
Excused or Absent: Kathy Black, Leslie Farnsworth, Phil Gordon, Matthew Holland, Carolyn Howard, Farid Islam, Stan Jenne, Brian Jensen, Amir Kia, Phil Matheson, Kristin Mecham, David Millet, Margaret Mittelman, Jeff Packer, Harry Taute, Paul Taylor

- Call to order – 3:01 pm
- Approved the Minutes from January 17th Senate Meeting.
  - VPAA – Ian Wilson
    - The President asked to be excused as he is meeting with the Legislature.
    - Third week enrollment reports are showing about a 3% increase.
    - The new classroom building is #4 on the Regents list and #3 on the building board list.
    - The President made a presentation to the Higher Education Appropriations Committee making a case in terms of what UVU is doing and the strategies we are using.
    - State of University Address is scheduled for Wednesday, February 1, 2012. The President will be outlining the state of the university and initiatives. Please attend.
    - The President and Ian Wilson will attend Faculty Senate on February 28 to participate in a discussion on Shared Governance.
- Election
  - An election was held for the Rank and Promotions Committee Chair.
    - Gary Measom was the sole nominee.
  - All in Favor? Motion passes. Against: 0; Abstain: 0
- Emergency Preparedness Committee
  - Jim Michaelis is in charge of forming a Search Committee for the new Emergency Preparedness/Risk Management position. This position will focus on policies for the University dealing with issues related to insurance and how hazardous materials and events are handled.
  - Gary Measom recommended Dale Maughan from Nursing. Gary will discuss this committee with Dale and report back to John Balden.
Craig Thulin from Chemistry will check with his department for any volunteers. He indicated that Chemistry in very interested in this area and feels it would be an effective opportunity to get involved. Craig will report back to John Balden with input.

Lyn Bennett asked if the job description was posted. Ian Wilson said the posting is on the UVU Employment website.

**Policies**

- Lyn Bennett opened the discussion by indicating the policy committee felt that all three policies needed additional procedure information and terminology defined in various sections.
- The question was raised that if policies and procedures were to be separated before moving on to the next stage, why are we spending time now?
- David Connelly asked if failure to separate is systemic to the policy or can these move forward with the current comments?
- Ron Price remarked that procedural “stuff” has been stripped away from the policies.
- Lyn Bennett disagreed with Ron Price that procedures should be consistent and visual. The Senate Policy Committee wanted clear procedures for an employee to follow for needed resolution. The employees need to know the process by which things can be resolved.
- The Senate needs to review the comments and decide if the recommendation is to send the policies back to Stage 1 for revisions.
- Lisa Lambert commented that the three policies as currently written only protect the supervisor and above, not the staff.
- David Connelly noted that removing procedure from policy is a “bold” change.
- Ian Wilson responded by asking “How are you going to write/review policies if you don’t have a policy on policies?”
- Additional comments noted that the policies need to provide an opportunity for the employee to have an objective advocate and state how and when the Human Resources department gets involved.
- Policy 331 – *Performance Evaluation for Staff Employees*
  - 5.3.2 – What is the process? It does not outline the steps of the procedure.
  - Stott Harston asked, “Is there any other procedural irregularity than 5.3.2?” Ron Price with Human Resources will work with his policy committee to resolve. Dennis Potter feels it is ambiguous and needs additional details. Procedures are in place to protect people.
  - Problem – if two people don’t like you, you’re toast.
  - A recommendation was made to email Ron Price with additional comments as it relates to this issue.
  - Ron Price noted that the policy numbers are accurate now. The Policy Office changed the numbers so they were more in sequence.
  - Lisa Lambert agrees with comments as outlined by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee.
- Policy 334 – *Probationary Period for Staff Employees*
  - Lyn Bennett said the committee felt the procedures were not vetted enough to comment.
- The term “probationary period” will only be used when someone is first hired. If they change jobs, it will not be used.
- If a staff employee has a break in service, there is a reinstatement policy that supersedes probation. The policy committee would like it referenced in the policy.
- 4.3 Comment - Lyn Bennett suggested that Human Resources use specific language when referring to Human Resources such as HR Director or designee. It was suggested that the language be cleaned up to reference a position not just Human Resources in general on all three policies.
- 5.1.1 – Comment was this might be a good time to refer to “guidelines” to provide the necessary procedures. Guidelines need to be under references so employee can find them.

