**Faculty Senate Executive Council Minutes**

March 22, 2022

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

***Present:*** Russ Bailey, Ben Moulton, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Elijah Nielson, Hilary Hungerford (President), Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Karen Sturtevant, Kathren Brown, Nizhone Meza, Sandie Waters, Skyler Simmons, Wayne Vaught (Provost), Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko (Vice President)

***Excused or Absent:***

***Guests:***

Call to order – 3:00 pm

Minutes approved – 3:01 pm

**PROVOST**

* University College update. We have received a large amount of feedback and we are pivoting, planning not to merge English and Math. There were some positive impacts anticipated, but also a lot of consequences that were less desirable. There are a lot of things going on in other areas, including community outreach and engaged learning. There are some ideas around bringing departments together as a sort of sandbox, a way to facilitate faculty creating innovative programs and degrees. Conversations are continuing and I will share more information, including possible decisions, as we have them. Our timeline includes talking with deans and faculty about recommendations, then speaking with Faculty Senate next Tuesday about this.
  + Hilary Hungerford: Is there part of this UC discussion that we should not share? Provost: The faculty whom this effects should hear about this first, so mostly hold onto this for now even though I didn’t share anything secret. Hilary Hungerford: There have been many important and valuable discussions. Tammy Clark has been great to work with, recognizing faculty deciding curriculum. Provost: Academic affairs will not supplant faculty on curriculum, that is their prerogative.
  + Hungerford: There are questions about whether it is a money decision. Provost: These changes are not about the money, it’s a reclassification and there are no additional lines of funding.
  + Sandie Waters: As a university, we went through a significant process to get to this point, conversations and angst, etc. Can we take stock of the process itself? Provost: We can look at the process. Waters: At the beginning, faculty seemed skeptical about this. Since it went well, it seems like a valuable opportunity to learn about what went well, create more symbiosis and less skepticism. Provost: It reflects shared governance, the roles of administration, roles of faculty. How do we avoid unrealistic expectations on both sides as well as inefficiency? I think we need to look at the process that went well for shared governance.
  + Dianne McAdams-Jones: This came from Academic Affairs, not from the president as some thought. Provost: It came about because of Forrest’s retirement, thinking about how many of the functions of University College would move forward, raising many questions about how we accomplish university goals and thinking about university structure. It was not about faculty not being involved at the beginning, faculty were always involved. The question about whether these programs were failing wasn’t relevant, that was not the issue. Hungerford: The compromise was great to see.
* RTP progress, we have finished reviewing and are moving forward on schedule.

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**

* No updates this time.

**FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Hungerford: I’m happy with the compromise on University College. Waters: Question to clarify. Anderson: The departments move but they do not merge. University College will no longer exist. McAdams-Jones: UC was a happy place for people, I don’t blame people for being sad about having to move to CHSS. Hungerford: Yes, true. Takeaway is that faculty were listened to, so compromise was helpful. Anderson: Losing UC, now committees are down people.
* SEGO survey updates. Last ExCo people were surprised and taken aback by this. We have had meetings with Tammy Clark and Ann and Tom (past FS presidents) and Wioleta. The conclusion is that we do not have the timeline this semester to have this survey go out. Next year there will be more buildup. Tammy has been great to work with, have her be responsive to our concerns.
  + Wioleta Fedeczko: Need for more emphasis, a “year of engagement” over the next year. Faculty and students need to be made aware of the Carnegie designation and that this survey is less about evaluation and more focused on engagement and this designation. I can see why they found Canvas as the best option, as leery as I was about it. In the past we had more talk about the Carnegie designation, we need to bring that back. Hungerford: We’re still negotiating how to handle the results of the survey, conversation about who has access, how for it not to be punitive and keep it anonymized. More on this in the Fall as we move it forward.
* Evaluation of Deans update. There was talk about how to hold deans accountable when there are toxic situations. We have been reaching out to HR and received input from Elijah, I do not yet have the final instrument. They are saying this could happen by the end of March, the evaluation going live.
  + Fedeczko: When we first discussed this with Provost, it seemed it would be senate-led. I don’t want this to end up in the president’s office, I want us to be part of the process and appreciated Provost Vaught’s support of that. I anticipate faculty also wanting associate deans to be evaluated.
  + Waters: There needs to be accountability at all levels, we need to move in the direction of associate deans. We want less punitive measures. Hungerford: Yes, we want feedback for improvement but to have it be less punitive. Waters: Growth mindset is the way in running business, as well as in university. David Frame: Good leadership involves helpful feedback. McAdams-Jones: The biggest problem we have is that systems are failing people. Calling out the bad is less helpful, things are set up for them to fail and not enough to keep people here. We need to acknowledge this, make space for faculty to not be punished for thinking and having a different perspective than administration. Hungerford: We want to be a part of the conversations about evaluation.
* SRI revision working group. Based on last senate, it seemed like we are going to do this, with Provost on board. Did you hear this the same way? It will be significant work, do we want to move ahead? (Assent.) We need to start working on this over the summer. Let’s get people involved, including technology help.
  + Waters: Check with Wendy Athens. Athens: It’s in the bylaws for teaching to work with SRIs. OTL does not operate as an evaluative organization at all. Hungerford: Respect for this boundary, not to invite Wendy to be in this.
  + Jon Anderson: The conversation we scheduled for the agenda at the last senate meeting was about Joy’s measure and we got sidetracked. There is history of trying to do this and we get sidetracked. We need to track this conversation, anytime we talk about evaluating classes SRIs will come up. We still need to address what came up last time (Joy’s group’s measure) and possibly task Joy’s group with this. We need to see what they’ve done. Hungerford: We didn’t vote on this and we need to, address the developed measures, then move forward with voting about whether we should revise SRIs. McAdams-Jones: I support revising SRIs, anticipate support for this. Anderson: Joy is not interim. Hungerford: She believes that she is interim. Question about whether or not she is, we need to vote her in, make sure we do an election on this, possibly in fall.

**Ex-Co membership updates**

* Need elections for Advancement of Teaching and for RTP & Advancement. Also need for Special Investigation, Service & Elections, Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC).
* Waters: What is the rationale for term limits on S&E and others? Anderson: Spreading the pain perhaps? Sharing the load. Waters: Let’s be purposeful about this when we do the bylaws.

**Bylaws**

* Hungerford: We need to address these in Faculty Senate, what is the best way?
  + Waters: We have done this the same as policies, addressing comments line by line. Simmons: We prepare these and vote for them by the end of Senate. Anderson: Yes, I recommend going item by item. Waters: We got stuck partway last time. Anderson: They came back up in the fall and we addressed them. Waters: Let’s streamline the process.
  + Anderson: There will be some heated debate on some of the bylaws. Hungerford: Lyn Bennett expressed wanting there to be a working group to shepherd through policy. Anderson: Formerly there was a policy subcommittee, we moved it toward this responsibility being for all of Faculty Senate. We want faculty senators involved in the process.
  + Hungerford: It is challenging to get feedback on policy from senators. McAdams-Jones: For senators, this involves reading, it’s a lot of work to read--and read for understanding--on behalf of faculty. Simmons: Yes. Many senators are here for service opportunity needed for advancement rather than seeing it as a vehicle for improving the university. Anderson: There are many service opportunities, we need to change faculty viewpoint on this. It shouldn’t be a check box. Waters: Do you think people don’t want to do a good job on senate? Maybe they don’t understand the job and how important it is, they don’t know how to pick apart policy. How do we help them understand the importance of this? Hungerford: We can address this with trainings in senate. Anderson: You’re right, Sandie, and a lot of people get roped into this because they need it. They sometimes don’t understand policy or what’s going on and they’re really busy, they’re overwhelmed. It’s not that they don’t want to do a good job. We need to show that it’s important. We need release time for senators. Waters: If we show participation is valuable in RTP, this would help.
  + Elijah Nielson: Where is this question coming from, is this anecdotal evidence? Perhaps being on Teams, perhaps we address the process of participating, would in-person senate bring more participation. There could be learned helplessness with folks feeling that participation doesn’t even matter. Hungerford: Yes, we can reiterate the “why”.
  + Fedeczko: A response to Elijah, yes, meeting in person really makes a difference. In the past, there were often debates before or after the meeting and there were connections made. Our desire is to have senate be more social and this is harder with Teams. Perhaps we vote on this, possibly making it in-person again. This could help with faculty, especially junior faculty participating.
  + David Frame: You could give me compensation time for senate, but it wouldn’t change my courseload and the number of hours in a week. I do as much as I can, others would do the same. We don’t have the resources to be good at this work. Nobody in my department believes that the senate is doing anything and that actions affect them.
  + McAdams-Jones: It’s the system again. This is the system we have. It drives people insane to give them something to do and no tools to do it with. We need to focus our attention on policy, know the policies. I learned this in healthcare. If you don’t know the policy, you get caught with your pants down. It affects us and is exhausting because policy changes are very slow and gradual, which makes it hard.
  + Nielson: I wonder if we can remind junior senators, let them know they can speak. Being in person might help with trust building.
  + Ben Moulton: Paid training session for senators would help. The magic happens outside the meeting, in the hallways, if we were to go back to in-person. Waters: It seemed like the same people who were sticking around and talking.
  + Hungerford: We need to make sure that Senate continues to be relevant. Let’s make a list of our accomplishments. The idea of a paid policy training session for senators is a great idea. We can probably move forward with the face-to-face versus Teams meeting for senate.
  + Hungerford: It has been brought to my attention that Senate president term is too short and I get it. Don’t think about it as a Hilary thing, but presidents in general. Is it just long enough to know what you’re doing and then you’re done?
    - Nielson: That third year could be beneficial, with the first and second years being helpful to become effective.
    - Fedeczko: I feel like I am just now figuring things out and next year I’ll be done. As an example, say we begin revising SRI stuff, by the time we get it done our time will be up and we won’t be able to move it forward. We may be limiting what we can get done in two years. Ann (past president) noted opening up policies that didn’t get through and then they slowed down after her term was up because there wasn’t someone pushing it forward.
    - Simmons: We could have a president-elect position, time for learning the job. Neilson: A year is a long time for apprenticeship, but some more time for crossover. Waters: Three years and a president-elect is asking for a lot of money. If we keep things simple, we have a better chance of getting what we want. Hungerford: With regard to training a president, Ann and I text all the time, I continue to rely on her goodwill. It doesn’t seem like there’s a strong push for two or for three years. Fedeczko: There is some support for three years in the chat, do we seek for senate support and change bylaws?
    - Anderson: Term length is likely in the constitution, so it would be a policy change and not just a bylaws change. Most presidents are grateful that it’s only two years, and the pressure to have it be longer often comes from the outside. Hungerford: It wouldn’t necessarily start with my term. I’ll be in touch with Jon about whether this is a change to the constitution or bylaws. Ann’s experience is relevant, with her policies that weren’t done and then being on sabbatical. Given the amount of content for senate, we will have Kelly Flanagan come another time.

