**Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes**

March 14, 2017

LI 516, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Jensen Astle (UVUSA), Mark Bracken, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Doug Gardner, Lindsay Gerber, Ryan Leick, Anthony Morris (Library), Jeff Olson, Jim Pettersson, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman

Visitors:

***Excused or Absent:*** Kat Brown

* Call to order – 3:05 PM
* Approval of Minutes from February 28, 2017. Minutes approved.

SVPAA

* Legislative Session concluded. Olson reported that funding was approved for Growth at $3.5M. Legislature will assist UVU in funding the bridge between UVU Main and West Campus from state and institutional priorities.
* The Legislature also changed the responsibilities of the Regents. Senator Ann Millner sponsored a bill that allows the Trustees to approve degree programs that then move directly to NWCCU for approval. Bracken concerned about flooding the market with professionals with just having Trustee approval. Olson responded that Regents does has an opportunity to comment prior to Trustee approval. The Board of Regents also has authority to pull the plug on programs. Olson reported that Saeed Moaveni, the new Dean for TAC as of May 1, 2017, has some great ideas on how we launch into engineering degrees.
* Legislature found a way to fund some capital facilities this year, which puts UVU in a good position for the WSB building next year.
* Legislature also put more power back into the Trustees over the President. Olson reported that apparently there was some disappointment among Trustees at Utah State University over the appointment of their new president.
* Connelly share that the Legislature also funded 8% for healthcare.
* Restored 2% cut. Funded 2% compensation increase, but Olson cautioned that this is an average.
* President Holland is working hard to not increase UVU Tuition and working hard to keep it down statewide.
* Representative from UVU to witness Dan Fairbanks receive the Mendel Award from Mendelian. Geneticists attended from all over and toured sites in Brno and Vienna where Mendel worked and studied.
* Cabinet is meeting next week to discuss PBA proposals keeping in mind student success.
* Bracken and Olson met with Clemes re employees who were subject to investigations. Met with Makin on the concrete steps her division is taking to make sure, if an investigation is taking longer than expected that everyone is notified and provided an updated timeline, provide resource materials, and an individual to whom they can confer. Olson approved sharing this update.

UVUSA

* Elections concluded. Three individuals are in executive office that have not been involved in student government previously. Rob Smith is the new President. Average voting for elections nationwide is 3-4%. Last year it was 8.3%. This year we hit 16.3%. Will be changing how the debate works as did not receive many questions. Astle reported that they feel the increase was due to increased publicizing of the elections. Bracken feels faculty also contributed to the increase by encouraging their students to vote.
* Applications are open tomorrow for Student Council positions. All those who are selected except assistants are on full tuition scholarships.
* UVUSA sponsored the Hamilton Pizza & Politics today.

