**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

April 5, 2016

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Dustin Fife (Library), Doug Gardner, Ryan Leick, Jeff Olson, Jim Pettersson, Matt Robins (UVUSA)

Visitors:

***Excused or Absent:***

* Call to order – 3:02 PM
* Approval of Minutes from March 22, 2016 Executive Committee meeting. Minutes approved.

SVPAA

* Board of Trustees approved the five new master’s degrees. Still need Board of Regents and NWCCU approval. Have also notified USHE that we will be coming back in the next few years for additional master’s degrees. We are now classified as a master’s institution with Carnegie. UVU has no plans to become a doctoral institution.
* Olson will make Faculty Senate presentation to update the senate on the status of the Academic Master plan and the implications with the Facilities Master plan. Reviewed the processes over the last year that have fed into the plan. Highlighted that the majority feel that the Orem and West Campus should be built up and move only strategic areas to the Vineyard property.
* Compensation will be covered in Hoagies with Holland.

UVUSA

* Mental Health Awareness Week events were successful.
* Final Academic Speaker Series will feature Max Greenfield who is an actor in the TV show “New Girl.” He will be speaking on the importance of arts in his life, how he got into the acting world, and his successes and failures along the way.
* The new election process needs several years to determine if it is effective or not.

Faculty Development & SRI

* Thulin met with Olson and will submit a PBA proposal for additional faculty development funds as an early request. Will send out proposal for review and discussion for the April 12 meeting. He reported that the committee decided to overhaul the awards in order to encourage more participation. In regards to a reapportionment or additional awards, the Executive Committee decided for additional awards. See attached proposal handout. In larger colleges and schools, would like to add more recognitions if desired. Senate needs to discuss, amend, and approve the resolution. Since this will be a PBA request, there is no guarantee of additional funding.
* SRIs – Committee would like a vote on the proposed motion:

“Whereas, new SRI questions have been developed over the course of the past five years, the process began in early 2011 and have been piloted in several departments for three or more semesters and then campus-wide alongside the current SRI questions during summer 2015 and fall 2015 as well as the current semester and,

Whereas, analyses of the piloting of the new SRI questions have shown them to be at least as effective as the current questions and completely compatible in terms of quantitative aspects and the new additional questions add significantly to what we learn about the effectiveness of teaching and learning at UVU.

Therefore, be it resolved that the new SRI questions be adopted for permanent use across campus beginning summer term 2016.

It should be noted, that this is NOT a discussion of how to affect student participation in the SRI process nor is it a discussion on the overall topic of how teaching quality should be measured including the role SRIs should play in that evaluation. Those are two very important discussions that Faculty Senate should engage in, but this present discussion is limited as to whether or not we should adopt the new SRI questions.”

Add discussions about how to improve teaching measures on a fall agenda.

POLICY

* Policy 607 – *Course and Lab Fees* was approved on April 21, 2015 by AAC to move forward.
* Policy 115 – *Minors on Campus and at University-Sponsored Events* - Based on discussion at the last meeting asked faculty to provide feedback prior to sending forward official comments. Faculty sent forward new comments, but faculty voted to move forward the comments submitted as of the Senate meeting. New comments should be brought forward in Stage 3.

RELEASE TIME FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FACULTY

* Discussion about the time involved by each committee chair over the past academic year. When promoting for replacements, need to be sure to emphasize the importance.
	+ RTP – 3/3 release time sufficient
	+ Curriculum – 3/3 release time sufficient
	+ Service & Elections – 3/3 release time sufficient
		- Bring forth committee names for Consent agenda
		- University committees seeking faculty representation need to provide a charge.
	+ Special Investigations & Ad Hoc – 3/3 release time sufficient
	+ CAGAS – Not a standing committee chair, but did need the course release which was covered by UC.
	+ Faculty Senate Vice President – role is ambiguous. Role has been defined more as time progressed.
	+ Responsibilities and roles of the officers and chairs needs to be defined in the Bylaws. Consensus was that a 3/3 release time was sufficient.
	+ Policy Liaison – Position should be working with Kat Brown to assist in moving forward policy. Should be person facilitating the Senate in the overall process. ExCo approved putting this position up for election.
	+ Send official recommendations on release time to Jeff Olson for approval.

ELECTION PROCESS

* Send out list of positions that will be open for election and submit nominations to Clay Brown. Invite all new senators to last meeting and conduct the voting at the beginning of the meeting. Each chair needs to send a brief description of duties to Clayton by close-of-business on April 6. Can allow brief campaigning comments. Nominations can only be made by continuing or incoming senators and can be self-nominating.

Curriculum Chair

* Leick shared the problems in Aviation about election of a Senator for the next year and how it conflicts with his current service as Curriculum Chair. Bracken noted that the Constitution states the position is for three years to preserve institutional memory. Question is can ExCo enforce the three year term. Only way to shorten the term is to depose the senator or the senator can choose to step down.
* Bracken will meet with Aviation Department Chair and new senator and note that the election was not in line with old or new policy. Leick does not want to create contention in the department and will step down and the newly elected individual will serve for a three year term. Remind senators that service on senate is a three year term, but allow substitutes for extenuating circumstances with department approval.

Faculty Grievance

* Bracken and Pettersson will review Weber State policy and report back.

Faculty Policy Subcommittee

* Olson recommended Bracken and Olson as co-sponsors and put on Faculty Senate agenda. Meet with Kat Brown, Bracken, Gardner, and Olson. Purpose is to make sure that all the policies “sync” together.
* Background – Previous AVP not transparent in creating policy. Policies 632, 633, and 638 were all rewritten. Policy 638 passed through Stage 2 comments and was held for Policies 632 and 633 to catch up. Policies were cross-referenced by large committee. Ian Wilson decided to hold to wait for the new SVPAA to bring their views. Created Shared Governance committee to review these policies. Connelly feels that the policies are going to be controversial regardless, so need to vet, re-draft and move on. ExCo recommends push forward to President’s Council for approval to move into Stage 2, review over the summer, so they can come to Faculty Senate in early fall. **MOTION** – Jon Anderson motioned to extend conversation for five minutes. Clayton Brown seconded. All in favor? Motion passed. 1 Opposed. Connelly recommended asking for an extension to the 60 day process.

MISCELLANEOUS

* Bracken will take the Birth Leave recommendation to Benefits committee.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

**UVU Faculty Senate Resolution Improvements to the**

**Faculty Excellence Awards**

Whereas:

The Faculty Excellence Awards are honors given under the auspices of the UVU Faculty Senate and are accolades recognizing faculty excellence, especially in teaching;

And whereas:

The current structure of these Awards does not result in proportional recognition of the UVU faculty across the University, compromising both participation in and significance of the Awards;

And whereas:

The Faculty Excellence Committees of the various Schools/Colleges-which select the Award winners-lack sufficient uniformity across the University but also need sufficient flexibility to make their selections as proficiently as could be;

And whereas:

The process for nomination for recipients of the Awards and the process of application by nominees for evaluation by the Faculty Excellence Committees are currently neither sufficiently clear nor optimal to facilitate participation in the process and the selection of the best candidates as awardees;

Therefore, be it resolved that:

1. The number of Senate Faculty Excellence Awards be expanded in a tiered fashion based upon the total number of full time faculty in each School/College.

The current practice of recognizing at graduation one Full-time Faculty Excellence Award winner and one Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award winner from each School/College is an important tradition in a public graduation ceremony that should be retained.

However, the wide disparity in the sizes (as seen in the full-time faculty count) of the various Schools/Colleges of the University results in an inequitable opportunity to win and distribution of the award (both money and prestige), as Schools/Colleges with as many as 130 faculty members receive the same number of awards as those with less 30 faculty members.

Continuing the tradition, a single Full-time Faculty recipient will be chosen in each School/College. In addition, *one additional* Faculty Excellence *Recognition* will be given in each School/College *for every 25full-time faculty members beyond thefirst 25.* (This is the same rule that governs the number of representatives in the Faculty Senate. Thus, while a small School/College of 30 full-time faculty would continue to have both an Adjunct and Faculty Excellence Award winner, they would not be granted any extra Faculty Excellence
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Recognition recipients. By contrast, a larger School/College of 130 full-time faculty would have both an Adjunct and Faculty Excellence Award winner and four Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients).

The Faculty Excellence Award would continue to include $2,000 cash award as it has, and Faculty Excellence *Recognition* would include $1,000 for each awardee. (Note: These dollar amounts are not yet funded. See Appendix VI.)

Similarly, a single Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award recipient will be chosen in each School/College, with additional Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognition given for proportional representation among adjunct faculty, equal to and not to exceed the number of full-time Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients for the School/College. The Adjunct Excellence Award would continue to include $1,000 cash award as it has, and Adjunct Excellence *Recognition* would include $500 for each awardee. (Note: These dollar amounts are not yet funded. See Appendix VI.)

These awards-including full-time Faculty Excellence Awards and Faculty Excellence Recognitions as well as Adjunct Faculty Excellence Awards and Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognitions-will be selected by the School/College Faculty Excellence Committees, employing a single nomination and application process for all of the awards

and selecting from that pool of applicants (one pool for the full-time awards and another for the adjunct awards).

1. Criteria and guidelines for the constitution of School/College Faculty Excellence Committees (FEC) be clarified and improved.

Faculty Excellence Committees have been insufficiently consistent across the University and have lacked clarity. The guidelines for the constitution of these Committees are delineated in Appendix I of this Resolution. These guidelines supplant those in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

1. The process for nomination for Awards be clarified and improved.

The nomination process for the Faculty Excellence Awards has lacked clarity and (perhaps as a result) participation. The nomination process as improved is delineated in Appendix II of this Resolution. This process supplants that in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website. Because there is frequently confusion among the general faculty about the process, each year the Faculty Senate President will send out a succinct "Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations ", which will also be published on the Faculty Senate website (see Appendix V of this Resolution).

1. The process for nominees submitting applications to the FEC be clarified and improved.
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Submission of applications by those nominated for the Awards has lacked clarity and uniformity across the University, resulting in unnecessary burden to some Faculty Excellence Committees and an insufficient basis for selecting awardees by others. The application process as improved is delineated in Appendix III of this Resolution. This process supplants that in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines

previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

1. The criteria for selection of awardees by the FEC be clarified and improved. Selection of faculty to receive Awards should have some uniformity across the

University; but it needs to be recognized that differences across the academy justify

variations and adaptation from one School or College to another. The selection criteria as clarified are delineated in Appendix IV of this Resolution. These criteria supplant those in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

(Note: Text in appendices I through IV that is shown in black is taken verbatim from existing FEA guidelines. Changes are indicated in red text.)
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**Appendix I**

**Faculty Excellence Awards School/Colle&e Faculty Excellence Committees**

Each School or College from the list below should have a regularly constituted Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC) composed of a minimum of five committee members.

Schools and Colleges which will each have a Faculty Excellence Committee: 1. School of the Arts

1. School of Education
2. Woodbury School of Business
3. College of Aviation and Public Services
4. College of Humanities and Social Sciences
5. College of Science and Health
6. College of Technology and Computing
7. University College

The Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC) is to consist of the following individuals:

* The chair of the committee is the representative of the Faculty Senate Faculty Development Committee (FDC) from that School/College. The chair will have a vote the same as all committee members. It is the responsibility of the chair to organize the committee and preside over meetings, handle any committee disputes, ensure the adherence to guidelines within the committee, and keep the FDC informed on the functioning of their award committee. (If the chair is nominated that year for the FEA or has an ethical or moral conflict of interest, the co-chair will assume the duties of the chair, in coordination with the FDC chair.)
* The co-chair of the committee is the previous year's FEA full-time faculty recipient from that School/College. The co-chair will have a vote the same as all committee members. It is the responsibility of the co-chair to assist the chair with meetings or disputes or tasks as assigned by the chair. The co-chair works with the FEC Committee for one year following his/her receipt of the FEA.
* At least three members of the committee will be from various departments within the college. Members of the committee other than the chair (the FDC representative) and the co-chair (previous year's FEA recipient) will be selected by each School/College according to the School/College's chosen process, should serve for a minimum of three years, and their service will be tracked by the Faculty Senate Service and Elections Committee to ensure continuity. Ifa committee member is nominated for the award, they should recuse themselves and a new member can be selected to serve for that year on the committee.
* Department chairs, associate deans, and deans are not permitted to sit on this committee unless they are the winners of the awards from the previous year.

Note: Any exceptions to deadlines, disputes, or other issues need to be agreed upon by a majority vote of the FEC.
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**Appendix II**

**Faculty Excellence Awards Nomination for Awards**

ELIGIBILITY

* 1. Full-time faculty members must have completed at least two years of teaching at UVU and be currently employed at the University. At least 50% of his/her workload must be teaching.
	2. An adjunct faculty member must be in at least his/her third semester of teaching at UVU and must have taught a minimum of one class each semester.
	3. FEA recipients are not eligible for the award until the fifth year following the year in which they received the award. For instance, if a faculty member receives an Award in 2015, they would not be eligible again until 2020. The Award is intended to recognize excellence during the last five years, not over an accumulative career. Recipients of Faculty Excellence Recognition are not eligible for Recognition or the FEA until the third year following the year in which they received Recognition.

NOMINATION PROCEDURE

1. Nominations may be provided by full-time and adjunct faculty members (including self-nominations) to their department chairs or by the faculty member's chair by the appropriate date listed. The department, as a whole, provides input and assists the department chair in selecting the nominee that will best represent their department.
2. Nominations need consist of only the nominee's name and a brief justification of the nomination. Though these justifications will be communicated to the FEC, they are not the basis for selection of the Awards; the Award Application is. Nomination is not done via any online form, but can be submitted to department chairs via email or other written communication.
3. Each department will nominate one candidate to represent their department's

full-time faculty (including lecturers), or two candidates from a department that has more than 25 full-time faculty.

1. Each department will nominate one candidate to represent their department's adjunct faculty, or two candidates from a department that has more than 25 adjunct faculty.
2. Nominated faculty members will be notified of nomination by and subsequently submit their Award Application to their FDC representative by the appropriate deadlines, following the Award Applications guidelines.
3. The college or school's FEC Committee will review the applications and select the FEA recipients according to selection criteria on the Faculty Senate website.

TIMETABLE

1. Each ear the FEA rocess will roceed with the followin deadlines:

1st Tuesday in December Call for nominations distributed from Faculty

Senate President
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| znd Tuesday of Spring sem | All nominations due to department chairs |
| 3ro Tuesday of Spring semester | Department chairs to send one (or two) full-time faculty and one (or two) adjunct faculty member's name as decided by that department to the School/College Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC). Department chair will inform nominees and the School/College FEC. |
| 4t11 Friday of Spring semester | Nominees' applications are due to their FEC chair (the School/College Faculty Development Committee representative), who forwards the applications to the rest of the FEC. |
| 5t1t Tuesday of Spring semester (on or about) | The FEC Committee meets to evaluate applications and rank at least the top two nominees in each category (plus additional Faculty Excellence Recognitions if applicable). |
| 1st Tuesday after Valentines Day | Faculty Excellence Award and Recognition potential recipients' names are sent to the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL). OTL then forwards the names of potential recipients to Human Resources and Academic Affairs. |
| 1st Thursday in March | After receiving clearance from Human Resources and Academic Affairs, OTL reports findings to the Faculty Center, Faculty Senate President, Campus Awards Committee and the institutional awarding officers and entities. |
| Friday following 1st Thursday in March | Faculty Senate President as awarding officer (or designee) notifies FEA recipients, chairs, deans, and College Marketing. |
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**Appendix** III

**Faculty Excellence Awards Awards Auulications**

Nominees will submit applications electronically (i.e. in the form of a PDF document) to their Schoolf College FEC chair (FDC representative). Applications should be complete but succinct, avoiding production of a tenure portfolio. Nominees should familiarize themselves with the Criteria for Award Selection (available on the Faculty Senate website). School/College FEC Committees have latitude to adjust these application guidelines to fit the needs of their individual School/College should they choose to do so.

The application will consist of one to two pages for each of the three areas: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Listing of previous awards, honors, and recognition should include information allowing verification (e.g. website for the organization that granted the award, or a link to a published citation of a recognition). Original evidence-such as certificates, etc.-is not to be included. Evidence should be limited to the past five years.

Some examples of possible evidence may include, but is not limited to:

Teaching -A brief statement of teaching philosophy, listing of teaching awards, peer and supervisor reviews, participation in teaching workshops or related faculty development programs, and student ratings of instruction (SRI's), etc. SRI's may be summarized, or included in entirety, at the discretion of the FEC. SRis should be from the past two or three years.

