Faculty Senate Minutes
March 20 2012
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm


Excused or Absent: Kathy Black, Matt Draper, Leslie Farnsworth, Debora Ferreira, Phil Gordon, Stott Harston, Carolyn Howard, Stan Jenne, Brian Jensen, Xraoyi Ji, Amir Kia, Ryan Leick, Phil Matheson, Kristin Mecham, David Millet, Rick Moody, Matt Nelson, Axel Ramirez, Joy Santee, Ian Sorensen, Paul Tayler, Kent Walker

• Call to order – 3:05 pm
• Approval of Minutes FROM March 20, 2012 Senate meeting. Minutes Approved.
• President Holland
  o Compensation – UVU received a 1% increase just for compensation. The President, Cabinet, Human Resources, and Budgets are working together to make this a true increase in compensation. In order to do this, there will be changes coming to the Benefits Plan.
  o Building – We received planning money for a new building only. There is no guarantee UVU will get the building next year, but he is optimistic. This building will be very large. We have started conversations with Ian Wilson and the Deans to get faculty input about who goes in and the proper design. This building will most likely not be dedicated to a particular school or college, but will bring in various departments and disciplines around the campus.
  o Equity Money – UVU received approximately $1.5M to address equity. Between the equity money and institutional priorities, we came away with about a 4.5% bump to our base budget. He expressed gratitude for all who participated in achieving these outcomes.
  o The Gun Bill was killed in committee and the Tenure Bill went away, but we still need be proactive on tenure and develop a solid post-tenure process that is meaningful and real.
  o Questions
    • Kim Strunk – Is the issue of tenure coming up in other states? President Holland indicated that is has in Texas and a few other places.
• COMET Powerpoint Presentation – Russ Thornley
  o Discussion on Process and how COMET is used
    • The main problems identified by the Curriculum Committee are 1) the process is viewed as a mere “jumping through the hoops” process, and 2) the cycle is not effective.
The Committee would like to make the documentation less of a formality and more supportive of a more meaningful process. This means need to create a cycle based on Learning Outcomes from the University Level all the way down to the Learning Objectives in the classroom. It will take this comprehensive/holistic approach to achieve the outcomes we really need to achieve.

- The goals to be achieved are: 1) create an effective process, 2) integrate the documentation process with what faculty are already doing, 3) align and clarify connections between actual practices and goals, and 4) support the University Essential Learning Outcomes. We want to be able to trace all we do in the classroom supports the University’s mission.

- In regards to degree information, more description allows us to map degrees to programs and courses within the programs and allow certain courses to show how we are meeting goals.

- At the course level, we would replace some of the details with other information. New information requested for Student Learning Outcomes would be ELOs, assessment plan, and syllabus. Our hope is to develop a shared resource library and an opportunity for other options.

- Our objective is to get feedback from faculty on how to see the curriculum process changed and how to make COMET more useful to the departments and the University as a whole and focus more on outcomes.

- The Committee would ultimately like to see COMET enable curriculum mapping and show how our courses are supporting particular SLOs.

- There are six University Essential Learning Outcomes. You can view the link [http://www.uvu.edu/gened/essential/index.html](http://www.uvu.edu/gened/essential/index.html) for more information. The committee’s idea is to map the SLOs to the UELOs.

**GOALS**

- Would like to implement some procedure changes on how COMET is used, finalized and implemented by end of spring 2012. The policy needs to be rewritten and would like to move it to Phase One asap. We would like to get COMET updated by end of Fall 2012 and implement new procedures by Spring 2013 (for AY2014).

- The Curriculum Committee seeks feedback regarding input on policies 603, 604, and 605 and how they should read and procedural changes. The primary one the committee is dealing with currently is Policy 605 – *Curriculum and Program Changes Approval Process*. Contact Eva Bernfeld or Russ Thornley with any questions.

**QUESTIONS:**

- Marcus Vincent - Would this be just in the application process or minor tweaks to course syllabi? Russ noted that the idea is to get a representative syllabus. It is not meant to be prescriptive.

- Kim Strunk – Is there any possibility to shorten the timeline from an 18-month process? Russ would like to see this process run more efficiently and raise awareness to the context in which we are working, but also noted that much of the approval is contingent upon the Regents and Board of Trustees. Kim also asked what about a two-tiered process for minor
changes? Russ would like to see a fast track process as well. Are other institutions subject to the 18-month process? Russ is not sure.

- John Balden will distribute the presentation to the Faculty Senate.

**Policy Committee – Lyn Bennett**

- Policy 523 *Grading* – The committee completed its review and would like it placed as an action item at the next meeting.
- Policy 631 *Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses* – The committee meets April 3 and will complete its review and forward any comments to John Balden. It will not be ready for the next meeting.
- Policy 601 *Classroom Management* – The Senate charged the Policy Committee to begin review of this policy.
- Policy 135 *Appropriate Use of Copyrighted Materials* – Open for Discussion
  - Include Policy 635 – *Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities* as a reference.
  - Under procedures, add a definition of the Oversight Committee. Should this be a definition as well as policy item, not a procedural item?
  - 5.1.3 – Who is the administrator? Request that the policy designate a specific position.
  - 5.2.1 – Suggest that instead of “become aware” maybe they inform in writing of alleged infringements. Lyn stated she would like to be notified in writing if she is in violation. Linda Makin wanted clarification that the first action would be to inform the Oversight Committee of the alleged infringement and then the first action is to inform that person in writing. Lyn’s and several Senate members feel there needs to be actual documentation preserved for future protection of all parties.
  - Pierre Lamarche – Does the Oversight Committee determine what constitutes a copyright infringement? Jacque Demal stated it is a difficult area that would need to be determined by the judicial system. Jacque’s responsibility is to provide an explanation as to why he thinks or does not think an infringement has occurred.
  - Dennis Potter expressed concern about the wording in the policy. John Balden noted that if a person sees something they feel is not right they should notify that person and if no correction has been made, then inform the Oversight Committee. Dennis feels that it should state, “When the Oversight Committee becomes aware of alleged infringements of copyright, the first action taken…” Feels “campus community” needs to be removed.
  - Linda Makin requested notes on the copyright comments.
  - Pierre Lamarche motioned to pass on to the steward. Dennis Potter seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

**Proposed Summer Senate Session**

- John Balden sent a copy to the Faculty Senate. The intent is to get some of the policies into the information stage during the summer, so the Senate can hit the ground running in the fall. Please review this proposal and be prepared to discuss at the next senate meeting.

**Tenure Document**
o All the Faculty Senate Presidents from all the universities in Utah developed this document. Please discuss this information with your constituencies and determine what you agree or disagree with, how you feel about this particular document, and propose any changes. We do recognize the person challenging tenure in the legislature is no longer running for state legislature, but we want to provide a clear definition of what tenure really is.

o Lyn Bennett – Once all the Faculty Senates agree regarding the contents, what will be done with the document? John Balden noted those who are working on tenure issues in the Senate will be approached and we will work with them. Lyn would like to know what the plans will be once the document is completed.

- Bret Boyer
  o He congratulated all those involved in on the new science building and noted the Open House will be April 20 at 11:00 am.

- Lars Eggertsen motioned to adjorn at 3:55 pm. Motion passed.