**Faculty Senate Minutes**

January 26, 2021

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

***Present***: Maureen Andrade, Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Wendy Athens (OTL), Lyn Bennett, Lauren Brooks, Kat Brown, Seth Christensen, Joy Cole, Suzy Cox, Karen Cushing, Shane Draper, Beka Grulich (PACE), Lisa Hall, Barry Hallsted, Young Wan Ham, Melissa Heath, Rick Henage, Jessica Hill, Joshua Hilst, Hilary Hungerford, Armen Ilikchyan, Greg Jackson, John Jarvis, Kyle Kamaiopili, Jeremy Knee (OGC), Stephen Ley, Diana Lundahl, Mohammad Masoum, Jeff Maxfield, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Rick McDonald, Natalie Monson, Elijah Nielson, Matthew North, Alan Parry, Jim Pettersson, Kelli Potter, Audrey Reeves, Denise Richards, Brandon Ro, David W. Scott, Dustin Shipp, Skyler Simmons, Peter Sproul, Karen Sturtevant (Library), Zachery Taylor, Wayne Vaught, Ryan Vogel, Bob Walsh, Sandie Waters, Lucy Watson (UVUSA), Christopher Witt, Alex Yuan, Geoffrey Zahn

***Excused or Absent***: Leo Chan, Max Eskelson, Chuck Knutson, Scott Lewis, Ronald Miller, Evelyn Porter, Leo Schlosnagle

***Guests:***  Susan Thackeray, David Connelly, Kelly Flanagan, Christina Baum, Jason Hill, Seth Gurell, Kazem Sohraby, Forrest Williams, Nizhone Meza

Call to order – 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2021. Minutes approved.

**PRESIDENT**

* Nominations for office of Faculty Senate President – Hilary Hungerford and Sean Tolman
* Nomination for office of Faculty Senate Vice President – Wioleta Fedeczko
* Arendt will work with Institutional Research (IR) on the Qualtrics Survey for voting and results will be announced at the 2/23 senate meeting.

