Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes
April 2, 2013
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

Present: Lyn Bennett, Mark Bracken, Kat Brown, Arlen Card, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Lars Eggertsen, Pierre Lamarche, Dan McDonald, Gary Measom, Russ Thornley, Elaine Tuft, Marcus Vincent, Ian Wilson, Erin Haskell

Excused or Absent: Matthew Holland

- Call to order – 3:00 PM
- Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2013 Executive meeting. Minutes approved.
- VPAA – Ian Wilson
  - Benefits Package was approved by the Board of Trustees. Human Resources (HR) will be holding a Healthcare Forum on April 9th from 1:30-3:00 pm in the Ragan Theatre. The Executive Committee would like it advertised on the scrolling screen.
  - Salary increases were approved: 1% Faculty and 2% Staff.
- UVUSA – Erin Haskell
  - Student Government has expressed parking structure concerns and the impact it will have on students. They are weighing various options and determining how to proceed.
- Tenure Board of Review – Marcus Vincent
  - Process Issues – Marcus discussed various problems and issues that the current University Tenure Board of Review Committee (UTBR) endured this year and provided a handout for discussion.
    - Would like to see training for the new chair of the committee. Elected committee members need to be available during that academic year for any situation that may arise.
    - Policy 637 discrepancies need to be readdressed for consistency and standardization.
  - Evaluations and Documentation
    - Annual Reviews need to be completed appropriately and record accurate performance. A suggestion was made that Department Chairs and RTP Chairs review annual reviews. Faculty Senate proposed issuing a statement to faculty that annual reviews are crucial.
    - Deans are responsible to evaluate chairs who in turn evaluate faculty.
  - Human Dynamics
    - All issues external to the actual tenure process should be left with Human Resources.
- SRIs
  - Lars Eggertsen presented a draft of potential questions for the UVU SRI. (See handout)
David Connelly will send out the draft to the Faculty Senate seeking feedback/comments by April 19th in order to revise over the summer and be able to implement by the fall semester.

Russ Thornley asked that the document contain theoretical reference data on what good teaching is and what factors were utilized in the development of the new SRI. Lars indicated that they used the “caring dimension” and the “instructional dimension.” Lars will send David the citations.

The Executive Committee wants students to review the questions to be sure the questions we are asking is the same as what the student understands.

Regarding questions 16-18 on the draft SRI, the Executive Committee wants to know how the information will be used and by whom.

How are SRIs being used - formative or summative evaluation? Kat reminded the committee that the SRIs for faculty are an indicator of student perception of how a professor is doing in a course. Faculty needs to include multiple sources to demonstrate their teaching and that the SRI is a useful tool, but not the only tool.

- **Sticky Dot Exercise**
  - Committee motioned to move the exercise to the beginning of the fall semester in order to address specifics over the academic year.

- **Fall Speaker**
  - Suggest a UVU faculty member for fall semester and a guest speaker during the spring semester.
  - David Connelly proposed David Knowlton as the fall speaker. The committee agreed.

- **Summer Senate**
  - Discussion on proposed summer sessions (see handout). Idea is that the Faculty Senate can begin reviewing policies so they will be up and ready for fall. David will present proposal in Senate for approval.

- **Elections**
  - There are currently no nominations for President. Any suspension of the Constitution rules needs to be proposed by the senate and approved. A motion needs to be made to suspend the entire process or just the nomination process and open it up to all faculty for elections. The real motion is to petition a variance of the policy to suspend the rules nomination process, for the election to stay the same, and a variance for the term of the next president only.
  - Ian inquired as to what does it say about the senate with no faculty coming forward to serve as President. The time commitment seems to be at the forefront.
  - The committee feels faculty members who say the senate is not important don’t understand “shared governance.” Shared governance does not mean the senate has “power.” Years ago, UVU adopted a shared governance model and that all faculty members have the ability to influence which does give “power.” The Senate needs to convey to faculty what is being accomplished. A suggestion was made to utilize Faculty
Convocation as a forum to convey to faculty the purpose of the senate and allow for Q&A.

- Elaine Tuft and Karen Cushing will work with Nathan Gerber to set up Election site on web page.
- Need elections for new chairs that are rotating off - Pierre, Lyn, Arlen, Elaine.
- Discussion regarding the curriculum committee members and whether or not they should be elected or appointed. Need to have a more collaborative way of doing curriculum and who is serving. The chairs need to be a right-hand person to the Dean when making decisions to drive curriculum. Chair position needs to be more substantive.
- Committee thought it might be a good idea for chair to develop a traveling notebook of things I learned that they could pass on.

**Role Statements**

- With Post-Tenure and other things coming there seems to be more discussion on what constitutes the nature of being a faculty member at UVU. Is there any interest in developing three different committees on teaching/service/scholarly creative works and what it means in context of tenure, rank, etc. and see what comes out of the conversation and driven from faculty.
- Kat brought up the fact that Associate/Assistant Deans are not eligible for promotion because they are in an administrative role under the current policy. The issue is being addressed in the new rank policy.
- Executive Committee members like the idea of individual faculty plans based on resources, etc. so there is a record of the plan.

**Post-Tenure**

- Model is to be reviewed every five years after tenure.
- What might an alternative model look like?
  - The Executive Committee preferred the “triggered” model but addressing it in the context of “merit” and “discipline.”
- What does due process look like under a universal or triggered model?
  - Moments of due process
  - Time frame
  - Language of the policy matters so it is interpreted appropriately
  - Keep decisions at low levels as much as possible
- David will send out information to the senate.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.