Faculty Senate Minutes  
November 8, 2011  
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm 


Excused or Absent: Kathren Brown, Lars Eggertson, Leslie Farnsworth, Debora Ferreira, Phil Gordon, Carolyn Howard, Brian Jensen, Amir Kia, Phil Matheson, Gary Measom, Kristin Mechem, David Millet, Margaret Mittelman, Jeff Packer, Dennis Potter, Paul Tayler, Rick Vincent

1. Call to order – 3:02 pm

2. Approval of Minutes – Minutes are approved no adjustments noted.

3. Budget Committee Member

Elaine Tuft -- Axel Ramirez was nominated to serve as a Budget Committee Member – All those in favor? Nomination approved by majority vote.

4. John Balden informed the Senate that Policies 524 & 204 are on the Policy Pipeline for review. John will send out the comments from the Policy Committee when he receives them from Lyn Bennett. He noted that the Appropriateness of Expenditures is being changed and raising the limits on certain approvals.

5. Policy 524 – Graduate Credits and Transcripts

- Liz Childs appreciated all the comments and recommendations submitted by Senate members and is reviewing them for incorporation into the policy. If the Senate approves Policy 524, it will move on to other organizations for comment.
- John Balden requested a motion to approve and send forward to next stage with the submitted recommendations. Thomas Henry made the motion. Ian Sorenson seconded.
- Lyn stated the Policy Committee decided not to wordsmith the policy and left that up to policy steward. They only focused on content.
- All those in favor? Motion passed.
6. Benefits Discussion
   - Stan Jenne provided an overview of UVU’s self-funded plan and noted that when the plan saves money, we all save money. EMI is the administrator of UVU’s plan.
   - He noted that the Benefits Committee has two representatives from the Faculty Senate that serve along with other members of the university on the Benefits Committee. He informed the Senate that health care costs continue to rise and that we cannot rely on the state to fund the increased costs. The only options left are to either decrease benefits or increase premiums. The insurance plan UVU has dipped into the reserves to cover increases in healthcare costs.
   - UVU has a consultant who examines the market and develops a proposal that will best meet UVU’s needs. The Benefits Committee will meet in the near future to consider a possible 2-tier plan. The idea is to keep the same covered items under both plans. Some of the differences might occur in copays, deductibles or overall coverage percentages.
   - Contact Stan Jenne at Sjenne@uvu.edu with any concerns or comments in regards to benefits discussion. Also, if you have any ideas with respect to wellness please let him know.
   - Marcus Vincent expressed concern that UVU has been a strong attraction in the past because of their benefit package. He noted that we have lost some good people because of a lack of raises and perception of lower benefits.
   - Lisa Lambert asked if there was any printed material to review on the proposed revised benefits. Stan said not at this time as it is only early dialogue at this point.
   - Russ Thornley asked if he would review the financial statements describing the self-funded plan. John Balden said this information is sensitive due to the privacy of individuals. John did note that we can provide the Senate an overall financial summary for the new plan options if they get past the discussion stage.

7. Administrative Reports
   - Academic Affairs – Ian Wilson
     - The PBA process has begun. Everyone is welcome to attend and witness the process in action. The President will collect, prioritize and reevaluate all submissions after the legislative session.
     - Ian reminded the Faculty Senate to remind their faculty to not cancel classes on Monday or Tuesday prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday.
   - President Holland
     - The President discussed some of the challenges UVU is facing at the present time.
       - UVU continues to grow while facing the struggle economically, which creates more pressure on higher education spending. Senator Steve Urquhart is wrestling with higher education issues and is attempting at some dialogue. He appears to have a new tone this year and if he is to have any impact, he needs to do it in different way. He has created blog which can be accessed at steveu.com. He would like to hear from faculty and students. President Holland asked how do we survive the moment we are in and keep each
other informed? If you have any ideas, please contact him.

- Matthew Crawford’s visit was a great success. He spoke nicely in relation to UVU and what we are about. The presentation is available online for viewing at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TW0b-eRTD8w

- UVU had a successful scholarship drive and received donations from many sources. John and Karen Huntsman made a significant donation. Total amount received was a little over $4M, which will help move UVU to next level.

8. White Paper – Points discussed:

   - **Clarify Faculty Credential Standards and Expectations for Tenure and Rank**
     - Discussions began on defining terminal degrees for disciplines and tenure. Senate members felt that the faculty within each discipline needs to define what is considered a terminal degree in their department.
     - Ideally, Departments should not hire someone they do not want to see go through the tenure track process.
     - The RTP criteria needs to contain language that would allow a department to grant the rank of Professor if the faculty member earns a PhD at a later time, for example Developmental Math.
     - Faculty Senate would like to keep rank and tenure decisions at a department level following a broader concept of interpretation at the University level.
     - Achievement of the rank of full Professor can be different than Tenure Track. However, there needs to be credibility for the rank of Professor. There are some individuals that have made some extraordinary achievements and deserve the rank of Professor. Where do these individuals fit in that have extensive experience, are published, etc.? The University needs to clarify where these unusual faculty fit in.
     - UVU needs to reward what it values at this institution and needs to continue to encourage professionalism. UVU needs to decide what it is going to become. We need to make distinction between tenure and promotion decisions.
     - Policy needs to define how to achieve full professor. Knowing what the objective is can then determine who achieves this rank.
     - Criteria should be set by the departments which are best suited to make those decisions and can make the criteria clear to all job candidates prior to acceptance of position.
     - Lyn Bennett made a Motion to Extend Conversation for 25 minutes. Marcus Vincent seconded. Passed
     - Kim Strunk mentioned that the Department of Dance in the School of the Arts does not have post-tenure document. Her question was what does she do when she goes up for full professor if no such document or policy exists?
     - Faculty Senate members expressed that the department needs to develop the post-tenure criteria. Ian Wilson noted that some departments have included the post-tenure criteria as part of their overall RTP Guidelines.
Full Professorship requires certain standards as general rule, but should specify exceptions. The Senate felt that peers should evaluate and determine if a faculty member has achieved the overall requirements for Professor.

Ian Wilson remarked that the VPAA, Dean, and Department Chair need to get the post-tenure criteria up and going. The Regents are proposing a revised policy at the November 18th meeting here at UVU. Remember, UVU Schools and Colleges don’t have policies only guidelines. Policy 632 – Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank is scheduled for revision, but on hold until items raised in the Faculty Senate are completed. There are three issues: multi-year contracts, clarification of terminal degrees, and role statements. In addition, how do we handle the issue of faculty with wide variety of credentials? Departments should have the rank of professor included in their RTP guidelines. Ian Wilson and Kat Brown are currently meeting with RTP Chairs and Deans to review their guidelines.

President Holland noted that post-tenure is an issue that makes tenured faculty nervous. If we don’t develop meaningful post-tenure guidelines, then it creates problems. Our best defense is that we are managing this as an academic institution and making progress.

Arlen Card inquired if the university can have “gap filler” provisions if departments have not developed their guidelines. Ian Wilson stated that RTP Guidelines could be tougher than university policy. He suggested waiting until the Regents meeting to see what they propose as they might already answer this proposal.

Ian Sorenson made a motion to send summarized comments from the White Paper Committee back to the President’s office for review then to the Faculty Senate. Stan Jenne seconded the Motion. Lyn Bennett opposed the motion as she feels the Faculty Senate needs to make some decisions.

In further discussion, clarification was made that comments would be summarized and sent back to the White Paper Ad Hoc Committee and they would bring them back to the Faculty Senate for a vote. The motion to review and summarize was restated. Motion carried.

Ian Wilson has contacted the USU to see if they would be willing to come down and answer questions on role statements. To review information, you can link to http://www.usu.edu/provost/faculty/promotion_and_tenure/doc/P&T_FAQs.pdf.

Russ Thornley made the motion to approve the USU to request for input regarding the issue of Faculty Roll Statements. Lyn Bennett seconded. Vote was unanimous.

We will review the role statement section of the White Paper for the next meeting.

9. Motion to adjourn was accepted. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.