**POLICY**

* Policy 644 – *Appointment and Responsibilities for Department Chairs -* Parry will review all comments and senators will note which ones they would like to have a discussion.
	+ Section 3.1 – (Comment 6) - Yes
		- Concern about some departments allowing adjunct reps and other non-benefit eligible individuals to have a say while others do not. Departments should have decision to include them.
		- Issues with consistency regarding who exactly is a member of the “faculty.” Staff members also report to the department chair, should they have a vote? Need to determine what we mean by eligible.
		- All full-time faculty should have a vote along with any staff reporting to the department chair.
		- Examine issue through supervisor role if they will be conducting reviews on others that are not faculty. Be inclusive.
		- All individuals supervised by the department chair should have a vote.
		- Departments should have the ability to determine who gets to vote. Consider academic freedom.
		- Individual staff members hired to perform the same job functions should be treated the same in regards to a vote.
	+ Section 3.1 – (Comment 32) – Yes
	+ Section 3.2 – (Comment 7) – No
	+ Sections 3.1,3.2,3.4,3.5,5.3.2 (Comment 9) – No
	+ Section 3.5 (Comment 64) – Yes
	+ Section 3.6 (Comments 8,33) – Yes
	+ Section 3.6 (Comment 33) – No
	+ Section 4.2 (Comment 80) – No
	+ Section 4.2.1.3 (Comment 34) – Yes
	+ Section 4.2.1.8 (Comment 10) – No
	+ Section 4.2.1.9 (Comment 1) – No
	+ Section 4.2.1.9 (Comment 2) – Yes
	+ Section 4.2.3 (Comment 11)– No
	+ Section 4.2.6 (Comment 12) – No
	+ Section 4.2.6 (Comment 35) - No
	+ Section 4.2.7 (Comments 36,65) – Yes
	+ Sections 4.2.9, 4.2.10 (Comment 13) – No
	+ Section 4.2.12 (Comments 14, 37) – Yes
	+ Section 4.2.13 (Comments 15,16) – Yes
	+ Section 4.2.15 (Comment 66) – Yes
	+ Section 5.1.1 (Comments 17,38) – Yes
	+ Section 5.1.1 (Comment 18) – Yes
	+ Section 5.1.2 (Comment 19) – Yes
	+ Section 5.2.1 (Comments 67,89) – Yes
	+ Section 5.2.2 (Comments 39,79,81) – Yes
	+ Sections 5.2.3,5.11.1, 5.11.2 (Comments 20,61) – Yes
	+ Section 5.2.4 (Comment 40) - No
	+ Section 5.2.4 (Comment 21) – No
	+ Section 5.2.5 (Comments 22, 77) – Yes
	+ Section 5.2.7 (Comments 23, 24) – Yes
	+ Sections 5.2.6, 5.2.7 (Comment 90) – Yes
	+ Section 5.3.1-5.3.3 (Comments 25, 91) – Yes
	+ Section 5.4.1 – (Comments 26,92) – No
	+ Section 5.4.2 (Comments 27, 93) – Yes
	+ Section 5.5 (Comment 29) – No
	+ Section 5.5.1 (Comment 28) – Yes
	+ Section 5.5.1 (Comments 3, 31, 41, 42, 73, 94) – Yes
	+ Section 5.6.1 (Comments 30,68,74,82) – Yes
	+ Section 5.6.2 (Comment 43) – No
	+ Section 5.6.3 (Comments 4, 50,69,75, 78,83, 95) – Yes
	+ Section 5.6.3.1 (Comments 5, 51) – Yes
	+ Section 5.6.3.2 (Comment 84) – Yes
	+ Section 5.6.4 (Comments 52, 71) – Yes
	+ Sections 5.7.1, 5.7.2 (Comment 87) – Yes
	+ Section 5.7.1 (Comment 44) – No
	+ Section 5.7.2 (Comment 53) - No
	+ Section 5.7.3 (Comment 85) – Yes
	+ Section 5.7.4 (Comment 54) – Yes
	+ Section 5.7.5 (Comment 55) – No
	+ Section 5.7.6 (Comment 45) – Yes
	+ Section 5.7.7 (Comments 56, 86) – Yes
	+ Section 5.7.8 (Comment 57) - Yes
	+ Sections 5.8.3,5.8.8 (Comments 46, 58) – Yes
	+ Sections 5.8.4,5.8.5 (Comment 47) – Yes
	+ Section 5.8.6 (Comments 59,60) – No
	+ Sections 5.12.1, 5.13.3 (48,72,76,88) – Yes
	+ Section 5.13 (Comment 63) – Yes
	+ Section 5.13.2 (Comment 62) – Yes
	+ Section 5.13.4 (Comment 49) - No
* **MOTION** – Rick McDonald moved to extend discussion 10 minutes. Sandie Waters seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
* Policy 525 – *Credit for Prior Learning* and 522 - *Undergraduate Credit and Transcripts*
	+ 2019 State Legislative Session produced HB45 which discussed credit for prior learning. USHE then put together R472 which now includes specific directions on portfolios. Would like to see the policy in place before the first course in fall 2021. Important that each school/college/department handle their offerings, but do have a directive to expand and market offerings.
	+ Policy 522 contained content that has been transferred to Policy 525.
	+ Credit for Prior Learning can draw from many things and the Prior Learning Assessment is what assesses credit for prior learning. Depending on how the department chooses to assess the prior learning credit is what the policy covers. The UVST 1100 course already on the books will guide and assist students in developing a portfolio for assessment. Intent is to have one course that serves all schools/colleges so students can do an intake process and determine if they have experience and knowledge that can be assessed through a portfolio method.

**PROVOST**

* COVID testing is underway. Messaging has gone out to faculty to encourage students to get tested. Randomized testing is also moving forward.
* Provost Office has done some reorganization to allow the Provost to focus on more strategic matters, address issues that impact academics, and provide for improved communication. Vaught’s new title will be Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. In order to alleviate some of the Provost duties, Kat Brown has been given additional responsibilities for the day-to-day operations and primary contact between the President’s Office and Academic Affairs with a new title of Deputy Provost. She will continue to perform her current functions in addition to these new responsibilities. A general announcement to the campus will be coming soon.
* Concerns were raised during the State of the University address about upper administration not hearing and being sensitive to some of the impact COVID has had on faculty to include stress or other situations they might be experiencing and how administration can be more attentive.

