opportunity for feedback on the schedule in forums, wiki, etc. The latest version (version 10) based on feedback that has been received so far is coming soon. The feedback process will continue next semester. Other old business?

Discussion *Comment: There was a motion on the floor in the previous meeting that was approved by the faculty present. However, after the meeting, the SFA*

leadership determined this vote to be invalid due to a lack of quorum because emeriti faculty are counted as voting members in the by-laws. I would like to bring forward the motion again if a quorum is present.

Decision 70 members are counted, which constitutes a quorum.

5. Title: New Business—Motion to vote on schedule

Presenter Maire Mullins, Professor of English

Summary Motion: The faculty have the right to vote on any change to the Seaver schedule.

Discussion Motion is seconded, and the vote is called.

Decision Motion is approved unanimously by voice vote.

6. Title: New Business—Forums, community page

Presenter Karen Martin, President

Summary K. Martin encourages faculty to attend the academic excellence forum and the diversity forums. There is a SFA community page on which announcements can be made. Motion to adjourn, seconded.