

Minutes of ASU Faculty Senate

Minutes of March 28, 2008

Chairman Moore called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

I. Minutes:

The minutes from the February 15, 2008 were presented and approved.

II. OLD BUSINESS

Attorney General Textbook Royalty Opinion

Senator Segall motioned that the discussion regarding the attorney general's opinion begin. Sen. Grippo seconded. Moore explained the decision Attorney General Dustin McDaniel presented in a letter to Chancellor Potts. For the most part, if a faculty member chooses a text that s/he has authored, it is up to the faculty member's department committee to approve the decision and whether the faculty member has to turn over earned royalties to the university. It was suggested that the dollar amount from royalties at the author's institution will be so small that the funds would not amount to a significant increase in revenue.

Segall suggested that the attorney general's decision is one that is left open for interpretation. For example, in order to write a text, it is understood that a faculty member has to use resources beyond those supplied in his university work space. In other words, the individual has to use a home computer and office. For this reason, the royalties should not belong solely to the university.

Senator Bill Humphrey added that most textbook royalties would come from books sold elsewhere and not at the author's institution. He also suggested that the issue also will be an administrative one involving how to use the royalties.

Senator Humphrey motioned that the Senate support the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded and approved.

Salary Equity Adjustment Process

Senator Bill Rowe motioned to discuss the proposal about the latest changes in ASU's salary equity adjustment (SEA) review process. Senator Pradeep Mishra seconded the motion.

Rowe began the discussion by summarizing the proposal. A discussion followed describing how ASU's salary equity adjustment review process has evolved over the years.

A number of SEA facts and concerns were mentioned. It was stated that there is roughly \$70,000 in the budget for the salary equity adjustment cases. Because some departments and

programs have differential tuition, they have the ability to raise more funds for SEA purposes. This is not the case for other departments and programs.

Senator Rowe pointed out that while the Senate does not have control of the amount in the equity fund, it can still fight for changes to be made in the rules on how the funds should be rewarded.

Senator Amy Claxton suggested that the equity formula should be run every year, and that faculty should not have to request that it be run. Doing so would let the Board know how much should be in the fund.

Sen. Rowe motioned that the proposal be approved. Senator Humphrey seconded the motion. Sen. Freer suggested that the language in the proposal be adjusted to reflect the Senate's suggestion that the Board and administration run the SER formula on their own. Chairman Moore cautioned that it is more likely that the Senate would have to submit a request to have this done rather than leave it up to an outside party to do willingly.

Federal Student Aid Regulations Manual

Chairman Moore asked for specific concerns that should be reflected in the policy that was presented in writing. A great deal of discussion ensued. Several senators expressed concern that the proposal was ambiguous and unclear.

A vote was taken on whether to support the policy. Thirteen (13) people voted yes. Still, more questions and discussion followed. Senator Win Bridges explained that the vote could be rescinded with a two-thirds vote. Sen. Freer motioned that we rescind the vote. For the most part, Senate members concluded that we had so many unanswered questions about the interpretation of the proposed policy that we need someone to come to a future Senate meeting to address some of the questions. When this is done, we will be in a better position to vote on the proposal.

Sen. Claxton suggested that even if the vote is rescinded, the Senate would still need to have someone come and explain what the proposal really means. Sen. Bridges clarified that by rescinding our vote, we could send the proposal back without the decision or vote made today (3/28/08).

Chairman Moore asked for a vote to rescind the previous vote. The poll did not yield a two-thirds majority in favor of rescinding the vote. So it was concluded that we would send over our previous decision from 3/28/08 to support the policy but that we still would seek out a representative to come to the next Senate meeting to address lingering questions about the policy.

Civil Rights Timeline

Chairman Moore opened the discussion by explaining the Civil Rights Timeline proposal. Several points were made concerning this proposal, some of which had nothing to do with the proposal being discussed. Senator Bill Humphrey pointed out that the only thing being asked

was for ASU to get in compliance with the Civil Rights Office by adjusting the handbook language on pages 35-36 of the Faculty Handbook. For example, some parts of the section on sexual harrasment uses the term "calendar days" while other parts use the term "working days". As such the handbook lacks consistency. Humphrey stressed that the handbook should use the term "business days" and not "calendar days" or "working days."

Senator Humphrey made a motion to approve the proposed revisions on pages 35-26 of the faculty handbook to bring ASU into compliance with the Civil Rights Office. Senator Grippo offered a friendly amendment to change the term "calendar days" to "business days" throughout the document. The Senate voted unanimously in favor of approving the document with the suggested changes in language.

Announcements

1. One person, Dr. Beverly Boals, has expressed interest in running for president of the Faculty Association.
2. Chairman Moore announced that senators whose terms are expiring need to have their replacements in place by the third Friday in April.
3. Moore announced that the Senate might be asked to discuss the issue of vesting for ASU employees at the next meeting.
4. The issue of when to schedule the 2009 spring break might be on the agenda again at the next meeting.
5. Senator Humphrey (**or was it Bill Rowe???**) suggested that we need to discuss the definition of a faculty member vs. an administrator. Some administrators sit on PRT Committees. He explained that there should be a clear definition of who's a faculty member. Where do you draw the line?

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Submitted by Lillie M. Fears, acting secretary.