DEBATE CALENDAR

* Many policies coming to President’s Council for request to move into Stage 2 in the next few weeks. Leick felt that Faculty Senate could put many of these policies on the agenda for a First Reading. He feels that 635 – *Faculty Rights & Responsibilities* and 637 – *Faculty Tenure* will not change much.
* No policies currently in Stage 2 that Faculty Senate has not discussed other than the two on the table. Two travel policies are on the President’s Council agenda for this Thursday – 251 – *Traveling on University Business* (Regular) and 252 – *International Travel for Students, Faculty, and Staff* (Regular). Policies 165 – *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action* and 638 – *Post-Tenure Review* should be coming through Policy Subcommittee this week. Bracken clarified that a limited scope 162 – *Sexual Misconduct* has some minor changes and the regular policy 165 - *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action.* Connelly proposed scheduling a fourth senate meeting to address all the policies. Bracken noted that if we
* Olson complimented the ExCo for their work in preparation for Faculty Senate meetings and helping them be more effective. Concerned that if not having ExCo meetings to discuss and prepare for Faculty Senate, might lose some of the effectiveness.
* Arendt expressed desire to get 635 – *Faculty Rights & Responsibilities* into Stage 2 before end of semester so can get it through Faculty Senate, otherwise feels it will be a detriment to Senate.
* Leick expressed concern about the policy feedback closing date being March 16 for Policies 606 and 633 as they shortened the number of days. Bracken will ask for an extension to the full 60 days, which would be March 27.
* Bracken would like to reorder the policies for discussion and move Policy 633 first because it has accreditation implications.
* Policy 606 – *Adoption of Course Materials and Textbooks* challenge is the philosophical issue of what should be in a textbook policy. Need everyone to agree we need a textbook policy and it needs to address conflict of interest (COI). Bracken expressed faculty’s major concern is that they need to have approval of all course materials. Astle reported that UVUSA had a discussion with Pilar Hays recommending the Policy Committee change this aspect of the policy. Consider making a recommendation that the policy should only address COI issues. Olson stated that we need a mechanism dealing with content matter, quality control, and COI and be able to address complaints in a formal manner. Connelly then said need to find language that notes it is departments responsibility as the keepers of the gate for their discipline to police this without turning it into this onerous burden of approval of every single article that gets brought into the classroom. Need language that if there are concerns over the content of their course that is the job of their colleagues to review. Hence, the establishment of a committee at the department level to oversee this. Arendt would like language to address student appeals.
* Cost need to be addressed more when it comes to COI. Thulin stated the idea that we are preemptively trying to eliminate the possibility of bad quality by forcing everyone to vet everything they are going to use, raises a problem. Connelly recommended language such as “If a concern over content or teaching quality is raised by other faculty or students, a committee of the whole or of five faculty shall convene to assess the quality as related to the subject germane to the department.” Thulin asked if the responsive approach instead of a preemptive approach, would that placate the concerns of those that wrote this. Olson responded he does not know. Arendt shared an example of a faculty member using materials that were not germane to the course, was informed by the committee to stop the practice, but continues. Connelly responded that this is where annual reviews and course evaluations come into play. Olson noted the department chair as well.
* Thulin believes that to advance the cause, we need to emphasize the philosophical focus and provide Connelly’s suggested language as this changes the policy from a vetting to a responsive policy.
* Astle would like a student to sit on evaluation committee if a complaint was made by a student.
* Olson noted in terms of Academic Freedom, one of the distinctions is are you centering in advance or addressing afterwards. The courts want you to punish afterwards if you can accomplish the purpose that way. It protects Academic Freedom more to have the committee monitor as it goes on rather than approving everything in advance.
* Bracken proposed stating the philosophical question and sharing the two comments based on ExCo discussion and get Faculty Senate to agree then determine if we need to submit other comments. Connelly then stated that if steward does not agree with two main philosophical comments; ask what the sticking points are that Faculty Senate needs to address.
* Bracken feels that stewards and sponsors have very seldom not incorporated or addressed proposed comments. Tolman recommended having discussions one-on-one with dissenting voices from Faculty Senate.
* Policy Priority – Bracken wants to get as many faculty policies through this semester. Annual reviews and Post-Tenure reviews are critical for the accreditation visit.
* Discussion over Debate Calendar.
  + Leick reported that four policies should be in Stage 2 by next week: 705 – *Unmanned Aircraft Systems*, 165 – *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action*, 251 – *Traveling on University Business*, and 252 – *International Travel for Faculty, Students, and Staff.* Bracken reported that Clemes is transferring some information from Policy 165 to Policy 162, so might need additional conversation.
  + Bracken would like to get the 600 level policies through if possible due to accreditors coming in the fall.
  + Connelly recommended creating an extra meeting; suspend the calendar on any policies that we do not think are squarely germane to faculty. On the extra meeting, put all the policies on the calendar for that day.
  + Hold elections on 4/18 with smaller policies.
  + Change 4/11 to full Faculty Senate. Check on room CB 511 or CB 204 for availability.
  + Schedule 4/6 for ExCo meeting. Check FL 516 for availability.
* Discussion over policy priorities. Bracken will prepare spreadsheet for Faculty Senate distribution.
  + March 28 Info/1st Reading – Policies 162, 165, 251, 252, 705, 635, 637, 638

