**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

January 30, 2018

FL 516, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Pauli Alin, Jon Anderson, Wendy Athens, Clay Brown, Kat Brown, Karen Cushing, Lindsay Gerber, Chelsie Kraczek (UVUSA), Dianne McAdams-Jones, Jeff Olson, Jim Pettersson, Sean Tolman

Visitors: Jim Bailey, Phil Gordon, Alan Parry, Eugene Seeley

***Excused or Absent:*** Howard Bezzant, Anthony Morris (Library), Craig Thulin

* Call to order – 3:00 PM
* Approval of Minutes from January 16, 2018. Minutes approved.

**ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES**

SVPAA

* UVU continues with the Presidential search and the Legislative session has begun.
* Moving through the Tenure and Rank process.

AVPAA

* Pilar Hays and Robin Escobar are meeting with departments to share the mediation processes that are in place for faculty. Please contact them if needed.

OTL

* Technology conference on Friday in FL 428 from 9:00-3:00 p.m.
* Received good response to the Academy Awards nominations and are in process of reviewing.
* Continue to review the Strategic Plan with various university areas.

UVUSA

* SLAM conference this Saturday, February 3, 2018 from 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Students from around the state are invited to hear items on student leadership and mentoring.

**DEBATE**

* Policies 609 – *Business and Industry Incentive Plan for Course Delivery* and 522 - *Undergraduate Credit and Transcripts* will be action items. Currently have no comments.
* Policy 655 – *Graduate Faculty* (Limited Scope) – Will be first reading. UVU now has clinical faculty and needs to add them to policy. Also had interpretative language in the policy that needed clarification. Did have some faculty on the Graduate Council classified as Program Directors that created problems. The revision states that Program Directors will no longer be able to serve on the Graduate Council; however, they did express desire to participate in policy issues.
* Revisiting Apportionment of the GE Re-envisioning the Undergraduate Experience
	+ Phil Gordon expressed concerns from several faculty who felt ambushed and rushed in the 12/5 Faculty Senate meeting. Requested that the process be discussed at the next Faculty Senate. Anderson noted that this matter is on the agenda. What is not on the agenda is a discussion on revisiting the apportionment.
	+ Gordon feels that the process should have been a two-step process where the proposal was made; senators could take the information back to their departments for discussion, then return and vote. Tolman asked what outcome Gordon would like. Gordon would like to see that the reapportionment change and people feel a stronger sense of buy-in to the process. Gerber shared her perspective that if senate delayed the vote, the GE Re-envisioning Committee would not have been formed until February.
	+ Parry feels that trying to change the current committee make-up is problematic. Would like to see the Bylaws changed to refine the review process so this circumstance is not repeated.
	+ Pettersson inquired if the apportionment were revisited and the outcome the same, would the matter be put to rest. He also asked what affect this would have on future decisions that are made, would individuals want to revisit every issue that requires a vote.
	+ Gordon supports having a discussion on the process.
	+ Anderson reminded ExCo that once the committee develops a new GE plan, that faculty would have an opportunity to vote on the GE plan.
	+ Tolman reported that the committee is aware that faculty would like to hold open forums for face-to-face discussion/comments.
* General Education
	+ The GE Committee is beginning third year of reviews for GE courses. The Committee has a number of standards, procedures, areas of concerns that they have applied to both new and existing courses, but nothing is currently documented. The Committee is proposing a Resolution to accomplish this recording.
	+ Resolution proposes that GE courses should not have specific requirements as well as proposed several exceptions. (See attachment)
	+ Would like Faculty Senate to review, comment, adjust as appropriate, and then publish procedures for all to utilize.
	+ USHE Policy R470 governs GE. We have been using our criteria, but they are not currently recorded anywhere. Olson noted these are the expectations from USHE. Recommend adding a statement to the resolution that references the R470 policy.
	+ Anderson inquired if this should be a resolution or a practice. Seeley feels a resolution provides a little more strength and sets the right tone.
	+ Recommendations to Resolution
		- Revise introduction into a positive statement
		- Under exceptions section, revise opening statement to include “as approved by the General Education Committee” and delete this statement for each bullet.
