I. Review and approval of minutes

Sven began meeting. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December and January meetings. A motion was made. It was seconded and then approved.

II. Reapportionment of the University Faculty Senate
A. Please refer to the 1/26/16 UFS meeting agenda and minutes to review proposals, and note that there has been one additional proposal, which is to not take any action at the present time with regard to reapportionment of the UFS.

Sven said that the co-chairs wanted to make sure there was still equal representation after the creation of CoPA. After a lot of discussion about UFS representation at the last meeting the co-chairs felt that it might be better to just take no action at this time. The discussion isn’t being revoted altogether but it is not clear about its urgency.

Discussion:
Frank asked why the co-chairs felt that no action should be taken. Sven replied that there are more pressing issues at hand, specifically remuneration issues. And that reapportionment has been dealt with before. Elaine S. wanted to know if do nothing now how would that effect the elections. She proposed that formal arguments should be made at the next in order to come to a decision. A question was asked about the expectation of the bylaws, if things needed to be handled now. Frank said the language used was “reasonable” in regard to the amount of time to make adjustments. David didn’t feel like they should permanently table it but agreed that there were bigger issues at hand like remuneration. The three proposals for reapportionment were Barry’s (equal numbers), Craig’s (equal numbers and then additional by FTE), and Sven’s (take no action). Frank said that following Sven’s proposal would mean that the bylaws stand, but the numbers for Lang and Parsons would change slightly. One senator suggested that part of the discussion should be how the UFS gains more strength through its representation. Frank corrected himself by saying that the the numbers could stand as they were according to the bylaws.

Richard said that in his experience the UFS acted like a whole. He liked Craig’s proposal because it takes into consideration how small schools are effected. David felt that with remuneration it might be easier to get more PTF to serve which would help small schools fill the seats. Sven reminded everyone that the president and the PO see the UFS as its main way of communicating with FTF, since PTF have the union. One senator pointed out that was why the FT fall affairs committee was created so it shouldn’t effect the composition of the PTF and FTF. Erin said that she has been on the senate for a while and never encountered an issue with any college being aggressive about their own agenda. Christian said that in order to succeed the UFS needed man power and heterogeny and he felt that Sven’s proposal met those requirements. Barry said that after discussing he is leaning toward Craig’s proposal and he pulled his proposal from the table. A motion was made to vote. The motion was seconded and approved. A vote was taken between Craig’s proposal and Sven’s suggestion. 24 voted in favor. 1 abstained. Craig’s proposal passed. This change will need to be approved by the BoT.

III. Renumeration for Service
A. Part-time faculty additional pay scale based on current contractual agreements (Additional Duties), based on 18 hours per year for service (12 hours for UFS meetings and 6 hours for committee meetings)

B. Full-time faculty receive release from all other divisional university service, with the exception of standard faculty review committees.
C. Co-chairs receive a course release or equivalent pay, and service release, with the exception of standard faculty review committees.

Discussion:
Craig wondered if these proposals were from the chairs. Sven said there were. Craig supported the proposal. Jennifer felt that in practice releasing FTF from duties will be really difficult. She wondered about administrative duties, how will they be handled? Erin felt that neogitating one course release a year for all FTF might be better. Elaine A. felt that the proposals were too much. Elaine S. mentioned that the university has talked about quantifying service on a point system. Sven said that that becomes a bigger workload discussion. It was pointed out that the administration is open to ideas from the UFS because Middlestates is coming back and one of their issues was faculty governance. Luciana wondered about the timing of this proposal and the new apportionment of the UFS. How will PTF or FTF be affected?
Luciana supported the proposal by the co-chairs. Sven suggested proposing payment for the FTF instead. He also said that the UFS is going to have to accept that no matter what the renumeration is going to be uneven between FTF and PTF, and between UFS senators. Julie suggested to do the renumeration faculty by faculty. Sven said he would prefer to establish a flat policy. Jurgen said he liked the original proposal. He said it was good negotiation to ask for more than you will get. Sometimes faculty decided to take on service because they feel like it is important. If the dean’s buy into the renumeration proposals they can sort of spread the word that senators shouldn’t be asked to serve on additional committees. David recommended adding a clause about PTF who serve as chairs of a subcommittee, that they should receive additional pay. Erin felt that an equilivent should be added for FTF who chair subcommittees. It was pointed out that if FTF are paid for this service the university is going to say that it doesn’t count as service. Sven said that the UFS could suggest that the definition of FTF remuneration/recognition be discussed between PO and the FTF affairs committee. A motion was made to vote. The motion was seconded and then approved. The vote would be on the proposals stated in agenda, with two additional clauses about PTF as chairs of subcommittee getting an additional 6 hours of pay and in regard to FTF recognition of service. A unanimous vote was taken.

Barry briefly shared that there is a new system for assigning classroom spaces and would like to spend some time discussing it at the next meeting. He would like to creat a PO level committee on teaching and learning environments.

A motion was made to adjourned. The motion was seconded and then approved.