**Faculty Senate Executive Council Minutes**

February 15, 2022

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

***Present:*** Russ Bailey, Ben Mourlton, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Hilary Hungerford, Joy Cole, Karen Sturtevant, Sandie Waters, Jonathan Allred, Nizhone Meza, Sandie Waters, Skyler Simmons, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko

***Excused or Absent:***

***Guests:***

Call to order – 3:03 pm

Minutes approved – 3:04 pm

**PROVOST**

* The Town Hall meeting took place yesterday, with discussions on University College adjustments. Recommendations will be forthcoming after feedback and discussions have occurred. The RTP committee identified areas to address.
* We are mid-semester, COVID numbers are dropping.
* President: Question about the scope of University College having expanded. Provost: Having an Associate Provost rather than a Dean communicates that there are activities occurring across the campus, not just limited to a particular college. Academic support would be better aligned under academic affairs, it is not a critique of the work they have been doing. Under the proposal, all the programs would continue to exist but University College would not exist. We are receiving mixed feedback and we want to get the feedback. The feedback is most important.
* President: Having been in meetings with Nizhone, she is highly skilled with facilitating conversations. Feedback from faculty has been thoughtful and insightful, aware of possible effects of changes. I know people are frustrated, the point of the meetings is to have them offer their perspectives. The feedback seems to be going well so far.
* Vice President: Regarding the meeting with the English department, it was somewhat difficult to have all perspectives heard. This is a complicated process. Some opinions are heard over others and we will have more comments as different groups meet and discuss.
* Provost: There are real questions on many topics (COVID, shared governance) and this is the topic that draws a lot of attention. The discussions are meaningful, University College has developed something they are proud of, and they may fear that this is going away. We want them to have more support, more interaction, not less. There is a lot of animosity from different groups and it is a conversation we need to have.
* Skyler Simmons: Math Lab will be under Student Success, is that correct? Provost: Yes. Simmons: Why not put it in the College of Science, where math is hosted? Provost: It’s an excellent question. This is why we want this feedback, to know the downstream impacts of changes.
* Dianne McAdams-Jones: I appreciate the opinions shared and the opportunity that people have to share their opinions. It’s an important aspect of leadership to be able to listen to criticism and not have it be about you, so much as the system. People who don’t do this run the risk of causing larger problems. It’s important to have the hard conversations without having it be personal. Provost: Totally agree.

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

* Service & Elections: Sandie Waters: We are filling spots as we have them. Currently manageable.
* RTP&A: Jonathan Allred: A lot happening currently. Academic Affairs is busy reviewing criteria. We understand you’re under a lot of stress and pressure, thank you for what you do. We look forward to decisions and recommendations.
  + Policy 646 will go to President’s Council on 2/24, other policies are still in process.
  + President: What support is needed? Allred: Nizhone and the policy department have done very well in helping get us set up. Nothing as yet needed, we will let you know. President: We need an award for Nizhone.
  + Vice-President: Question, I met with a department today around Faculty Success, there was a question on Policy 637 revision. There is a tenure plan in that policy, where does it go if not in the tenure binder. The dean said the tenure plan is for the personnel file. Faculty Success does not have a spot for this document. This has come up and may need to be addressed. Allred: Annual goals are part of the tenure plan, but I can see that it’s disjointed. Evelyn Porter: The policy says that a tenure plan is required, but when they apply for tenure there is no place to upload it. Vice President: Yes, it says it goes in your personnel file, but it’s mentioned in tenure policy. Allred: Yes, it is not required in the tenure application.
  + Sandie Waters: Watermark is very long, is there a way to streamline this? Vice President: The goal is to have everything updated and completely done, so deans, chairs, RTP chairs are trained on it. David Frame: Do not want to have entered information and then it goes away when a tab disappears. Evelyn Porter: Need to keep a copy in a separate cloud storage, so then you can put it in when needed. Vice President: In the activities section, this will stay with you. If you make a report in workflow, this can possibly change. Nothing disappears. Start the process now. There is confusion around activities, workflow, and reports, hopefully we can in our meetings with faculty clarify where these things go.
  + Sandie Waters: Question for Provost: Can we have a system where we enter information and it populates the system for the ones who need it. There are so many systems (I’m on my fourth system) and can we have some automation do this? ExCo: Assent from many. President: I agree that there is a lot that could be automated, we may invite Kelly Flanagan to Senate to address this. Vice President: Yes, exactly, we need a system that allows for this.
* Advancement of Teaching: Joy Cole: Thrive and EdTech Summit both occurred and went very well. We will have information soon for faculty teaching awards. Teaching evaluation rubric is also being addressed, as well as the SRI process. Wendy Athens: 139 participated at Thrive, similar number at EdTech. President: The keynote was very helpful. Cole: We are teaching things related to ideas that don’t even exist yet, so teaching flexibility to students matters. Waters: Students don’t like to fail, we need to teach iteration. President: FEA awarded faculty will be leading their college in at commencement.
* Curriculum: Evelyn Porter: We have found things that need to change in procedures in Senate. Hopefully we will get procedures on the agenda for March, we have proposed changes to make the procedures clearer.