	+ Recommended Senate outcome is for comment, input, and support.
	+ Anderson will create a link for senate to comment.
* Policy 638 – Post-Tenure Review
	+ Olson and Brown will recommend the removal of the “termination” language from Section 4.1.7. to President’s Council.
* Research/Creative Works Sponsorship Committee
	+ Noted in many portfolios, faculty would like to receive credit for the research/creative works that are not necessarily part of the university’s mission. Propose a three-tiered rubric on a university scale: Tier 1) university would offer strong support where it benefits the university, faculty and students; Tier 2) diminished support 3) might only be you and a few other people reviewing a journal article, probably not support at all. Would like to constitute a committee to determine what this would look like and what would/would not be supported. Olson clarified that research/creative works are to complement teaching and the committee would help us define what forms of scholarship/creative work complements teaching and to what degree.
	+ Tolman feels that this might be problematic given a broad range of disciplines and mission. Concerned about how it might affect academic freedom. Might have unintended consequences. Olson shared that we are currently making these types of decisions all the time, but would like guidelines to assist in making judgments that are more informed. Would like to have the benefit of faculty thinking. Olson/Brown will determine how to structure charge for the committee which would be to develop the guidelines. Consider utilizing SCULPT.
* Student Success Declaration
	+ Term “student success” used all the time. Individuals wanted a definition of what we mean by student success and what we want to accomplish.
	+ Intent is to have a Faculty Senate discussion and move in favor of supporting the document. (See attachment)
* SRI Retaliations from Students Against Faculty
	+ Received email from a department expressing concern that students are giving lower SRI ratings at end of semester in retaliation against a faculty for low grades, being caught cheating, etc.
	+ Brown noted there are great ways to protect faculty from student revenge such as to show they are active in developing their pedagogy other than relying on SRIs. Another way is to reflect upon the SRIs and take the comments seriously in their portfolios.
	+ Alin noted that the Teaching Effectiveness Taskforce will be examining SRIs, how they are being used, and how they could be used to inform/improve their teaching.
	+ If faculty are placing all eggs in their basket on SRIs, they are not highlighting what they are doing.
	+ Anderson will respond via email and address First Amendment Rights.
* Debate Calendar Proposal
	+ Anderson reported that the only item that receives attention in more than one senate meeting is policy. Proposed three models for Debate Calendar for Non-Policy Items. ExCo recommended providing a statement that all action items for a meeting will be attached to the outgoing agenda.
		- Models 2 and 3 tie the Senate’s hands and prevent items from moving forward. Recommend helping faculty understand their role. Senators need to be sure they represent their department to the best of their ability. Need to discuss the issues and help faculty to be prepared to address appropriately. Be sure the conversations stay on topic.
		- Consider keeping Model 1 unless violated by not attaching action item to the agenda. Model 2 addresses any late item(s) added to the agenda after Thulin sends out the agenda email, will be an informational item UNLESS a majority of senators choose to move it to an action item and vote on it.
		- Anderson will revise the proposed models and send out to ExCo for review/comment.
		- Pettersson recommended training senators on Robert’s Rules of Order. This allows more efficiency in moving items forward. Will discuss more.
	+ Mandatory Training Resolution
		- ExCo recommended sending the resolution to legal to determine if legal counsel is supportive of the document.
	+ CAGAS
		- Propose CASAG (Council for Academic Standards, Admissions, and Graduation) or just keep Academic Standards. McAdams-Jones will ponder and notify the ExCo.
	+ **MOTION** – Lindsay Gerber moved to extend meeting for 5 minutes. Sean Tolman seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
	+ Set Agenda for the February 6, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm

**ACTION ITEMS**

* Create GE Resolution link for senate comments. (Anderson)
* Respond to department email re SRIs. (Anderson)
* Revised proposed Debate Discussion models, send to ExCo. (Anderson)
* Send Mandatory Training Resolution to Legal for review and support. (Anderson)
* Email Web Development on proposed name change for CAGAS once McAdams-Jones approves. (Cushing)