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

* Any Standing Committee updates? Neilson: We have feedback on the evaluation of deans. Hungerford: Yes, we support this as a joint endeavor with HR and faculty.
* Waters: Question regarding the timing of filling positions for senate for next year? Hungerford: Wait until next week and after the University College changes are announced.
* Wendy Athens: The academic integrity statement, a draft could be submitted to senate, what is the best timing for this? Hungerford: If it’s sent to me right away, like this week, we could read it next time and vote on it by the last meeting. We could also do a special vote on it.

**SENATE AGENDA**

* Hungerford: We’ll do policy first, then the bylaws discussion. We will announce the open positions. Anderson: We make a call for nominations, then they send the nominations. Waters: They send nominations to me and then I and Wioleta work on these. They need a bio and need to make statements. Hungerford: Elections will be 4/12/22. We will open discussion on bylaws, likely not complete.
* Hungerford: Regarding the curriculum procedures, people can read them in the homework. Regarding the two tools for teaching evaluation, it seems like people should look at them so we can vote whether to endorse them. Athens: Joy plans to present on the tool, the feedback and revision of the tool. Hungerford: We may have a vote on this, possibly next time. Fedeczko: I’ll have a vote ready. Agenda looks good. Do we need a list of proposed changes for bylaws? Anderson: It will be a tight meeting. Waters: Perhaps we have people read and vote outside the meeting? Hungerford: We can have senators vote in homework.
* Anderson: We need a quorum to be able to vote on it. With a homework vote we did not make quorum last time. Hungerford: I agree. Tomorrow and Thursday I will go through proposed changes, perhaps we can communicate via ExCo Teams channel, then bring them to senate. We can also look through the comment document. Fedeczko: The changes and comments were in the homework, we vote by 4/12.
* Waters: Perhaps we should keep comments succinct, people can read them quickly and get through them. Hungerford: I will only take unfriendly comments next time. We will vet the proposed changes, come with the proposals already formed. Anderson: We are already not going to propose as many bylaws changes as last time, since we had 50 last year. If we keep the list succinct we can get it done. Hungerford: If others are okay with this, I’ll post in ExCo and seek your feedback on it and we can collaborate.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**:

* The vernal equinox on 3/20.
* They’re voting on getting rid of Daylight Savings. The Supreme Court nomination is progressing.
* Let’s keep Ukraine in our hearts. Neilson: A person I know is helping coordinate things from Poland and there may be an opportunity for someone to go and help.
* Fedeczko: A lot of my family are in Poland and people are feeling the impact of this war.
* Poutine good, Putin bad. (Poo-tin??)
* We have accomplishments as senate that we can recognize.
* ExCo retreat? Let’s do it.

Session adjourned at 5 pm.