Faculty Senate Minutes
September 18, 2012
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

Present: Marlene Bacon, John Balden, Lyn Bennett, Bret Boyer, Mark Bracken, Kat Brown, Leo Chan, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, David Dean, Matthew Draper, Dwayne Erdman, Vivienne Faurot, Joel Herd (PACE), Vance Hillman, Matthew Holland, Yang, Huo, Mark Jeffreys, Xiaoyi Ji, Dianne Knight, Ryan Leick, Phil Matheson, Dan McDonald, Gary Measom, Tyler Nelson, Jeff Packer, Evelyn Porter, Jacqueline Preston, Axel Ramirez, Nancy Steele-Makasci, Kim Strunk, Darin Taylor, Russ Thornley, Craig Thulin, Haijing Tu, Elaine Tuft, Marcus Vincent, Kent Walker, Lorraine Wallace, Ian Wilson

Guests: Tom Hawkins, Linda Makin, Jim Michaelis, Barney Nye, Cara O’Sullivan, Mark Wiesenberg

Excused or Absent: Steve Allred, Deborah Baird, Kathy Black, Arlen Card, Lars Eggertson, Wioleta Fedeczko, Debora Ferriera, Doug Gardner, Stott Harston, Erin Haskell (UVUSA), Carolyn Howard, Lisa Lambert, Pierre Lamarche, Rick Moody, Dennis Potter, Paul Tayler

• Call to order - 3:03 PM
• Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2012 meeting. Minutes approved.
• President Holland
  o Preliminary results show UVU tied for 1st for building funds with Weber, but feel we made a value case based on growth and mission.
  o Center for Study of Ethics in 25th year with celebration and guest speakers such as David Gardner.
  o Cato production is running and encourages your attendance.
  o Scholarship Ball on September 22, 2012.
• VPAA – Ian Wilson
  o Encouraged faculty to attend events this week on campus.
  o 3rd week enrollment report will not be out for a few more weeks.
• PACE – Joel Herd
  o Provided comments from PACE on policies 165 and 302 to David Connelly for reference. David noted that PACE had a very good discussion and expects to see good things happen.
• Committee Requests & Elections
  o Task Force on Underage Safety and University Responsibility is still waiting for nominations.
  o Course Fee Committee is seeking nominations. There are usually two meetings a year and occur in February, and requires two year’s of service. Would like two to three faculty to sit on the committee. They suggest having individuals from departments who have heavier usage of fees.
  o Discuss these committees with your departments and submit nominations.
• Policy Office – Cara O’Sullivan
  o Provided an overview on the policy process to the Senate and will provide her PowerPoint presentation for reference. The presentation can be found on the Faculty Senate website under “Other Resources” or link
Policy Office is open to new ideas to improve the policy process.

Role of the Policy Office is to facilitate the policy development process, ensure compliance with UVU Policy 101, ensure editorial quality, conduct policy research, and develop a glossary.

Demonstrated online policy system

- New system will allow for all drafts and formally documented comments to be posted online and will add to the transparency process

Debate Calendar

- Policy 631 – Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses
  - Sent comments to senate and in action item phase.
  - Section 5.3.1 – excludes department chair, yet in 5.3.4 it includes the chair. Item needs to include department chair.
  - Discussion over the availability of SRIs to students for faculty so students have real idea of evaluations and not rely solely on Rate My Professor. Ian Wilson noted that students have asked for them and have been told no. Kat Brown indicated she would like to see a discussion transpire among faculty and determine their view on the issue.
  - MOTION - Mark Bracken motioned to move this policy to Stage 3 along with comments submitted by the policy committee. Lyn Bennett seconded. All in Favor? Motion passed.

- Policy 403 - Restrictions on the Use of Skateboards, Roller Blades, Roller Skates, Bicycles and Motorcycles
  - Why are motorcycles grouped with other items because they follow the street laws with moving vehicles? Jim Michaelis noted that UVU is making sure they are identified.
  - Discussion regarding “motorized scooter” and “non-motorized scooter” references in policy. Would like them removed.
  - MOTION – Gary Measom motioned to suspend the calendar and move to an action item. Marlene Bacon seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
  - Discussion – concern over skateboards in the parking lot and how to keep everyone safe. Policy does cover “due care and caution.” Reference to ADA accommodations is covered by police approval. Appropriate signage will be posted.
  - MOTION – Mark Bracken motioned to move the policy forward to Stage 3 with citing ADA references, striking motorized designation, and proper signage language. Leo Chan seconded. All in favor? Majority in favor; 1 opposed. Motion passed.