Move to Action – Policies 606, 633

* + April 4 Discussion – Policies 635, 637, 638
  + April 6 Add ExCo meeting
  + April 11 Change to Faculty Senate Meeting

Hold Discussion and Move to Action – Policies 162, 165, 251, 252, 705

* + April 18 Move to Action – Policies 635, 637, 638

Elections and Bylaws

RTP Advisory Committee

* Pettersson received some great feedback from faculty and have reworked the language. Feels that the faculty who were outspoken about the policy are now supportive. Working on a few last minute edits and will send out to ExCo for comment. Clarified Brown’s statement from previous meeting that she wants to make sure everyone votes in favor of the policy because they support it.
* Leick noted that even if the policy does not move into Stage 2, Faculty Senate could review and provide comments, but note that the policy can still change as it moves into Stage 2. Connelly commented that the key is to get the policy into Stage 2 before the end of the semester.

SCHEDULING

* Thulin inquired about the new start times schedule. Olson reported that the new schedule was presented in AAC on 3/14. Deans were to take the new schedule back and bring feedback back to AAC on 3/21. Implementation planned for summer 2018 in order to work out any problems.

BYLAWS

* Bylaws need to be reviewed to address the following items:
  + Curriculum Chair term of service, Constitution v. Bylaws (Sean)
  + Specify who can vote for Department Faculty Senate representative. Stated in Constitution, specify and clarify in Bylaws. (Lindsey)
  + Open Forum for Faculty Senate President and Vice President Candidates (next time) (Mark)
  + University Committees, membership ratified, term of service now is three years. Original term was five years. Do we honor initial appointment, but note all terms of service now are three years. (Doug)
  + New Faculty Senate President Transition. (Mark)
  + Apportionment of numbers of senators. (Jon) Need to determine when new senators actually take over.

GE Committee Representation

* Member of GE Committee resigned. Bracken met with Maureen Andrade and she reported that she asked Deans for suggestions noting for qualifications/experience. Wayne Hanewicz has been recommended by the CHSS Dean to replace Mike Shaw. Arendt expressed that there could be a potential political issue on this matter. ExCo ratified.

POLICY 633 – *Annual Faculty Reviews*

* Leick shared that the policy does not reflect the intent. Feels policy convoluted. Need to simplify exactly what is to occur – one year plan, next year report, and set goals for following year. Connelly noted that each year you walk in with a one-year plan.
* NWCCU requires annual reviews. Olson shared that the failure of Shared Governance is faculty could not develop an effective annual review policy. He would like to find a way of tweaking this draft to getting it approved.
* Connelly noted that because the policy came forward without the guidelines that stipulate what performance levels look like, you have a sticking point for a rogue chair. Either Faculty Senate needs to take responsibility of what the guidelines are or acknowledges that it still needs to be developed. Do want some institutional definition of what constitutes excellence in teaching. Thulin proposed to appoint an ad hoc committee to draft what the template should look like. Gardner interjected to add the process for approving on a regular basis. Olson noted the reason we do not want in policy is that we want it to be a living document. Connelly stated that the guidelines do need nuances for faculty going up for tenure, rank, merit, or annual reviews.
* Thulin recommended passing current comments on 633 with the understanding, we have this ad hoc committee that will draft a template and approval process for the template tethered to the Faculty Senate for oversight. Connelly restated that we should amend policy to indicate institutional guidelines will be developed and reviewed on a specific schedule or a variation of the process such as Faculty Senate, then SVPAA Office for approval. Need to consider macro guidelines, but then consider departmental considerations. Will proposed to constitute ad hoc committee on 3/28 and provide draft by 4/11.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm