Faculty Senate Minutes
February 28, 2012
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm


Excused or Absent: Bret Boyer, Lars Eggertson, Leslie Farnsworth, Phil Gordon, Thomas Henry, Carolyn Howard, Brian Jensen, Amir Kia, Phil Matheson, Kristin Mecham, David Millet, Harry Taute, Paul Tayler

- Call to order – 3:03 pm
- Approval of Minutes.
  - Clarify charge from Faculty Senate regarding the Ad hoc Committee reviewing Policy 644 and expanding the Ad hoc’s charge to include the Associate/Assistant Chairs to the revised policy. Otherwise stand approved.
- VPAA – Ian Wilson
  - Tenure and Sabbatical letters have gone out.
- Benefits Options – Ron Price
  - Distributed handout to explain definitions and comparison charts to other institutions.
  - Possible increase in benefit premiums unless we do some retooling to our plan or make significant modifications as it relates to designing two different plans.
  - Examining two plans because of a possible 14-18% increase in benefits and don’t want to pass those costs to employees. When change is necessary, the committee will tweak the plan in the deductibles, co-insurance, or co-payments.
  - Running $1M in claims per month in last few months. Trend is due to aging staff population.
  - Intention is to offer two plans this year: 1) base plan similar to current plan, low premium and 2) buy-up plan that will be about $50-$70 increase per month. Goal is to offer more plans including a high deductible plan. HR will be educating faculty and staff over the next year to help everyone understand all plans to better inform them in making their choice.
  - John Balden noted a faculty member would like to see a high deductible with an HSA. On surface looks okay and can build up dollars to your HSA and works well.
  - About 36% of UVU population never goes to the doctor. Will be rolling out new Health & Wellness Program to incentivizing faculty/staff to go to doctor for check-ups.
  - John Balden would like to see a comparison chart that was excluded. Ron will put it back in.
  - Russ Thornley – How hard would it be to do a Benefits Analysis relative to our Salary
Status? Ron said it would be complex to do that because of all state employees paying 10% of healthcare costs.

- Lyn Bennett – Lyn asked Stan if there was anything in the Executive discussions that he would like to bring out? Stan responded no.
- Linda Makin – Noted UVU’s Benefit plan is much richer than the other institutions around state. We would like to reach a salary/benefit balance.
- Matt Kushin – Is there an opportunity to incentivizing pro-health behaviors by reduction in monthly deductibles? Ron noted we need every dollar coming into the plan right now, but is investigating this idea. The committee will not immediately go for discounts in premiums, but are looking at other options.

- **Emergency Response Team - Margaret Mittleman/Zach Lyman**
  - Emergency Services Department has been looking into this concept for at least 10 years and determined there was a greater need with the university’s growth. Zach took initiative the development.
  - Zach is a student of Emergency Services Program at UVU. Saw some things in a class that triggered him to begin research to implement a program that would fill gaps. He used BYU’s model to assist in his formation of a response team at UVU.
  - Program has 12 students that are student interns. All students are certified EMTs at some level. They work in conjunction with the police department and public safety. Those needing assistance still call 911 or 5555. However, the UVU dispatcher will now call the response team as well as Orem City, which means a quicker response, and allow students to utilize their education to give back to the university.
  - Axel Ramirez – Does dispatch call Orem City and response team? Yes, response team acts as an intermediate.
  - Lyn Bennett – What happens to the 12 student interns when they graduate? Zach noted the first team was established through an extensive application process, their education, background, volunteer work and the team was handpicked that would provide support. Lyn - Where does funding come from? Initial funding comes through Student Life. Ongoing costs are extremely small and when response team uses something, Orem City will replenish.
  - Vance Hillman – Do you have a certain number of people on campus at a time? Always team of two working seven-hour shifts. Other side of freeway will be served by Orem city.
  - Margaret Mittleman – UVU’s response team is a designated agent with the Bureau of EMS, so we are a designated licensed response unit, not transport. This qualifies us for grant money.
  - Stott Harston – Couple of years ago we had an incident with the open carry. Would you respond to those kinds of calls as well? Zach said the general practice is called “staging” meaning they stand far enough distance where if gun fire were to break out, they would not get shot. Then they wait for the Police Department to issue a “safe scene” at which time they will enter.

- **Message from President Holland**
  - We have been successful at the committee level thus far. Started session on a bleak note with a possible 1-2% cut, but it has gone away. Base budget has passed and it appears there is some money available, not much. The Council of Presidents has unified and lobbied in a coordinated fashion about top priorities. First priority is that compensation is necessary for employees and is coming out of the Higher Ed Appropriations Committee.
He hopes that comes through as a 1% compensation increase. Second priority is the push for mission-based funding. Twist this year is that half goes to institutional priorities or projects that are consistent with the institutional mission and the other half to equity funding. First time we have had effective official recognition that there is an equity issue. The challenge today is holding the line on equity funding. The other issue is the building. He feels we had great success at the committee level. Went into the session as fourth priority in Higher Ed Regents process. As we worked with building board, we worked as second priority for higher education and third priority overall. If there’s enough one-time money, then we are in good shape. Candidly, there is some support in the senate, but not the house. Need to push importance of securing those buildings. This is a unique moment where they come together for mutual benefit. There is number of major projects going off-line, so a few more public projects like this would help economy. Signals this morning were not positive.

Lyn Bennett
- Motion to change agenda to deal with two issues that are short. Gary Measom – Second. All those in favor? Motion passes. Opposed - 3; Abstained - 4
  - 1) De-table discussion of the three staff policies and vote to post-pone the senate discussion until the stewards come back and address the senate’s concerns. Concern is there are significant changes in the policies and HR is redrafting. Lyn made a motion to de-table? Stan Jenne seconded. All those in favor? Motion passes.
  - 2) Solicit faculty for post-tenure planning committee. Lyn made motion. Ian Sorenson seconded. All those in favor? Motion passes. Abstained – 1. Lyn Bennett nominated Jason Slack; David Johnson; David Knowlton; Danny Horns. Kim Strunk nominated Doris Trujillo. All in Favor? Motion passes.

- Policies
  - Policy 125 Appropriate Use of Copyrighted Materials
    - Linda Makin provided brief background of the policy. In 2008, the Higher Ed Opportunity Act was revised. They requested more compliance and sharing of digital materials and we needed to be in compliance by 2011. President’s Council enacted a temporary emergency policy that was enacted by the Board of Trustees on June 16, 2011 and started a 12-month clock. Nancy Bartlett and Jacques Demal worked on the draft. Not only have we addressed adding the statement required by the Federal Government, but also we have cleaned up the definitions and references. This policy is clear about the use of copyright materials. Cleaned up organization of the committee on the use of copyright materials and added the information on the agent, Ray Walker. We have also included the statement that offenders are subject to criminal and civil action.
    - Lyn Bennett – Is Jacques with Library staff? Yes, he is current chair of Copyright Oversight Committee. Feedback on the policy goes to Faculty Senate Policy Committee.
    - Gary Measom – Who enforces violations in the policy? Linda Makin noted we are required to post the warning, but Feds would prosecute. Ray Walker has authority to take down the site and deny access to the computer.
    - Lyn Bennett – Referenced 2.5 to Policy 648. Kat Brown noted that the reference
would be changed once the changes have been officially made.

- Russ Thornley – Does the purview of the committee include Distance Education (DE) or Canvas? Jacques responded that the committee is charged to help people comply. How is DE represented on the committee? Janelle Mitchell is on committee.
- Stott Harston – Is there a process whereby Janelle or anyone else would use content to see if it violates or is it as reported? Jacques said as reported, but DE may have something he is not aware of. Who at the university level under policy & procedures is responsible for maintaining compliance? Linda noted Ray Walker and Legal counsel. If want to know if something is in violation, contact Ray Walker.
- Axel Ramirez – Is there a link already established? Linda noted there is a copyright website and a library website. Jacques noted there is a reference on almost all websites.
- John Balden charged the senate to take the information back to their departments for discussion and it will be an action item next meeting.

