**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**Special Session**

January 25, 2022

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

***Present***: Russ Bailey, Alex Yuan, Armen Ilikchyan, Ashley Larsen, Ashley Nadeau, Ben Moulton, Bob Walsh, Brandon Ro, Chris Witt, David Scott, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Elijah Nielson, Eric Russell, Ethan Morse, Evelyn Porter, Greg Jackson, Hilary Hungerford, Jim Pettersson, Jim Sutton, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Joshua Hilst, Justin Schellenberg, Kathleen Young, Kathren Brown, Kevin Smith, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Lauren Brooks, Leo Schlosnagle, Lisa Hall, Lyn Bennett, Maureen Andrade, Michael Shaw, Mike Smidt, Nicole Gearing, Nizhone Meza, Peter Sproul, Sandie Waters, Shane Draper, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Trevor Morris, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Young Ham, Zachery Taylor

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Troy Martin (VP for Digital Transformation), Ashley Larsen (Deputy Dean of Students), Jacob Atkin (Associate VP for Policy and Finance)

Call to order by Vice President Wioleta Fedeczko, standing in for President Hilary Hungerford– 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – Minutes approved for 1/11/2022 (3:01 pm)

**PROVOST**

* Town Hall meeting held yesterday, discussing especially responses to the current spike of infections. Report on ongoing work to accommodate persons who are ill or quarantining, students, faculty, and staff. Recognition of the task force for helping to use information to guide decision-making through this time.
* There was a letter sent on behalf of anonymous faculty. Faculty are encouraged to register their concerns with Faculty Senate as a venue for having their concerns addressed.
* RTP cases have all come through Digital Measures and the hope is that this is a helpful tool for handling reviews and portfolios.
* Question from Bob Walsh: Clarification on statement about moving to remote delivery. PROVOST: If you are teaching a face-to-face class and there is a situation in classroom with a health-related concern due to COVID, you are authorized in consultation with your department chair to move to remote delivery on a temporary basis. Flexibility is offered to faculty so that they can make decisions regarding how they address the health and safety of their classroom. Faculty are not permitted to move classes to remote delivery for the duration of the semester, as this would contravene state law.
* Question from Young Ham: Regarding control over recordings of media files of class lecture/discussions, we only have the authority to publish or not and do not have the power to delete old recordings. Can we get more control over these files? PROVOST: My goal is for you to have complete control over those files, including deleting if you wish. There is ongoing litigation with another university, but this concern has been clarified and should not interfere with moving ahead. IT has informed me that it is possible to delete videos if wished.
* Question from David Frame: Regarding RTP process and Digital Measures, when can we expect the questions to be updated for next year’s RTP applications? PROVOST: I am unaware. VICE PRESIDENT: As RTP liaison, we are currently working with specific colleges on this, the goal is to have this completed by the end of the academic year and have RTP chairs complete workshops at that time as well as in August. For those submitting in September, there will be sufficient time to address the questions in Digital Measures.
* Question from Justin Schellenberg: Follow up on RTP process question, does entire portfolio need to be submitted via Digital Measures, including if faculty previously submitted a hard copy binder? PROVOST: Yes, this is ideal. VICE PRESIDENT: Faculty are already importing documents into Digital Measures and it is recommended that faculty do so. PROVOST: This will keep all documentation in one place, making it easier for those who are reviewing. VICE PRESIDENT: For anything else RTP-related, please contact me personally. (END 3:19 PM)

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Cloud storage discussion: Troy Martin, Associate VP for Digital Transformation, responsible for IT infrastructure at the university. With regard to data storage in the cloud, a 2021 audit found concerns that UVU has too many cloud-based platforms that makes it confusing to end-users. It increases our vulnerability. In addition, the large number of platforms is costly to the university. The plan is to consolidate platforms and address this concern. Google Drive no longer offers unlimited storage to institutions as of May 1, and given the current usage the university’s bill for this service would be $420,000 on May 2 if we do not transition the data. Box is also indicating a price increase upcoming. OneDrive has been licensed for USHE and is tailored to the individual, with SharePoint as the companion platform for sharing. S Drive is a homegrown platform based on Novell. OneDrive offers unlimited storage to us. The plan is to have a team assess in each area of the university what platforms are being used and come up with a plan to migrate data appropriately. We have begun this process with Google Drive, but the School of Education is an exception for Google Drive because of specific learning outcomes needed to address. No need to fear this change, embrace this. We will absolutely not lose data and we are taking a very measured approach to this change. There are some systems that we simply cannot afford to continue and we aim to make data storage more usable.
  + Question from Chat: Notice received that Dropbox will be deleted, is this true? MARTIN: IT will be in contact about migrating data, you will absolutely not lose data.
  + Question from Michael Shaw: Is the university becoming overly reliant on Microsoft tools and do we need to divest in some way? MARTIN: This is a concern, we do not want to over-rely on a single vendor. Be aware that this is the state of Utah meeting with Microsoft. We proactively monitor all vendors in this space. Shaw: Will it be possible to move from Teams to Zoom like other institutions? MARTIN: I can’t answer this.
  + Senators requested Martin’s slides to be able to share with their departments (END 3:33 PM)
* 3rd Science GE Discussion, Evelyn Porter, turned time to Eugene Seeley (chair of General Education committee). Some classes have been historically counted as science that were not physical science. Life Science, Physical Science are two areas that are required by the state, our committee has wanted a 3rd science category added. We have proposed another category called Applied Technical Sciences that would fit courses like Technology Management. Please see attached [proposal](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fVU5xThuQFrhHAMI4_I9kkg4QtyrJrtD/edit) (read aloud). This would not change the requirement of the first two science requirements (these are state mandated), but the third science category would be specific to UVU. It would not replace the life or physical science requirement. One possible course would be introduction to engineering.
  + Question from Kathleen Young: Why does the university feel that students need a 3rd science course? SEELEY: Impassioned request from a previous dean to the committee in defense of a 3rd science course. We want to encourage an understanding of science for all students. YOUNG: This seems self-serving for science departments, we would need a broader list for what counts based on what students need. Evelyn Porter: The 3rd science requirement has been in place already, this decision was made 50 years ago. Comments and feedback are needed on the proposed designation of the 3rd science possibly being filled by a broader *category* than those currently being allowed for general education. VICE PRESIDENT: Contact Curriculum committee with questions and comments. SEELEY: This has been discussed with department chairs several years prior, hopefully this is not a surprise. (END 3:44 PM)

**POLICY**

* 644—*Department Chair* policy.
  + Skyler Simmons: Continuing to discuss comments from previous Faculty Senate meeting, please see linked document from meeting agenda.
    - Section 5.5.7, regarding reduced teaching load negotiated with the dean
    - Section 5.6.1, regarding ongoing training to department chairs. Who is responsible for this? Sandie Waters: Discussed last time, we can continue.
    - Section 5.6.5, any way for chair to reject or appeal evaluated content?
    - Section 5.6.6, Is the dean the evaluator for chair performance, what is the written plan?
    - Question: How will these questions be addressed? SIMMONS: Since this is Stage 1, drafting committee will receive these comments. Jon Andersen: There will be opportunity through these stages to address these comments and make sure they are addressed.
    - Section 5.7.1, would chair notify faculty regarding this item? Lyn Bennett: If chair decides to resign, they would notify dean, it seems they would need to notify faculty as well.
    - Section 5.7.1, what does no-confidence process look like, can it be closed-door?
    - Section 5.7.3, Do we need policy references here, Policy 165?
    - Section 5.7.4, John Jarvis: Dean can call for the chair’s dismissal, this should be clarified.
    - Sections 5.8; 5.13, If a Program Coordinator’s responsibilities are equal to an Associate Chair, can a second Associate Chair be allowed? Michael Shaw (speaking in behalf of Michala Giesenkirchen Sawyer), Avoid a one-size-fits all approach to programs.
    - Section 5.9.1, What is the rationale for one-year repeatable terms for assistant and associate chairs? Ashley Nadeau: Yes, that is what was expressed. John Jarvis: If underperforming, one year may be useful to dismiss. Sandie Waters: Options would be for a one-year repeatable term, or with a multi-year appointment they could be released following a review of the service done.
    - Section 5.10.1, 5.13.3, regarding reduced course loads. Why should they only be reduced in “rare circumstances”? In many programs, these roles are more demanding than others. Shaw: Without a course load reduction, there would not be anyone willing to assume the responsibility of an Associate or Assistant Chair, in the opinion of our department. Being Associate Chair can mean different things in different departments, it’s a question of workload rather than title to consider reduction.
    - Section 5.11.1, Who creates the training and orientation for associate and assistant chairs? Clarification needed.
    - Section 5.11.1, Is there a chance to appeal dismissal for associate/assistant chairs?
    - Section 5.13.4, A one-size-fits-all approach to the election of a department chair may not be desirable.
    - Simmons: Please note the separate comment section for the policy comments that relate to grammar, editorial comments. (END 4:01 PM)
* Policy 161 *Freedom of Speech* Limited scope revision
  + Simmons: Stage 2, the Faculty Senate now needs to create a summary of comments. This was a limited scope revision, focused on Section 4.1.2.1, we recommend that this move forward. Shaw: Clarification requested. Simmons: The only policy eligible to be changed is in 4.12.1. Michael Shaw: When you say that this will be approved, does this mean that we will not discuss the comments? Jon Anderson: When we have a limited scope issue, we are limited to only respond to what that limited scope is addressing. We may discuss other related issues here and raise other concerns, but what we can pass on is limited in scope. Shaw: I have comments and questions relative to academic freedom, want to clarify that we do not simply approve and move on without addressing this. Anderson: We have two more weeks to address this. Shaw: Several questions regarding academic freedom remain. Ashley Larson: As policy proposer, there are many ways to address these concerns, through President’s Council. This limited scope revision is an item that needs to be addressed, needs to evolve with us relative to free speech law and practice. Today I am only authorized to address the deletion of 4.12.1. Sandie Waters: If we deal only with 4.12.1, can we add an addendum that as a Senate there are many areas we wish to address? Larson: That additional feedback can be received through President’s Council and entertained, need to be addressed to Hilary Hungerford or Kyle Reyes. John Jarvis: Comment in support of dropping 4.12.1, will others see this change as tacit approval of people’s free speech? Larsen: Everything will still need to be approved through Campus Connection, this only addresses the allowing of the possibility of anonymity for legitimate reasons, with the criteria to be determined. Shaw: What is being deleted? VICE PRESIDENT: Section 4.12.1. Larsen: I cite case law about whether universities should allow for an avenue to have signage approved without identifying the author or sponsor to prevent a retaliation issue. Shaw: Further comments from department only relate to the larger policy. (END 4:16 PM)
* Policy 115 *Personal Use of University Policy*
  + Simmons: Language that reflects typical faculty use of university property (principally computers) that spells out guaranteed acceptable behavior should be included. Shaw: Clarifying Michaela’s comment, requesting there be language reflecting acceptable behavior. Elijah Nielson: Conflict of interest policy already exists, could there be an adoption of a similar language as University of Utah relative to personal use? Simmons: Can we make comments at this stage? Anderson: Yes, but in a limited fashion, we could ask for a language change or recommend that.
  + **MOTION**: Nielson: Extend the time for 5 minutes, seconded by Sandie Waters. Motion passed
  + Jacob Atkin: We expect to make a significant rewrite regarding use of offices for business purposes, akin to what is used at the University of Utah. Nielson: Point of order, clarify typed comment by Simmons.
  + Simmons: Regarding comment: What determines the values of both the personal benefit and the value to UVU? Atkin: The purpose is to issue equipment to university employees for university benefit, should exceed the possible personal benefit of that equipment usage. We may return to the committee to clarify language that would quantify that comparison.
  + On Section 4.5.1, Language needs to be clarified. John Jarvis: Move sections to 4.6, recommended by Simmons to be taken up by Atkin.
  + Atkin: To reflect policy closer to University of Utah policy, we take this back and will bring back a revision. (END 4:27 PM)
* Policy 326 *Workplace Conduct*
  + Simmons: We are not endorsing workplace violence, to be clear. Clarifying the tone, comment by Trevor Warburton. Waters: This is improved. Dianne McAdams-Jones: Clarify language around black woman and white man, the necessity of inclusion of a content matter expert on racism to review this. Kyle Kamaiopili: Need to clarify language “expert on racism” to be less vague. Simmons: We are not using this specific verbiage in the policy, this was a summary of the comment, but please recommend a revision if possible. McAdams-Jones: To reiterate, we do not know exactly what “expert on racism” is, need clarification.
  + Suggestion to include reference to policy 168, (whistleblower anti-retaliation)
  + Comment about using definitions, clarifying words like “at will employee” and “factfinder”.
  + Comment recommending instances of abusive conduct that are not currently included, such as incitement to abusive conduct, retaliation against the complainant, and all abusive conduct.
  + Record-obtaining and record-keeping processes need to be clarified and logistical details specified.
  + 4.1.1, Do employees have an obligation to promote and preserve the reputation of UVU? Instead, maybe a statement about demonstrating respect toward members of the UVU community. Jim Price: Support this comment, need to support our free speech rights, including criticisms of the university if applicable.
  + Section 4.2, Procedures for corrective actions for staff and faculty.
  + Section 4.3.1.2, Does the scope of the policy extend to contractors/subcontractors with UVU?
  + Section 4.3.1.3, Original language regarding making police and supervisor aware of violence, both should be made aware. Sandie Waters: This needs to be recorded somewhere and policy made to prevent it from being “swept under the rug.” Jim Price: The behavioral assessment team on campus needs to be the first place to go if someone displays behavior that is threatening in some way. Simmons: This policy refers to faculty and staff.
  + Section 4.3.5, Need procedure spelled out if an accusation is false and/or malicious. (END 4:41 PM)

**NON-POLICY**

* Part-time shared Governance committee:
  + Simmons: Continuing discussion on comments.
  + Tier 4: This effectively doubles the size of Faculty Senate and is a major change. Need to ensure concerns of part-time faculty can be addressed. PRESIDENT: Open discussion for comments. VICE PRESIDENT: Feedback from senators that they have not had sufficient time to discuss with their departments. Anderson: There is no policy-mandated timeline for this. VICE PRESIDENT: Waiting to hear from senators on this. Joshua Hilst: This meeting is taking place prior to my being able to bring this to my department, requesting more time. Dianne McAdams-Jones: This relates to the culture around treatment of adjunct faculty, correct? PRESIDENT: Let’s revisit this in a few weeks. VICE PRESIDENT: Senators need more time to discuss with departments, will revisit this in a few weeks. Shaw: I request a description of the proposal. VICE PRESIDENT: To briefly summarize, this relates to how shared governance may work for adjunct or lecturers, seeking feedback from departments that are highly variable in their makeup. We are seeking to establish how shared governance works for this segment of the university community. McAdams-Jones: It is important that they receive representation in governance relative to their work, trying to share the governance. Dustin Shipp: Comments from department about not wanting to subject persons in these roles to additional committee work, time obligations, added workload. VICE PRESIDENT: There is a need to make sure that workload is not increased while ensuring representation in governance. Kathleen Young: Compensation needs to be addressed as a major issue, office space also needed, appreciative of the comments passed on by Dustin Shipp. McAdams-Jones: Need for shared governance, which can help with these concerns. Shipp: In agreement. Young: This is our responsibility to speak up for our adjuncts. McAdams-Jones: In agreement. VICE PRESIDENT: I recommend that these comments and suggestions be added to the document. (END 4:54 PM)
  + Anti-Racism Resolution: VICE PRESIDENT: This is still being revised, please be ready to comment on the updates.
* VICE PRESIDENT: Please review the rest of the agenda for additional items to peruse and address as needed.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Elijah Nielson: Expressing appreciation for all persons stepping in and participating in this body, especially Vice President filling in for President today.
* VICE PRESIDENT: In agreement, also recommending that all participate in Provost’s Town Hall meetings. Check out OTL events for faculty development and opportunities for stipend.
* John Jarvis: University College to meet with Provost to discuss realignment and the plan is to meet together to further discuss with deans.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm.