**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

October 6, 2020

Via Microsoft Teams – 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Wendy Athens (OTL), Kat Brown, Joy Cole, Suzy Cox, Karen Cushing, Jessica Hill, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Alan Parry, Evelyn Porter, Denise Richards, Karen Sturtevant (Library), Wayne Vaught, Sandie Waters

Visitors: Nizhone Meza, Dustin Shipp, Kelli Potter, Kyle Kamaiopili, Scott Lewis, John Jarvis, Lauren Brooks, Audrey Reeves, David W. Scott, Shane Draper, Krista Ruggles

***Excused or Absent:***

* Call to order – 3:00 p.m.
* Meeting is being recorded.

**ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES**

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Reminder that the purpose of the Executive Committee (ExCo) is to set the agenda for Faculty Senate on 10/13/20.
* At the 9/29 Faculty Senate meeting, several senators expressed concern about not having enough time for debate items. ExCo agreed to discuss meeting processes at the next ExCo meeting.

**POSSIBLE REMOVAL OF TIME ALLOCATIONS TO ADMIN UPDATES OR STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

* Discussion about ways to create more efficiencies and allow additional time for debate.
  + Waters - Create a document of updates and posting at the end of the minutes.
  + Richards - Disadvantages to not having updates are delays and lack of consistency. Supports keeping updates at end or requesting written updates only.
  + Potter- Supports moving updates to end of meeting.
  + McAdams-Jones - The meeting is set for two hours and not everyone will be able to share one’s opinions. If want to meet longer than two hours, we can have more debate. Potter clarified that senate is to have robust debates not necessarily having all voices heard during the meeting.
  + Reeves - Updates at end allow senators the advantage to participate in more of the meeting and for debate items.
  + Anderson - Senators are able to comment on debate items. Coming prepared to senate having previously read the materials does allow for robust discussion. Putting time limits on debate items can be a deterrent to robust discussion. Rather than focusing on language needed, focus on how the comment will help senate further their objectives.
  + Arendt - Expressed concern about senators not commenting on debate items and then trying to determine how much time to allocate during the meeting.
  + Parry - Whatever comments are going to be debated need to be in the comment document that provides the starting points for debate. Some senators feel that new comments should be allowed during live debate. He noted that during the course of the debate if new information surfaces, senators could share. He feels senators really need to come prepared ahead of time for effective debate.
  + Decisions focus on fulfilling the purpose of Faculty Senate. Process needs to address the purpose and intention of senate. Comments should be the result of that discussion.
  + Arendt - ExCo did previously remove presentations from agendas starting fall 2020 to help with allowing more time for debate. Inviting faculty to participate in presentations/PPTs that no one participates in is not helpful. Sometimes it is difficult to know whether a presentation item might lead to a robust conversation as previously with President Holland.
  + Vaught - can set up town hall meetings to give faculty topical or open-ended conversations with the Provost.

**HANDLING OF POLICY COMMENT AND DEBATE PROCESS**

* Parry - Whatever senate decides, need to determine the goal of the comments and to whom we are representing.
* Anderson – Faculty Senate has 60 days to respond to the policy steward and the process is to determine how senate wants to comment.
* Arendt – As a senate, we only have ability to give feedback. We are not a decision-making body.
* Discussion about consolidating all items for vote into one Qualtrics package **after** all the debate occurs in senate. Need to be mindful how we track the voting process and reporting in the minutes.
* Due to senate debate last year, there was debate on how the comment summaries were captured. Need to determine that the vote would be on the content of the overall summary not wordsmithing. If senate chooses to debate each comment, it can become laborious dependent on the number of comments. Need to determine how the collective voice of the senate is represented.
* A task force can handle debate on items that do not specifically address policy comments but a larger issue such as how the policy interacts with other policies.

**NON-POLICY COMMENT AND DEBATE PROCESS**

* New process is to bring proposals to senate and determine if senate even wants to discuss the proposal. Currently have seven items backlogged.
* Anderson’s initial policy primer was helpful especially for new senators; however, some felt there was not enough information on how to comment on policy/non-policy items.
* If senators want a strategic discussion, they need to send request to Arendt. She will bring to senate to determine what action senate wants to take on the proposal. If want comments on a debate item that does not go to the steward, it will be a non-policy debate item and developed as a taskforce.
* Joy Cole handles campus-wide committee assignments. Taskforce committees are more open.
* The Policy Office generates a policy template summary. Faculty Senate felt the summarized comments did not always capture the full scope of the comment, so the full comments were included as an appendix. Comments not meant to go forward can be put in, but then will need to be removed before sending to the steward. Quality debate needs to focus on developing the official position of Faculty Senate.
* Anything that is not policy and needs action comes to Faculty Senate to determine the outcome and move forward. Faculty Senate would decide how the item should come in: resolution, strategic discussion, or taskforce.

SET AGENDA

* When time runs out on the meeting, items that have not been addressed automatically table until the next meeting. The tabled items will become the first item in its respective category.
* UVU Faculty Senate follows a relaxed version of Robert’s Rules.
* Recording stopped.
* Moved administrative updates and standing committee reports to bottom of agenda.
* Discussion on Provost updates and appropriate time to address. Several ExCo members felt that a connection to the Provost is perhaps the most important person to hear from. **VOTE** - Keep Provost at top of the agenda. Passed. **VOTE** – Keep Provost time limit to 10 minutes. Passed.
* Discussion about the comments allowed on the bylaws were comments on the proposed changes from spring 2020. Proposal made to move this to a Qualtrics vote.
* Recommend having comments due by Sunday evenings at midnight. ExCo agreed.
* **MOTION** – Extend meeting for 10 more minutes. All in favor? Motion passed.
* Incoming proposals presented to Faculty Senate to determine if want to discuss or not, how want to approach (debate, resolution, task force, executive summary, etc.), and what type of outcome is senate seeking.
* **MOTION** – Sandie Waters move extend discussion for 10 minutes. Jessi Hill seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
* Look at minutes to determine if GI and WE were added to UCC and Senate Bylaws.
* Discussion about senate direction and when the vote actually occurs on the direction to go. ExCo will provide a recommendation and if Faculty Senate not vote on next steps will address additional motions at next senate meeting.
* ExCo will experiment with written updates and ask Faculty Senate if the updates were informative and effective. Will put in template Hill drafted and need by Thursdays at COB to Arendt.

Meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.