**SENATE AGENDA discussion**

* President Tuminez will be joining us, taking the slot normally occupied by Provost Vaught.
* Policy 115: Will they have a procedures section by the next senate meeting? Skyler Simmons: Since faculty are focusing comments on the current version, we do not want another iteration. We will be recommending that it re-enter Stage 1 so all aspects can be completed. Jon Anderson: President, you need to advocate very strongly about this. Since you are the faculty voice on President’s Council, represent that we do not want this to move forward. Our Stage 2 ends on 2/22, we need to have our official comments in by then. President: Yes, I will make sure to attend to this for the President’s Council meeting on 2/24 as well as on Policy sub-committee. Vice President: Question clarifying whether this was a policy that we had voted to table.
* Policy 326: We may be ready for a vote on this, may need to plan for more time. Anderson: It is possible that we can send the vote and move on with the meeting, allow senators to vote after the meeting. For example, state that the vote is due by 5:30. Simmons: We have had past problems with reaching quorum. Anderson: Yes, we need to remind them to act on it to prevent this. Waters: Can we put the vote out and then faculty can vote in the background, emphasizing the need to maintain trust in the system. Simmons: The vote totals are posted on Teams and chat. President: We could just give time to complete this. Vice President: I somewhat disagree with having the meeting move on at the same time, too many things to be paying attention to. President: How long does it take? Discussion of 10 minutes for each vote, need 25 votes to reach quorum.
  + Solution reached to give people time until quorum is reached, then if people want to take more time to vote they can. Vice President: Recommendation to instruct faculty senators to do their homework and be prepared to vote.
* 3rd Science GE. President: It seemed that we were ready to vote, we will vote on this. What do we vote on? Porter: Are we supportive of this designation or not, that would be the vote. We want feedback from Eugene and then we can work through the wording for the vote.
* Anti-Racism resolution: President: After the vote on this, it seems that we will be ready to vote on the Anti-Racism Resolution.
  + President: I have received questions about this, including what does it mean if Senate passes it and an individual senator disagrees with it. People can vote no if they wish. Vice President: This is what votes are for, there will always be some disagreement. Senators are representing their departments. President: There is worry about implications for their particular departments or programs. It’s a statement that matters, but does not have teeth. Waters: You have to start somewhere. Frame: It shows the powers that be that we are willing to fight for something important. President: We are losing faculty of color over this issue, we will decide about this as a faculty. What does this do? Vice President: This is going to departments that don’t address this, but for me it is something that moves conversations forward. We are already losing or not recruiting faculty because of perceptions of our state, it’s important.
  + Anderson: It does not have teeth does not mean it would not have a potential impact. If we can get a supermajority, we can say that we as a faculty body, this is how we feel. When we have a resolution, that’s what we should have in mind, what we feel as a faculty needs to be addressed. I recommend we look for a supermajority, which would be 2/3 rather than ½. McAdams-Jones: Thank you, and yes, I have to defend myself for even being here based on perceptions of the state, the feeling that “the rest of the world does not belong here”, I wonder if people feel that they would be penalized by this resolution. What is the fear to have a statement that says who we are and how we feel? President: Speaking to the feedback I’ve received, people are wary of the politics around this resolution. Even if they oppose racism, they dislike everything included in the resolution, like systemic racism. McAdams-Jones: Because it’s talking about something that excludes others (i.e., racism), then yes, there will be people who do not feel included in the resolution, because they have not had the experience of being on the receiving end of racism. The point of this is to include people who have been excluded. Porter: I can see where people are coming from, there needs to be a mindset change, that this action does not take something away from me. It took me awhile to get my head into that space and I think there are people who are just not there yet. We have to get away from this fear mentality. President: Isn’t it terrible that we see it as a zero-sum game? It isn’t one.
