Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes
February 21, 2012
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm


Absent or Excused: Thomas Henry

• Called to Order 3:00 pm
• Minutes Approved.
• VPAA/President – Ian Wilson/Matthew Holland

  o President Holland noted that he and Ian have a general spirit of agreement with document as it currently stands. Ian reviewed the document to make sure key elements have been incorporated into existing policies as a way to affirm institutional commitment. President would like to have a heavier emphasis on the last paragraph. The first two paragraphs give a little impression of what each entity does, and does not reflect shared governance to him. He feels the last paragraph captures the idea of shared governance. His hope is that we do much of what we do in dialogue and discussion even with respective spheres. His optimal view is to listen, hear people out, reasonable dialogue about concerns, and see if can come to some kind of agreement even if not full agreement.

  o Ian Wilson – Referred to Policies 635 – Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities and 101 – Policies Governing Policies and Procedures that outline a variety of shared governance. These identify areas across campus that faculty has opportunity for input. If this is not happening broadly, then we need to identify areas of concern and be sure faculty feel their voice is being heard.

  o Stan Jenne – Identified a few problems such as 1) the ability to count some courses for graduate or undergraduate credit and 2) faculty needs to step up to the plate and do their part of shared governance. Stan is pleased with the progress UVU has made, but we still need to work through the snags.

  o President Holland – He recognized that UVU will go through growing pains due to major growth which present new dynamics. It is his intention as an administrator to have as much dialogue and find out ways how we grow into the university in terms of its size and maturity.

  o Lyn Bennett – There is a culture that has to be created in Faculty Senate and is an ongoing thing and needs to come from the Executive Committee and the Chairs working with its members. We need a clearer process of how it can happen such as a first reading in the Senate before giving charge to the committees. This is the same idea that needs to happen with shared
governance. Her concern is what happens when administration changes if this idea is not reflected in policy? Where is it outlined? How do we know the things we are working on, that it’s not going to be taken away? The Senate wants something more tangible, permanent, and does not get eradicated with a different president.

- **President Holland** – What areas do you see you would lose under different administration? Lyn Bennett noted that committees where we’re creating policy, faculty input is gathered from Faculty Senate and we are choosing those members or recommending them.

- **David Connelly** – When committees are formed and faculty are needed; it should be the senate that finds the members, not administration hand picking individuals.

- **Lyn Bennett** – If the senate rejects policy or strongly suggests revisions, we need to hear back from stewards regarding the input provided. If the senate is being asked to approve policies to the next stage without feedback, we cannot do that. Another problem is if the senate fully rejects a policy and it continues down pipeline, it reinforces “why bother?” It’s not just the senate it’s any entity. There is no way to kick it out.

- **President Holland** – We do have a pattern of kicking things back up the pipeline, but Lyn says this is a point that what happens with another president. Holland suggests having dialogue about who has final sign-off, but is willing to listen and continue to have a discussion. He needs to think carefully about what “substantial revision” means and Regents has noted that their needs to be a decision point.

- **Lyn Bennett** – Feels if entities and stakeholders are onboard from the outset, which has been done more this year, this is a way to avoid rejection. Most of the problems occur in Stage 2 because there was no shared governance.

- **President Holland** – He agrees a more upfront discussion and broader audiences will allow for more input and direction and he and Ian are committed to this direction.

- **Kim Strunk** – She complimented Holland’s administration for upholding shared governance.

- **David Connelly** – The Senate is not looking for absolute power to stop something. He commented that part of the system problem is that Policy 101 gives strategic flow. Where it gets interesting is the comments made, versions done, and feedback process. David noted he makes comments, but receives no response to his comments. He made reference to the Tenure Policy prior to Holland’s arrival where the senate collaborated and submitted major modifications under the assumption that changes they proposed would be incorporated. Upon return in the fall, the policy had been revamped completely, but no feedback provided to the senate. He knows decisions have to be made at some point, but no discussion or feedback came back.

- **President Holland** – His understanding of the process is that as a policy moves through various stages, there is a clear posting and alert such as Stage 2 came in, individuals can provide feedback and dialogue for further refinement, then it moves to Stage 3. A second posting occurs so everyone
can see what happens between stages. President Holland feels we do not need a detailed listing of what was changed or not. Open periods are for comment and feedback. Conceptually, the process is designed into the process for concrete assessment before it moves on.

- Stan Jenne – The Faculty Senate would like to receive feedback on specific recommendations, not necessarily to each point.
- Lamarche Pierre – He recommended a committee review Policy 101.
- David Connelly – He intends to have the senate review Policy 101 in the fall to be sure everyone understands what it means.
- Ian Sorensen – The Faculty Senate can always request feedback after changes are made.
- Kim Strunk – Suggested having an orientation for new faculty senators and what it really means to serve on the Senate in hopes that this will aid in creating a culture of shared governance. David Connelly noted moving the elections to the spring will help in this effort.
- David Connelly – Part of the cultural change of service and orientation needs to be reflected in the RTP decision process.
- Arlen Card – When it comes to the policy pipeline, there is a place for comments to be made, but not see other comments made or administrative rationale for the changes made. We have a communication issue. Can we save administrative time if all comments submitted are available for individuals to see.
- President Holland – UVU has made progress on not wordsmithing and does not want to take a step back. There is a line to walk here in getting policies codified and collaborating and knowing at the end of the day it’s got to be worked out by people.
- Stan Jenne – We need to make faculty aware of policies or issues coming down the pike via faculty senate.
- Arlen Card – Suggests have one central body of notes taken in the Senate and then send a tweet to everyone regarding key ideas or announcements. We need to use technology to provide notice of change. Communication is the key. The technology is there and available, and we should use it.
- Kat Brown – She commented that she tried this in September and all but one did not use it.
- John Balden – We can post documents in Google docs for discussion.
- President Holland – He agrees that we should expect service to receive tenure. Everyone has to step up the plate and provide service. It is something that gets harder to assess as it goes up the line for approval. Need to hold people accountable. Holland’s philosophy is you should give more service as you go along in years. We dodged a bullet on the tenure issue in legislature. Having been defeated twice now, if we take the initiative and show a robust post-tenure policy that works and can’t just get tenure and become deadwood, it would take care of the issue.
- Arlen Card – Do you understand any particular points that the legislature would need to see in a post-tenure policy?
President Holland – He believes they want to see there is a process with some teeth to it and they could lose their jobs if they are not stepping up.

Kat Brown – She suggested the Senate ask for nominations for the Post-Tenure Pre-planning Committee. Need a variety of faculty for representation.

Ian Wilson – Faculty Senate does not meet in summer and Academic Affairs is trying to get policies finished now or early summer so they are in Stage 2 during summer and the senate can hit the ground running in fall. He raised the possibility for the Policy Committee to meet a few times during summer? If they did, their comments would be ready for the fall. Lyn noted they might need to revise the bylaws and constitution to accommodate this issue and compensate them. She sees this is problematic and the senate needs to structurally come up with a bridge.

David Connelly – Suggested maybe establishing a smaller quorum in the summer to address some of these issues.

Kim Strunk – Is there a discussion board on the senate website? John Balden replied no and noted we need to consider.

- Policies
  - Policy 523 – Grading and Policy 631 – Instructor and Course Evaluation are not ready yet.
  - Policy 601 – Classroom Management is ready for Stage 2. The Senate can make a charge to the Policy Committee at the next meeting.
  - Policy 612 – Course Content Modifications is no longer a stand-alone policy and has been incorporated into Policy 601.
  - Lyn Bennett expressed concern over the Policy Pipeline updates. Kat does not know what their procedure is for updating the pipeline, but will contact Cara to make sure pipeline versions are real time and revision date noted at the bottom of the policy.

- Committee Reports
  - Thomas Henry – Nothing
  - Stan Jenne – Benefit costs will most likely be going up. The committee meets tomorrow to begin re-examining the plan and coming up with alternatives to a potential 18% increase. If you have any feedback or areas that need to be protected more than others, let Stan know. Health savings account model requires higher deductibles vs flex spending. Health savings carries over year-to-year, but responsibility is yours to track.
  - Kim Strunk – Nothing
  - Russ Thornley – Committee had a meeting last month and reviewed items to incorporate changes into new policy. They will meet again the first week of March.
  - Ian Sorensen – Nothing
  - Pierre Lamarche – Nothing
  - Elaine Tuft – CHSS is holding elections now. She is in the process of getting other elections going.
  - Lyn Bennett – 1) 601 1st reading to senate then provide comm comments 2) Invites stewards back on staff policies to provide feedback. John noted their
intention is to make the changes and take to PC for stage 3. Will table until wait and see.
  o Arlen Card – How fast can we move the pre-planning committee for post-tenure committee? John will add this as an agenda item for next week. Kat would like an individual from each school/college. Fred White, Sam Rushforth have already volunteered and she would like a mix for different view points, but they need to be tenured.
  o Gary Measom – Nothing

Agenda Items Next Week
  • Shared Governance
  • Policy 601
  • Post-Tenure Pre-planning Committee Members

Adjournment