- 371 – Corrective Actions and Termination for Staff Employees
  - Apply the same comments as other policies.
  - Putting corrective action steps in place make sure the process is being followed.
  - The question was raised on how could we reach out to faculty in regards to faculty who supervise staff? Suggestions were:
    - Faculty needs to look for policies when they need it so they are clear in their understanding.
    - When faculty is assigned a staff employee, their assignor needs to direct them to policy.
    - Add staff reviews to the training process with chairs by Academic Affairs.
    - There is frustration on the staff side because faculty fails to find out what the procedures are and by the time there is a problem, it is a big mess. Faculty needs to be educated and receive opportunities for training where needed.
    - Ron Price reminded faculty that Human Resources is a resource that faculty can turn to for advice and information.
  - 5.1.3 – This is a vital piece of information and needs to be repositioned in line as a preventative measure. A suggestion was made to move it up in line.

- Ron Price noted when policy changes, it affects the entire university not just a select few. When a procedure is changed, he agreed there is a need to notify all parties that a change has occurred. When changing a practice, procedure or making major changes in policy, employees need to be notified that a change has been made.
- Policies 331, 334 and 371 will be action items on the next agenda. Senators should discuss them with their constituents and bring feedback for discussion and their recommendation.
- Send any additional comments to Ron Price or Mark Wiesenberg and they will rework.

Report on Utah Council of Faculty Leaders

- David Connelly provided an overview from the January 13, 2012 meeting at the UofU that was organized in our response to Senator Urquhart’s white paper.
- Phyllis Saffman spoke on mission based funding and post tenure review.
  - The likelihood of any funding occurring this year is remote.
- It was felt that the legwork had not been completed. It is a nice piece of legislation, but needs more work. She noted that Senator Urquhart is more inclined to get us included in the 1% pay raise.
- The question was raised as to how mission based funding is being included in the universities and have faculty been consulted. The general consensus was that no faculty had been included. A charge was issued that senate leaders ask their administrations what, if any, plans they had to include faculty in future conversations regarding mission based funding.
- Based on retention and completion ratios. Will those be future retention and completion ratios or past performance? No one really had a good answer.
- A push is being made on Urquhart to examine K-12 issues and the inputs problem.
- A new regents policy is coming forward regarding post tenure reviews that has some solid teeth and might resolve legislative issues for removal. Discussion moved around to who’s doing what. SUU put an excellence component in and faculty is reviewed every 5 years. If excellence is obtained, there is a merit increase, but no explanation as to where the dollars would come from. Time frames seem to be up to institutions.

- Senator Urquhart
  - Time and money are problems students face today and the more time spent in remedial courses, the less likely they are to complete their education.
  - He is pushing for an assessment tool that would be administered around the start of a student’s junior year of high school. This provides a few years to complete remediation and be ready for the university level of competence. Russ Thornley asked if this was more of a standardized test. Urquhart has the belief that if you raise expectations, it will resolve itself.
  - He is currently not pushing mission based funding.
  - If the UofU is being pushed for higher admission standards, the question of what’s going to happen as it goes back down the system? If they do not have remedial courses, it is likely they would be pushed onto UVU.
  - He feels that online education needs to be appropriate for the circumstance. Faculty pushed back that communities of learning are important.
  - In regards to tenure, he felt that colleagues have not put the time in to really investigate and sees no way to let those things move forward.
  - He put out several offers to the faculty senates. 1) He would like to be able to develop a relationship with faculty senators and have them testify when needed in committees and 2) relates to innovation in teaching. He would like to invite anyone on campus that has ideas on how to pursue structural teaching that can be legitimately changed to email him.

- Role Statements
  - As leaders, it was decided to develop a statement on “what tenure means” to present to the legislature. The hope is that it will be approved by the group then sent to all faculty senates in the state and a document be developed as to what we define as tenure.

- Thomas Henry - Motion to adjourn.
- Motion passed – Meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.