Scholarship - Evidence of professional development, scholarly activities, evidence of presentations, publications, creative projects, etc. Papers themselves are not to be included, though abstracts-or titles with links to publications online-are appropriate. Evidence of mentoring and involvement of students in scholarship is encouraged.

Service - Evidence of commitment and collegiality and service to the department, school, college, university, or the community, peer or supervisory evaluations, awards and recognition, grants, committee appointments, writing letters of recommendation for students, etc.

Applications for the Adjunct Awards will focus on the Teaching area only. School/College FEC Committees may wish to distribute examples (wherein identifying information has been deleted or changed) of successful applications from the past as models for new applicants.

If further evidence is required, the School/College FEC Committee will request them from the faculty nominee.

Applications are to be turned in to the FEC chair (FDC representative) by the fourth Friday of Spring semester.
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**Appendix IV Faculty Excellence Awards**

**Criteria for Awards Selection**

The FDC encourages the FEC of each individual School/College to devise their ownselection procedures. The final selections for the Awards (one full-time Faculty Excellence Award and one Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award) and Recognitions (one Faculty Excellence Recognition given in each School/College for every 25 full-time faculty members beyond the first 25, and additional Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognition given for proportional representation among adjunct faculty, not to exceed the number of

full-time Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients for the School/College) will be selected by the FEC Committee.

Regardless of the criteria employed, the FEC Committee will weight Teaching the most (50%) and will establish the relative weights for Scholarship and Service up to a combined total weight of 50%. FEC Committee will evaluate the nominee based on the supporting evidence and documentation submitted in the nominee's application. As a guideline, the FEC could base selections according to the rubric included below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate's Name | 4 pts | 3 pts | 2 pts | 1pt | Overall Ranking |
| *Teaching-Includes any of thefollowing:** Student evaluations
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Statement of teaching philosophy
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Teaching awards
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Peer and supervisor reviews
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Participation in workshops
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarship/Creative Work- *Includes any of thefollowing:** Evidence of publications,

presentations or creativeprojects that advance discovery integration or application within discipline |  |  |  |  |  |
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* + Scholarly work related to teachi ng, student lea rning or



4pts x 9 boxes=36 total points possible

50% of pts go towa rds teachi ng and the rest of the 50% pts combine scholarship and service. NOTES:
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Appendix V

Faculty Excellence Awards Call for Awards Nominations

The following is an example of a succinct Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations to be posted on the Faculty Senate website (perhaps as an HTML document, not just a document to be downloaded or opened by the user) as well as sent out to the entire faculty each year near the beginning of December (the first Tuesday of December, as called for in the timetable) from the Faculty Senate President.

Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations

Each year the UVU Faculty Senate sponsors the

Faculty Excellence Awards and Recognitions

One full-time faculty member and one adjunct faculty member from each School and College,

With additional Recognitions in larger Schools or Colleges.

Nominate your faculty colleagues that you believe to be deserving of this honor, including colleagues among the adjunct faculty as well as the full-time faculty.

Self-nomination is acceptable.

Nominations are to be sent to your department chair,

who will direct the department as a group in choosing the final nominees (one full-time\* and one adjunct\*) who will represent your department for evaluation by the School/College Faculty Excellence Committee.

Nominations should be based on Teaching, Service, and Scholarship.

You may include a brief justification for your nomination, though it is not required.

Send your nominations to your department chair by the deadline:

the second Tuesday of Spring Semester.

For more information, please see the Faculty Senate website at Link.

\*departments with more than 25 faculty may select two nominees
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**Appendix VI Faculty Excellence Awards**

**Funding for Awards & Recognition**

The University administration has indicated agreement to increase the funding for the Faculty Excellence Awards in order to accommodate the additional Recognitions.

However, specific funding levels have not been approved, pending an early PBA request in the Fall of 2016. Below are the present expenditures and the forecast expenditures for the expanded FEA with Recognitions at three different funding levels. The Faculty Senate should decide on a level to request in the PBA process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current process: |  |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $24,000.00 |

Proposed process: (higher funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $1000 | $13,000.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $500 | $6,500.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $43,500.00 |

Proposed process: (moderate funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $750 | $9,750.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $350 | $4,550.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $38,300.00 |
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Proposed process: (lower funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $500 | $6,500.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $250 | $3,250.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $33,750.00 |

Resolution on Faculty Excellence Awards Page 12 of 12