- Policy 423 – Space Assignment and Space Change
  - This policy is primarily a housekeeping issue changing the name and verbiage.
  - Faculty Senate would like verbiage added that if a policy is denied, a written response with rationale is provided.
  - MOTION – Axel Ramirez motioned to advance policy to an action item. Gary Measom seconded. All in favor? Majority in favor; 1 opposed. Motion passed.
- Discussion – Suggestion to insert language that a reason for written denial with rationale is provided.
- **MOTION** – Matt Draper motioned to move policy forward to Stage 3 with addition of language regarding written rationale for denial. Leo Chan seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

  - Policy 165 – **Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action**
    - Policy committee comments sent out to Senate and are attached.
    - Main concern of policy committee is that there is no grievance process in Policy 165. Mark Wiesenberg noted that Policy 156 is going to Stage 1 for review to add a “complaint” procedure for Policy 165 that would require an investigating officer to respond to both parties. General Counsel has reviewed Policy 165.
    - **MOTION** - Russ Thornley motioned to advance policy to an action item. Dwayne Erdmann seconded. All in favor? Majority in favor; 1 – opposed; 1 – abstained. Motion passed.
    - Discussion - Policy Committee concerned that they are being asked to move forward the policy not knowing what the new grievance policy states. President Holland provided history dialogue for revisions. Based on discussions over the last year, determined that the grievance process needed improvement and issues were addressed. Concerned was addressed over what issues the new grievance policy will address. Mark Wiesenberg believes that current grievance policy would handle issues as it has done in previous years. The challenge is what is statutory and not. The individual always has the right to obtain legal counsel. Intent is to clarify. The intent of the policy is to reiterate that the University does not tolerate and we want to deal with these things in an expeditious way.
    - NOTE: When Faculty Senate reviews Policy 156, they review it in light of Policy 165.
    - **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett motioned to move policy to Stage 3 with comments to the steward. Russ Thornley seconded. All in favor? Majority in favor; 1 – abstain. Motion passed.

  - Policy 601 – **Classroom Management**
    - Policy Committee wants either specific charge or action from the Senate. They completed second round and have reviewed Section 3.
    - Concern over phrase “extenuating circumstances” as it causes problems because it is open for interpretation. Would like to see some sort of documentation/verification language for extenuating circumstances. Policy Committee also had some concerns as they feel that first sentence should stop after “by the faculty and department chair.” They feel this decision should be up to the faculty and department chair not the university. Senate would like to see language added something to the effect that “at the discretion of the faculty member/department, documentation may be required for extenuating circumstances” and possibly add a timeframe for production of documents.
    - Charge to the Policy Committee is to continue reviewing the policy and discuss at the next meeting. Lyn Bennett will send comments to David Connelly for distribution and review by senate.

  - Policy 302 – **Hiring of Staff and Student Employees**
- Discussion tabled for next meeting.
  - White Paper – Ian Wilson
    - Recapped a few items from white paper, but more detailed information is included on the Executive Minutes dated September 11, 2012.
- Faculty Section
  - Section is still under discussion and recommendations. Any thing in this particular section will be contained in Policy 632.
  - Define Terminal Degree – misspoke at the Executive Committee meeting. Asking departments to determine what is the terminal degree in their department and whatever the terminal degree is, the faculty member can receive Tenure and rank of Associate Professor, but cannot obtain the rank of Professor without doctoral degree.
  - Role Statements – Discusses faculty with varying responsibilities such as faculty who have responsibility for more rigorous research requirement and other areas it will be teaching. The question arises how can we reflect in Policy 632 varying role statements and how do we address them.
  - Multi-year contracts for lecturers – Practice is one-year appointment for lecturers. We need to develop a system to provide possible three or five year contracts. Issue is how do we do this and what criteria do we use. It has also been suggested to split Policy 632 keeping tenure track and creating a new one that deals with non-tenure track.
- David Gardner – He commented that the challenge higher education is facing is increased costs, etc. He was a President of the California system for about 10 years. He and the prior president set up system so that education was available to anyone regardless of circumstances. Set up system so that all Community Colleges were free. Then distributed students among state and other institutions based on academic performance. The system is now collapsing under pressure of increased costs. He encouraged institutions to be more creative and thoughtful in providing education that is more creative and cost less.
- Send feedback on structured enrollment to VPAA and Michelle Taylor, and to Karen Cushing and David Connelly for inclusion in the minutes.
- All lecturer language has been taken out of Policy 632 because they do not have traditional rank. The terms artist in residence, professional in residence suggest much longer term than placeholder lecturers or other lecturers. The term lecturer will cover all aspects of non-tenure track positions. The committee has not examined this issue globally.
- Motion to Adjourn – Matt Draper; Gary Measom seconded.
- Adjourned 5:00 pm

NEXT FACULTY SENATE MEETING – Tuesday, October 2, 2012, 3:00-5:00 pm, LC243
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS ENTITY</th>
<th>POLICY SECTION</th>
<th>CONCERN</th>
<th>SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Faculty/course evaluations; be clear something like “student evaluations of faculty and courses”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technically with the SRIs currently used, we don’t actually assess the course;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sentence is only about student evaluations of faculty, not the courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th sentence is about student evaluations of courses, not the faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: is this formative and/or summative in nature/intent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: evaluations should include both faculty assessment AND course assessment; students should be able to comment on both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>faculty rights/responsibilities reference?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>UUV should be corrected to UVU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>create separate definitions of faculty evaluations and course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>include language that indicates that the evaluation has met some validity standard and perhaps this standard needs to be evaluated by the institution every so often?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>include language “chaired by a faculty senator” (consistency in language w/policy 523)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>“shall be used as one of several tools for the evaluation of all faculty members...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include statement that requires re-validation of the evaluation instrument used, every certain among of year; periodic reassessment of validity; notification of this re-validation delivered to university community?

2nd sentence: strike this sentence so not to dictate particular categories of assessment (e.g., “faculty conduct” and “teaching effectiveness”) NOTE: current SRLs don’t have specific assessment questions about the course

| Faculty Senate | 4.2 | drop the “also” revise: “student evaluations of faculty as one of the factors in considering whether teaching appointments....”

add sentence: Department chair will utilize input from student evaluations of the course for course assessment.”

maybe include departmental access to some of these evaluations as long as they do not violate faculty or student privacy

| Faculty Senate | 4.3 | can S.C.O.T show up in here? it is institutionally approved what about department formative, etc. evaluations, are they no longer allowed? if we use supplemental evaluations, why must the Dean and VPAA approve them? recommend removal of this section

| Faculty Senate | 4.4 | what is meant by “ADA Services”? is this reference to the Accessibilities Services Department? “Appropriate”? why not just start second sentence with “Accommodations”?  

| Faculty Senate | 5.1 | isn’t this entire section policy instead of procedure?

| Faculty Senate | 5.1.1 | Why is this section in quotes? just say the VPAA or designee? suggest that the third sentence (about responsibility not changes, etc.) be separated into another section; that this new section clarify what is meant by “any course/faculty evaluation instrument.” Is this a reference to the university evaluative instrument?

| Faculty Senate | 5.1.2 | drop “some”  

5.1.2. and 5.1.3 really should be bulleted to fit university policy format

| Faculty Senate | 5.2.1 | suggest dropping words in first sentence after solicited e.g. “student input shall be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate</th>
<th>5.3.1</th>
<th>question of ability to review student evaluations for institutional purposes (faculty information kept confidential) shouldn’t the chair/appropriate departmental staff have access to these evaluations? are these all the entities who need to have access to this information? e.g. Board of Trustees?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>do faculty get aggregate data for themselves? if no, why not? shouldn’t faculty be able to review this data to access how they compare to other faculty, etc.? couldn’t aggregate data be used as a “core theme” indicator for NW Accreditation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Number: 631
Policy Name: Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses

1.0 Purpose
Faculty/course evaluations; be clear something like “student evaluations of faculty and courses”

technically with the SRIs currently used, we don’t actually assess the course;

3rd sentence is only about student evaluations of faculty, not the courses
4th sentence is about student evaluations of courses, not the faculty

NOTE: is this formative and/or summative in nature/intent?

NOTE: evaluations should include both faculty assessment AND course assessment; students should be able to comment on both

2.0
faculty rights/responsibilities reference?

2.1
UUV should be corrected to UVU

3.1
create separate definitions of faculty evaluations and course evaluations

include language that indicates that the evaluation has met some validity standard and perhaps this standard needs to be evaluated by the institution every so often?

3.2
include language “chaired by a faculty senator” (consistency in language w/policy 523)

4.0 Policy
4.1.1
“shall be used as one of several tools for the evaluation of all faculty members…”

include statement that requires re-validation of the evaluation instrument used, every certain among of year; periodic reassessment of validity; notification of this re-validation delivered to university community?
2nd sentence: strike this sentence so not to dictate particular categories of assessment (e.g. “faculty conduct” and “teaching effectiveness”) NOTE: current SRIs don’t have specific assessment questions about the course

4.2
drop the “also”
revise: “student evaluations of faculty as one of the factors in considering whether teaching appointments....”

add sentence: Department chair will utilize input from student evaluations of the course for course assessment.”

maybe include departmental access to some of these evaluations as long as they do not violate faculty or student privacy

4.3
can S.C.O.T show up in here? it is institutionally approved
what about department formative, etc. evaluations, are they no longer allowed?
if we use supplemental evaluations, why must the Dean and VPAA approve them?
recommend removal of this section

4.4
what is meant by “ADA Services”? is this reference to the Accessibilities Services Department?
“Appropriate”? why not just start second sentence with “Accommodations”?

5.0 Procedures

5.1
isn’t this entire section policy instead of procedure?

5.1.1
Why is this section in quotes?
just say the VPAA or designee?
suggest that the third sentence (about responsibility not changes, etc.) be separated into another section;
that this new section clarify what is meant by “any course/faculty evaluation instrument.” Is this a reference to the university evaluative instrument?

5.1.2
drop “some”

5.1.2. and 5.1.3 really should be bulleted to fit university policy format
5.2 Frequency of Evaluations

5.2.1 suggest dropping words in first sentence after solicited e.g. “student input shall be solicited.” and before “all faculty” (All should be the start of a new sentence)

5.3.1

question of ability to review student evaluations for institutional purposes (faculty information kept confidential)
shouldn’t the chair/appropriate departmental staff have access to these evaluations?
are these all the entities who need to have access to this information? e.g. Board of Trustees?

5.3.4

do faculty get aggregate data for themselves? if no, why not? shouldn’t faculty be able to review this data to access how they compare to other faculty, etc.? couldn’t aggregate data be used as a “core theme” indicator for NW Accreditation?
### POLICY APPROVAL PROCESS - STAGE 2
#### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS ENTITY</th>
<th>POLICY SECTION</th>
<th>CONCERN</th>
<th>SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Purpose 1.0</td>
<td>Lack of a revised grievance policy is of concern but we will await that new policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Harassment...inappropriately... Why use of “inappropriate” qualifier? drop qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Sexual harassment...unreasonably... Why use of “unreasonably” qualifier? drop qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>3.2, 5.4, 5.5</td>
<td>Clarification of the employee and student “equity officer” positions; who are they, how appointed, who appoints, supervisors, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS ENTITY</td>
<td>POLICY SECTION</td>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td></td>
<td>We recommend Faculty Senate take no action on this policy until a grievance process has been established (either in this policy or a separate policy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td>Purpose 1.0</td>
<td>We recommend the inclusion of the entire UVU Values Statement on Diversity; we should not just meet the letter of the law, but the spirit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Harassment....inappropriately....Why use of “inappropriate” qualifier? drop qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Sexual harassment...unreasonably....Why use of “unreasonably” qualifier? drop qualifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Cmttee</td>
<td>3.2, 5.4, 5.5</td>
<td>Clarification of the employee and student “equity officer” positions; who are they, how appointed, who appoints, supervisors, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>