- Policy 523 – Grading
  - This policy arose because the old or new policy did not take into account the changes that came with becoming a university. Took the grading policies and procedures out of Policy 602, added some material for graduate programs and changed the title to just Grading. We added significant parts in the “T” grade.
  - Kat received concerns from Kathy Black about changing grades. As the policy currently stands, it has a tendency to take control of the grade out of the hands of faculty member that issued the grade and the professor not consulted for reason of the grade. The concern is that the faculty members who issued grade should be consulted, if available.
  - Stan Jenne – This is more than consulting. Instructors grade should be considered appropriate and the student should bear the burden of proving the grade should be changed.
  - Rick Moody – He includes in his syllabus a clause that the student keep every assignment returned for later proof.
  - Russ Thornley – Is Stan recommending that only instructors should be able to change the grade, and if it does need to be changed against instructor’s judgment? Yes. Debora Ferreria noted this is a problem when adjuncts don’t return. John Balden noted then it goes to the committee.
  - Pierre Lamarche – Problem he has is procedural in how the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) is able to properly adjudicate these cases. His TAs know his grading formula. He has had several dozen appeals in eight years, but has never changed a grade because it undermines the TAs. He feels that all assignments would need to be re-examined unless it is a clear cut case.
  - Dennis Potter – Seems like 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 need to be changed because they give power to the ASC and is not specific enough.
  - David Connelly – Once the issue gets to the chair, a file/flowchart should be created, becoming legal matter. In the file should be documentation that supports both sides’ claims. Pierre said it goes back to an Academic Freedom issue and all procedures need to be clarified.
- Kathy Black – This situation happens on regular basis for her - student did not get things in on time, cheated, and did not take tests. The ASC Board did not allow Kathy to present her side. She feels a faculty member should be the only one to change a grade. Grade changes should be a rare thing and burden of proof needs to be upon the student. She noted that the business school faculty now has to prove guilt on the part of the student or change the grade.
- Ian Sorenson – Suggested that there should only be certain grounds that a student can appeal a grade.
- Kim Strunk – Suggested that the current form be revised so that the student must provide evidence when requesting a grade change.
- John Balden charged the Policy Committee to summarize the comments and the policy will be presented as information item at the March 20 meeting.

- Policy 601 – Classroom Management
  - Policy has been around for three years in draft form and there are significant changes such as Policy 612 has been completely changed into a course requirement modification and addresses a particular assignment. Other changes include what to do when a dangerous person arrives in class.
  - Pierre Lamarche – Noted a typo in 5.56 (Line254) retains language “content” instead of “requirement.” Lyn Bennett asked Kat to send the revision to her. David Connelly suggested that due to the limited time for review, discussion be postponed so can charge the committee later.
  - Dennis Potter made a motion to put as an information item at the next meeting. Gary Measom seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

- Policy 631 – Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses
  - This policy is for SRIs. The original policy was short and incomplete for a university level and various committees have now added content for clarification.
  - John Balden commented that it is fairly generic as far as saying we do have to have evaluations and must do with each and every class including summer.
  - Lorraine Wallace – Can a faculty member do an additional evaluation at the end of the course besides the SRI? Kat Brown said faculty could do a supplemental, but not replace the university SRIs. She also noted that SRIs scores are only one way to judge teaching.
  - Debora Ferreira – Languages is using a different evaluation and not putting that much emphasis on the SRI. Is the university using the SRI for teaching evaluation? Lorraine commented that in 4.1.3 wording suggests we cannot use additional evaluation methods. Lisa Lambert asked for clarification noting that last year Moh El-Saidi indicated other supplemental evaluations would not be considered in evaluating teaching. Ian Wilson indicated that for obtaining tenure and rank, only the institution SRI would be considered. He is aware of other departments using evaluations for their own purposes. Lisa Lambert followed up with an example of formative evaluations and their value. Ian Wilson reminded the senate that a faculty member can include any evaluations in his/her portfolio, but whether they will be considered is up to the departments. Ian Sorensen also reminded faculty that there is an institutional supplemental already called SCOT. It was noted that some classes have a low response rate.
  - Russ Thornley – He would like to see verbiage in policy requiring that the
institutions meet generally accepted industry principals and standards of based validity. We need to help students understand that it is an evaluation of instruction not just instructor. We need to make sure the instrument is really getting at what we really want. The current SRI has been validated and in order to change, it would need to go through proper process to change.

- Ryan Leick – Half of Aviation workload is online courses. Much of the evaluation is delivery and the way our model is set up, some items in Aviation are out of their control.
- Russ Thornley – He has a document he is willing to make available to Anton Tolman for evaluation.
- John Balden charged the senate to take the information back to their departments for discussion and feedback it will be an information item next meeting.
- Priority of policies to be considered: 523 – Grading, then 631 – Student Evaluations, then 601 – Classroom management.

- Shared Governance Discussion
  - President Holland – This discussion came about as a result of considering the statement developed by the Faculty Senate and posted on the Senate Web site. There was a preliminary discussion last week with Executive Committee. Our general response is we are quite comfortable with the statement as it stands. Best forms of academic leadership are collaborative and seek input. At some point in this process there needs to be decision maker. Some areas put emphasis directly on what faculty or administration does and these need more interconnection. There is a statement at the very end that he would like to see at the beginning and be amplified as a way to better contextualize. The Executive Committee had concerns and issues about past events and the policy process. He discussed these issues with Linda Makin and determined that several changes are already underway.
  - Ian Wilson – Most of the concerns had to do with policies and the process by which policies go through the system and tracking changes. Questions were addressed with Linda Makin about what can we do when changes are made until approved. Linda indicated it is already underway with the TOPS software currently being updated and revised which will allow us to more easily track changes to policies in the pipeline. Ian reviewed a handout dealing with the policy process. When we revise or change a policy, there will be a set of documents that should follow through from Stage one until final approval. The table indicates the documents and information the revised TOPS will contain that can be seen, such as whose keeping track of feedback and how is the steward tracking the changes? The revised system will handle this issue. Linda Makin noted that the document is only a representation of the minimum that should happen. Kudos to Steve Clark for TOPS. Transition to TOPS 2.0 will begin in the summer.
  - Dennis Potter – If we have shared governance at UVU, the faculty should have a real say over any policy that directly affects them. What is the possibility that the Faculty Senate at UVU will really have a vote? John Balden noted that the senate has significant decision making power with curriculum. President Holland remarked that this is statutory requirements we are dealing with and not anything we can wave a wand and fix. He used the current situation with the three policies just discussed and noted that they have been in the works for three years because the faculty senate could not agree on them. At some point, a decision has to be made. It is not fair to say faculty does not have fair input. Dennis noted that we don’t have a structure in place that provides more power. Darin
Taylor commented that he has seen the senate make great strides over the last 20 years. Mark Jeffreys shared that he did not realize exactly what a no vote by the Faculty Senate really meant. He is still not clear what it means when there is an objection. John Balden referred to Policy 612 because the Faculty Senate did not approve of it, so it was reworked. Ian Wilson indicated that comments and concerns would be reviewed, examined and addressed as much as possible. When talking shared governance, Faculty Senate input is taken into consideration. When feedback is provided, it impacts changes and decisions.

- David Connelly – Two things he is hearing: One is that faculty needs to step up and take responsibility. This takes a cultural change; better assessment process of faculty, and service needs to count more in the RTP process. Secondly, words like “primary responsibility.” There is a real concern that things are working great, but are there ways to codify this. This is a longer ongoing discussion regarding procedural issues. Stan Jenne agreed this does take a culture change and that faculty needs to step up and accept their role. We are moving that direction, but can do more. President Holland indicated this is part of a longer conversation. He is ready to stand firm in tenure and rank decisions when faculty is not doing required service if documented by the department. If UVU is going to live up to it’s potential as a university, it takes collaboration and service. Lisa Lambert noted that service swings both ways. The general feeling in the air is that where you are giving lots of service, but not publishing and don’t get tenure or promotion. Mark Jeffreys recommended the need to find balance. Russ Thornley asked if there is any reason why we could not have in the policy on policies a clause that says there needs to be a two-thirds vote to pass Faculty Senate. Power can be delegated. President Holland indicated he is not prepared to answer at this time.

- Stan Jenne motioned to adjourn. Adjournment at 4:55 pm.