**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**Special Session**

February 8, 2022

Via Microsoft Teams, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Russ Bailey, Alex Snyder, Ashley Nadeau, Ben Moulton, Bob Walsh, Brandon Ro, Candace Hill, Chris Witt, David Frame, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Ethan Morse, Evelyn Porter, Gareth Fry, Greg Jackson, Hilary Hungerford, Jim Pettersson, Jim Price, Jim Sutton, John Jarvis, Joshua Hilst, Joy Cole, Karen Sturtevant, kari Dennis, Kathleen Young, Kevin Smith, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Lauren Brooks, Laurie Toro, Leo Schlosnagle, Lisa Hall, Lyn Bennett, Matt North, Maureen Andrade, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mike Smidt, Nicole Gearing, Nizhone Meza, Scott Lewis, Shane Draper, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Toni Ludwig, Trevor Morris, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Young Ham, Zachery Taylor

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Chris Goslin, Eric Russell

Call to order by President Hilary Hungerford– 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – Minutes approved for 1/25/2022 (3:00 pm)

**PROVOST**

* President: Asked Provost to address restructuring recommendations regarding University College. Provost: The goal is for administrative restructuring, not eliminating any programs. With similar programs put together, the programs can function better for all involved. The conversations up to this point have included not just University College, but also CoEd, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and others. Could these services and programs be better organized and aligned? This was the primary question.
* [PowerPoint](https://uvu365-my.sharepoint.com/:p:/g/personal/10853027_uvu_edu/Efwz39faUc9ChI2XOLpZqFQBxVhS2zLyL3DUaWQY7t9B7g) slides shared by Provost. The timing was prompted by the upcoming retirement of Dean Forrest Williams. We presented these proposals to University College and deans of colleges where the impact of these changes could be felt.
* The goal is to support our academic support services, which is designed to serve the most vulnerable students at UVU. Commitments include ensuring student success, providing support for most vulnerable students, embrace our responsibilities as a dual mission institution.
* Further detail: no jobs are being eliminated. The changes are not to save money, it’s all about administrative organization, taken under consideration due to seeking de-fragmentation of programs, clarifying the scope of programming (providing support for students whatever program they may be in), and greater engagement. The services would be restructured under a single umbrella and housed under a new position, the Associate Provost for Student Success. Shared graphic of roles and responsibilities for the Academic Affairs Division structures, especially for the new position. The next aspect of the proposal is to align academic programming, including departments of Literacies and Composition and Developmental Mathematics to their respective disciplinary homes. The Student Leadership and Success Studies program would be moved to the School of Education. English Language Learning would be moved to Continuing Education. The proposed changes support all UVU students, especially the most academically challenged, in order to promote retention and completion.
* The deliberation process has included presentation to UC faculty and staff and other relevant department chairs and deans. This month the plan is to have meetings, discussions, receive constructive feedback. In March, we will work toward a refinement of the proposal and have a presentation of an updated proposal to all stakeholders.
* President: Faculty from the concerned areas are raising questions on several topics, including programs and RTP, these are important conversations. Provost: Question from the chat about how Weber State houses developmental math, we have considered many possible models and we are not saying to avoid considering these other models. Our question regards why do we have two departments and we need to weigh the pros/cons of having a single department. It was considered as a possibility, one of many possible structures.
* Question from chat: What specific problem is being addressed by this change? Provost: The fragmentation of these units, even when these programs are working well now, an improved administrative structure needs to be addressed. For example, having 3 units addressing academic support could work more seamlessly with 1 unit. Our completion/retention rates are not better than other institutions with single departments, so we do not necessarily need to retain the same structure for this reason.
* Provost: Responding to other comments from the chat. We are hoping for students to gain analytic competencies, and our current math departments share this, even though they are doing things differently they share a goal. We would benefit from more discussions about the potential challenges and benefits.
* President: Every program requires Math and English, this is why many departments need to know about these changes and as questions develop in your department, please let us know. Many questions about implications for faculty, especially if they are pre-tenure, we need to have these conversations. Provost: We want faculty input, guidance, and support consistent with shared governance and people can have the opportunity to join the conversation. People have ideas, I want to hear about it whether people think it’s a great idea or a stupid idea. We’re on the same team trying to best support our students. (END 3:33 PM)

**POLICY**

* Policy 161 Freedom of Speech (limited scope revision)
  + Skyler Simmons: We aim to vote on this policy today. We passed all of Faculty Senate’s comments on to relevant administrators. We need a motion to vote on official comments on the limited scope revision.
  + **MOTION** to vote by David Scott, Bryan Sansom seconded. Lyn Bennett: Clarifying the motion, we are saying we reviewed the limited scope change and are fine with it, that part of it. Simmons: Yes, that’s right. Use of official ballot via Forms in chat. President: Moving forward while vote occurs. (Later confirmed in chat that vote passed.)
* Policy 115 Personal Use of University Property (New policy)
  + Concerns from section 5 regarding procedures to enact the policy. Jacob Atkin: The process of approval to use university equipment for business-related purposes. This would focus on authorization. Bennett: There are themes in this policy around violation of policy, warnings and suspension, these really do warrant policies, this is a big deal and not a small thing. Agreement in chat from David Scott. President: Will we wait to vote on the policy without a procedure element? Will it come back to us after that? Jacob Atkin: We will be making substantive changes to the policy as proposed. I am waiting for official comments and then I can bring an updated policy to review. President: You have comments on what we have so far. Bennett: It will go back to Stage 1, correct? Atkin: It will not go to Stage 3 until you have had a chance to review it. Jon Anderson: The only way this can move to Stage 1 is if President’s Cabinet does so. We can vote with these comments. We can also ask to see this again when the procedures element is completed. Hilary will be present on President’s Cabinet. Atkin cannot move it back to Stage 1. President: It seems reasonable to send our comments forward, request to see the policy after the procedures are added. Vice President and Anderson clarifying language for senate vote. John Jarvis: Point of order, can we table this? Simmon: We have until the end of the month before our comments are needed. Atkin: I can work to have this element written within the next two weeks.
  + **MOTION** (John Jarvis, Jim Price seconded): Table this, bring it up in 2 weeks. Motion passes, policy tabled to next Faculty Senate meeting. Simmons: Forwarded to Jacob Atkin the comment document.
* Policy 326 Workplace Conduct (full rewrite)
  + Simmons: This is in Stage 1, offering feedback to the drafting committee.
  + Comment on 4.3.5, The procedure for determining if an accusation is false is not spelled out and should be.
  + 4.3.6, right to legal representation should be included. Simmons: Assume assent, comment if there is a debate item.
  + Several sections comment from Lyn Bennett: Need for involvement of faculty, not leaving it only up to Human Resource.
  + Comment: Does the accused have the right to know what is being alleged?
  + 5.1.4, Need to spell out more of the investigation process.
  + 5.2.1, Why is 180 days the number being used, doesn’t the university have an interest in addressing this regardless of when it occurred.
  + Grammatical corrections are collected in one place.
  + Comment (Jim Price): With regard to 180 days rule, there is a risk that a human is nursing injury over a long period of time if you do not put a timeline on it. These are often due to time-restricted stressors, and digging it up later is not always helpful, as we are interested in a pattern of behavior. President: Need to address past behavior and need to prevent retaliation. Price: Trying to put both sides of the argument on the table. Jarvis: I like the 180 days for the possibility of a student making a complaint, you lose people who are aware of the situation, possible loss of evidence, I prefer the 180 days.
  + Simmons: We need to vote on this, move forward in the policy process, will likely be on the ballot for next time. Vice President: We can prepare a vote if needed. Anderson: At debate stage now. Simmons: We are 8 months behind anyway. Anderson: Given this, we can take time to address this. President: This policy has a potentially very large impact, thank you for catching important items to address on this. We will vote on official comments next time.
  + Comment (Jim Price): There was going to be a policy to create a position of Faculty Advocate addressing a past event, what happened with this? President: Yes, there is now policy change on this. Faculty can have support person at any time in a hearing process. Evelyn Porter: There was a request to have a faculty person, PBA request, Nizhone occupies this position. President: Nizhone’s position is to mediate conflict. Porter: Nizhone’s position is a compromise on what we asked for, she does not have the role to be a faculty support person. Price: We didn’t want a support person, we wanted an advocate. Reference to how people that Mike Shively knew were told not to talk to him, contributing to his isolation and loss of support and eventual suicide. President: Thank you for addressing this, what we got was a support person. What we have now is that faculty can have a person present and not alone throughout the process.
  + Nizhone Meza: To describe my position and role, it is to facilitate conversations between faculty and others, also as a policy consultant to let faculty know what is happening and should be happening. I cannot advocate for you, but I can go through your petition and help you understand and become aware of the process. President: She can help you “deep dive” into policy, but she is not an advocate.
  + Bennett: When the policy was addressed last year, the result was that you can have a faculty representative as well as an additional emotional support person. We need to verify that this is the case. This is substantially more than what Dr. Shively had in his case.
  + President: I am open to having more conversations on this topic if needed. With the policy change, there can be more people present with you.
  + Price: Yes, we’ve made progress. If one side is following policy for confidentiality and the other side is flaunting with violations, we need a mechanism to enact when this is not equitable.

**NON-POLICY**

* 3rd Science GE discussion, Eugene Seeley present to discuss.
  + Evelyn Porter: The comments form has been shared and Seeley here to respond. Seeley: As far as specific wording, our committee addressed this over the period of a couple of years, passed by deans in science, received their okays. Porter: Many of the comments relate to the generality of the 3rd science proposal. I propose that Eugene takes this back to the GE committee. Many want it to be broader, adding an additional designation that could relate to more courses. The past discussion about getting rid of the 3rd science was heated and the senate voted to continue with their recommendation and retain it. GE Committee is trying to broaden the number of courses that could fit the requirement. Bob Walsh: There is also a health requirement. If we eliminate/allow the 3rd science, what would be the implications for the Health 1100 requirement? Porter: That is not a part of this discussion, since that is another part of GE requirements. This discussion focuses on the key science learning statements that these GE requirements are based on.
  + President: I had several concerns, there are no clear guidelines for what an applied science would be, the two guidelines for GE science requirements are already outlined. Seeley: There are many examples, Introduction to Technology, for example, or Introduction to Engineering. Michaela Sawyer: Does this mean an engineering course would lead to a student not having to take as much biology or natural science? Porter: The other two GE science requirements are not going away, the third science provides students with the option to choose a class that is under the applied technical science designation. Price: I am open-minded about the possibility of including applied science, this is a big part of our society, there is a need for students to understand how basic science led to applied science. President: This may also be an opportunity for methods courses. The learning outcomes are very general and hard to work with, I would encourage the committee to consider how they are going to measure and assess those.
  + Michaela Sawyer: The discussion has used the term applied science and technology interchangeably. President: Applied science needs to be better defined. Seeley: All science is applied as we teach it, we used the term technology because we’re talking about equipment and other ways to be engaged, e.g., field botany, learning to use an electron microscope. We intentionally added the term “technical” to highlight equipment, machinery, something beyond theory/application. Porter: My recommendation is that Seeley takes these comments back to the GE committee to move it forward.
* Anti-racism Resolution
  + Official draft 2 and Comment Document
  + President: There have been comments about whether the draft is too strong or not strong enough. I also welcome general comments on the resolution. We want to emphasize the importance of affirming our commitment to ensure that everyone has equal opportunity and chances to succeed at UVU. Thanks to Kyle for adding language and comments.
    - Kathleen Young: My comments have been added, seeking to clarify systemic and institutional racism. Anti-racism may divide us, so let’s be inclusive, recognizing that I have a skin color, everyone has a skin color. Let’s make this a very inclusive statement. President: I appreciate the comment, I also have a skin color and have a different lived experience to BIPOC individuals. Young: Everyone has hard things in their life. President: I can go to the grocery store and not be singled out, it is not the same.
    - Mike Smidt: Echoing what Kathleen said, attempt to reduce divisiveness. We denounce racism against BIPOC, but not other groups? We are saying the only people capable of racism are not BIPOC people. Racism transcends race groups, this makes it sound like only one group can be the victim and one group can be the perpetrator. President: This does not single out any person for being a particular way.
    - Joshua Hilst: I respectfully and stridently disagree with these last two faculty (Young & Smidt). There are difficulties in life and my difficulties do not have to do with my being a white person. Racism in this country has gone in one direction in this country historically. The context for this statement is violence against black people, if you see this as divisive, what is divisive about this? How can we oppose condemnation of violence against black people that occurs in this country every day? To ignore this is to be willfully ignorant. President: I appreciate the open exchange. This is not policy, but a resolution to provide some guidance around diversity and inclusion initiatives on campus. There are states that are legislating for higher education with scrutiny on our academic freedom, we are trying to make this statement to support the many ways knowledge can be approached. This is not to call out particular individuals or departments, but highlight how people have different experiences.
    - David Scott: The fact that this becomes a semi-political battle illustrates how precarious this is. I would be happy to bring someone from our department who is an expert on systemic racism. I don’t see any good coming from the legislature by moving forward with this, we would be inviting criticism of the Senate. President: The University of Utah passed an anti-racism resolution a few years ago, there is precedence for this. I understand this and this is mostly for us, our internally guiding principles. I can consult with other faculty senate presidents about the potential for legislature scrutiny.
    - Ashley Nadeau: This letter is meant to respond to what has happened and may happen on the horizon about states making laws about what can or cannot be taught. It provides cover in advance and sets the terms about what we stand for. It is very important to take a stand on this issue.
    - Bob Walsh: I thought we voted to support the University of Utah’s statement in this area. President: Unsure, I will look into that.
    - Lyn Bennett: My department is concerned about academic freedom because our theories, methods, and content are being challenged by these legislative actions across the nation, and this is important across the world. This is an academic freedom issue. Maybe your department does not teach CRT but mine does. If I can’t teach what I’ve been trained to do, what are we doing? It’s an academic freedom issue, consistent with what Ashley has said.
    - President: Thank you for your comments. I will examine the comments and put them in a new draft, we can hopefully be ready to vote on this in 2 weeks. Please take it back to your departments. Reminder that this is not policy, this is a statement that we recognize racism and we support academic freedom.
* Student Representative (Ethan Morse). Student events noted in the chat.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Talk with Tuminez is tomorrow (2/9)
* Provost Town Hall is Monday, 2/14, and will be recorded. Provost: Request to add topics for the Town Hall to the chat. We could possibly address issues related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.
* Dustin Shipp: The Excellence in Academic Advising initiative is ongoing. NACADA (national advising organization) sent representatives to help us evaluate how advising is going at UVU. We will share their recommendations. Currently in process, we welcome input and will update on this initiative.
* John Jarvis: Thanks to Provost Vaught for sharing the discussion on University College. He has taken a lot of flak on this topic. The Associate Dean has given a white paper about reasons for disagreement, everything has been brought forward from University College. If you have concerns, please send them forward. President: Uncertainty is hard, I encourage all to show empathy for our colleagues in UC.

Meeting adjourned at 4:56 pm.