  + McAdams-Jones: Thank you, yes, everyone wants to be included. Sharing experiences about talking with others, asking myself why do I stay here in Utah and at UVU, I miss having people where I feel belonging in this same way. It makes a difference having people that you can feel comfortable with and talking with. There is a disconnect for faculty of color, feeling that there is not belonging even when other faculty are supportive. Even if you don’t see the tears, you see the shield that people put up. Treat me like someone you wouldn’t mind being around. People need to understand how different this is for faculty of color.
  + Sandie Waters: I don’t have the same experience as Dianne feeling a sense of community locally. Being a member of a privileged community means something, it is important for people in the community who lack privilege, when they say, “we have your back.” Why can’t differences be celebrated? As a member of this community, it is really important to us to be seen. This resolution is essential.
  + President: Your vulnerability is appreciated and noted. I am surrounded wherever I go that people that look like me and I notice it, I don’t want it to be like this all the time. We need to trust faculty of color when they say that it is a big deal.
  + President: Are we ready to vote on this? Do we revisit language or let people just vote? Vice President: Let’s put it to a vote and see where people stand, that is my vote. Porter: I think we need a vote too. President: We can vote. Anderson: Question of whether we need a supermajority or not. President: If it fails, we take it back and revisit this. Moulton: What would be the steps to revisit this if it does fail? President: I understand if people are uncomfortable with specific language that we would revisit.
* Shared Governance discussion: Departments and programs have zero or little representation of adjuncts in shared governance. There are questions around hours and around possible stipends. Porter: Adjuncts can’t receive stipends. SPOT awards, yes. Vice President: Stipends are not possible, but we can pay by the hour. Porter: The number of credit hours taught, the hours weekly, there are implications for ACA requirements, SPOT awards are bonuses and not hours worked.
  + President: What would be a compromise, maybe 1 representative per college? Anderson: We would have to change the bylaws, but to change to voting members this would mean a change to the constitution. There isn’t a cap on # of senators, it’s minimum of 1 per department and then 1 per 25. We could vote on if and how to include adjuncts in senate.
  + Vice President: We need to not have this on hold forever, move it forward, possibly have a time set for a vote. Anderson: This has been a question for a long time, perhaps we find a way to register support. President: Perhaps we set 3/15 as a day for when we will vote on what adjunct representation should look like, how much representation and then on whether they should have voting powers. Porter: The first question is yes/no, should we have representation, then how much and then details. President: Agreement.
  + Discussion on how difficult it is to represent a large number of people. Anderson: Need to have them currently teaching adjunct. Waters: It will be difficult to be replacing them. Frame: There will be difficulty if they take positions not supported by administration, contracts could be canceled. President: Without voting, what will this be like in senate. Difficulty with sharing information. Waters: We can find a space in Teams for adjuncts to share information.
  + President: Let’s vote on it by 3/15, if we need to change bylaws then we can, then we can bring this to shared governance committee. Vice President: We can link this document to the reminder to senators.
* Policy 633. President: This is going to President’s Council, this is about annual review and, we found a compromise on it.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**:

* If you like Wordle, try Worldle: a game of maps.
* Today is National Gumdrop Day
* On this day in 399 BCE, Philosopher Socrates is sentenced to death by the city of Athens for corrupting the minds of the youth of the city and for impiety.
* On this day in 2011, Maya Angelou was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom.
* On this day in 1564, Galileo Galilei, Italian astronomer, physicist and engineer who has been called the father of science, was born in Pisa, Duchy of Florence, Italy.

President: Appreciation for the earnest, open conversations today. We’ll start thinking about a retreat.

Adjourned 4:59 PM