Present: Jon Anderson, Marlene Bacon, Lyn Bennett, Bret Boyer, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, Arlen Card, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Matthew Draper, Lars Eggertson, Dwayne Erdman, Vivienne Faurot, Doug Gardner, Phil Gordon, Erin Haskell (UVUSA), Joel Herd (PACE), Vance Hillman, Yang Huo, Xiaoyi Ji, Dianne Knight, Pierre Lamarche, Dan McDonald, Gary Measom, Rick Moody, Tyler Nelson, Cheol Hwan Oh, Dennis Potter, Jacqueline Preston, Darin Taylor, Russ Thornley, Craig Thulin, Elaine Tuft, Marcus Vincent, Lorraine Wallace, Ian Wilson, Alex Yuan,

Excused or Absent: Steve Allred, Deborah Baird, Kathy Black, Leo Chan, David Dean, Tim Doyle, Wioleta Fedeczko, Debora Ferreira, Matthew Holland, Carolyn Howard, Mark Jeffreys, Ryan Leick, Gary Mercado, Jeff Packer, Axel Ramirez, Nancy Steele-Makasci, Kim Strunk, Paul Tayler, Kent Walker,

Call to order - 3:10 PM

Approval of Minutes from March 19 and March 26, 2013. Minutes approved.

Policy

MOTION - Lyn Bennett motioned to reorder the agenda for Policy 204, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 421. Dennis Potter seconded. All in favor? Motion passed. The Policy Committee feels the policies were incomplete and requested that all policies be complete when entering into Stage 2.

MOTION – Arlen Card motioned to move the policies forward to the stewards with comments from the Policy Committee. Gary Measom seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

Healthcare Forum

• Lyn Bennett felt some changes could be made in the final year with EMI and also recommends the Faculty Senate take a proactive approach to propose a new model. She and Phil Gordon volunteered to participate in a cohort should one be established.

• Some senators were concerned over some panel members stating there would be “no cost” for initial set up for an on-site clinic was misleading and not completely understood. Some senators felt that a pilot program would be skewed and not a true representation of what the actual costs would look like because only “healthy” individuals would participate.

• Questions senators would like answered are: 1) What is the possibility to obtain case managers for the small group of individuals that are driving up UVU’s health costs? 2) How does case management work?

• David Connelly proposed developing 5-6 specific questions for President’s Council and request specific answers by a certain date. MOTION – Craig Thulin motioned for Faculty Senate to develop questions they would like answered (short or long term considerations) from the
Healthcare Forum sent to David Connelly by Thursday, April 11, to coordinate and present back at next Senate. Lyn Bennett seconded. All in favor? Motion passed. One Abstention.

**Standing Committees**

- Four standing committee chairs are rotating off the Senate. Senate is now taking nominations for the election next week.
  - Policy – Chair receives one reassigned class per semester and reviews all policies that come through the pipeline.
  - Faculty Grievance – Address issues regarding academic freedom not HR or tenure and rank issues. Refer to Policy 647. (Matt Draper nominated)
  - Post-Tenure – Reviews each department’s post-tenure criteria against university policy for conflicts.
  - Personnel & Elections – Tracks who is in what position, on what committee, and runs the elections (Rick Moody nominated)

- Budget & Benefits Member – Seeking nominations to replace Axel Ramirez as committee member.
- Nominations will be open until next Tuesday. Send Elaine Tuft any nominations.
- Discussion occurred regarding lecturers and whether or not they are allowed to serve on senate committees. In theory, lecturers are not hired with an expectation of service or scholarship. Some senators felt the wording in their offer letter states otherwise. Kat Brown recited the actual wording from the offer letter and faculty pointed out that the words “should participate” presents a conflict. Kat Brown will follow up on the wording to see if it needs to be changed. The primary issue is, can lecturers volunteer for committees. The senate wants confirmation from VPAA that the offer letter has been changed.
- Senate wants clarification on the expectations of a Lecturer.

**Ad-Hoc Committee on Adjuncts**

- Three resolutions (Office Space, Pay, Representation) were presented by the committee and discussed. The committee noted that the purpose of a resolution is not policy, but can be a statement of desire or wish for policies that are in line with the values expressed in the resolution.
- Discussion
  - Representation – Faculty from University College were against as they felt it was providing them increased power. Concern was raised over how do you put an adjunct as a senator yet restrict them. Need to examine procedures for adjuncts more in-depth.
  - Pay – Concern over increasing adjunct pay until they are comparable with peer institutions (however defined) causes conflict because full-time faculty feel they are underpaid as well.
  - Rewording was recommended on resolutions 1 and 3. Suggestion was made to eliminate the first phrase on 1 and 3 and was accepted by the senate. Add “more space where available.” Proposed dropping the phrase “from each college”.

A suggestion was made that adjuncts could develop an informal Adjunct Council at their own discretion with a senator appointed to represent them. In order to accomplish this, the senate could form an Ad Hoc Committee or form a new standing committee, but it requires a change to the bylaws.

- **MOTION** – Gary Measom motioned to accept Resolution 3 as amended and present to President’s Council. Pierre Lamarche seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
- **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to accept Resolution 2 as it stands and move forward. Lars Eggertsen seconded. All in favor? Motion passed. One abstention.
- **MOTION** – Mark Bracken motioned to accept Resolution 3 as amended and move it forward. Elaine Tuft seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

**Senate President**

- Currently the position is a four-year commitment. David Connelly proposed moving forward with the constitution revisions and separating the bylaws from policy and move the position to a one year term. The proposal is, if senate body agrees, the primary focus for next year will be on the constitution and bylaws and move them forward and what would the collective term of president look like. **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to develop an Ad Hoc Committee over the summer to rewrite the constitution and bylaws in order to have them in place by spring 2014 when the next elections would take place. Dennis Potter seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

**Summer Session**

- Proposal was made to take any policy directly affecting faculty through a first reading, give charge to the Policy Committee to begin reviewing in order to take earlier action in the fall.
- **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to establish two days in the summer to begin working on policies and provide a way for senators to dial into the conversation. Gary Measom seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

**Fall Faculty Speaker**

- Proposal was made for the Faculty Senate to begin sponsoring guest speakers in the fall and spring. The senate will dedicate one meeting for a speaker and forum in the fall. The spring speaker will be a national speaker.
- **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to accept the proposal for a UVU faculty speaker/forum invited each fall and national speaker/forum each spring. Dennis Potter seconded. All in favor? One abstention.
- Fall 2013 speaker suggestion was David Knowlton. Other suggestions were Alan Clarke, Elaine Englehardt, and David Keller. **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to ask David Knowlton and then Alan Clarke as an alternate. Arlen Card seconded. All in favor? Motion passed. One abstention.
Policy 638 - Post-tenure

- Previous discussion revolved around alternative models to the pursuit of the idea of post-tenure. Three ideas discussed with the Executive Committee:
  - Need language in terms of its tone, so not just a stick
  - Two models
    - Universal – every five years faculty would submit a portfolio to be reviewed by individuals/committees, goes through system and either given pat on the back or remediation.
    - Triggered – have some type of annual evaluation and that at some point if you receive enough problematic reviews, it will trigger a more comprehensive review.
  - The question arises as to what is the actual mechanism to move forward. Senate wants to know the purpose of the policy. Is it developmental rather than punitive? How can we help you? Would like definitive direction from Administration on the purpose. Senate wants to focus more on the remediation and development, not termination. If remediation is really the intent, some feel the tenure process needs to be stronger. In a trigger model their needs to be sufficient data points so nothing is arbitrary.
  - Policy needs to contain some permissive language in the purpose statement for the department or dean to free up resources as a reward or incentive such as stipend for travel, professional development to make post-tenure more attractive.

- David will send one last message regarding post-tenure to see if he can get some language going.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 16, 2013, LC243, 3:00-5:00 pm