**NON-POLICY ITEMS**

* Advancement in Teaching
	+ Committee has produced a draft for UVU’s Peer Observation Rubric. It should align with: 1) annual reviews and 2) the Teaching Excellence model that the committee began piloting in fall 2020. Another item wanted to build in was an observation process. Reviewed examples of evidence. Want feedback from senators. Would like to pilot the rubric the end of February.
	+ This is intended to be a one class observation. Intent is to shoot for comprehensiveness, different modalities, and alignment with work already done on the Teaching in Excellence model.
	+ The Teaching in Excellence model was currently in the pilot stages. This new pilot is strictly dealing with peer observations.
* University’s Usage of Proctorio
	+ Digital Transformation (DT) is open and supportive if faculty want to use Proctorio. It is not part of DT’s decision to get involved in the pedagogical purposes for usage. DT would handle the licensing and financial aspects of proctored testing to include efficiencies.
	+ In inquiry was made regarding UVU’s responsibility of using the program if it is proven to be a negative tool. Flanagan reported that AI and machine learning are pretty good at making determinations about facial expressions and motions but there can be technical risks. There is a possibility that it can cause some undue stress for individuals.
	+ Baum inquired about the options available for proctored exams if UVU faculty do not use Proctorio.
	+ Concern about using Proctorio and faculty having to review student tests to reduce opportunities for cheating.
	+ Maybe there is a time and place for the use of an invasive testing method outside of COVID. What other options, strategies, or training opportunities are available? Flanagan recommended OTL review options for proctoring exams and the technology required. It does require pedagogical preferences.
	+ OTL supports not putting students in a stressful proctored remote environment. Accreditors do want to authenticate the remote students to ensure we are giving credits to those who actually did the work. They would want to see something like a proctoring system available as a choice.
	+ Some faculty indicate the use of Proctorio assumes that students are cheaters.
	+ Most cloud providers want to be able to mine the data and market back to UVU what they think we might be interested in while also keeping FERPA regulations.
	+ Hill reported that UVU’s license does not use live proctors. Proctorio is unable to watch the videos or see video content, only the teacher or admin that owns the license.
	+ Contact Christina Baum with any additional questions.
* Encourage or Require Use of Open Educational Resources (OER)
	+ There is a committee that is examining OER and how best to bring the idea to UVU campus which does have a strong following in higher education. Want to determine how OER can best serve faculty.
	+ Definition of OER from Policy 606 – *Adoption of Course Materials and Textbooks*
		- Section 3.6 - “Teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual-property license that permits their free use and repurposing by others. OER include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge.”
	+ Gurell reported UVU does have pockets of OER across campus, but there is no formal strategic direction with how to approach the issue. Also have difficulty tracking OER data across campus. In Vision 2030, there is a call to expand the use of OER and Digital Texts. Textbook adoption is embedded in the classroom and through academic freedom. SLCC link regarding OER <https://www.slcc.edu/open/#numbers>. They targeted general education and high enrolled courses. Question is how does faculty move things in a targeted and strategic way that creates impact and gets measurable results?
	+ **VOTE** – Does faculty want to have a strategic discussion? All in favor? 30; Opposed – 13; Abstained – 1. Vote passed.
	+ **MOTION** – Suzy Cox moved that we have a strategic discussion in Faculty Senate with a focus on options instead of mandates and include notation of how this is already in Vision 2030 AND Inclusion 2.0, with the Director of the Fulton Library in attendance. Sandie Waters seconded. All in favor? 24; Opposed – 4; Abstained – 2. Motion passed.
* Handling of Retention of Final Exams
	+ There is currently not a policy or practice on exam retention. Currently final exams are retained in a variety of areas such as file cabinets and Canvas. As long as course materials and final exams are in Canvas they will remain for five years until they are purged. If videos were recorded and uploaded into Kaltura, we have unlimited space. The UVU Legal Department asked that we do not delete any files for the last year and a half due to COVID.
	+ Student information system, like Banner, keeps student final grades at least seven year. Information in the Learning Management System (LMS) is being kept for up to five years.
	+ **VOTE** – Does faculty want to have a strategic discussion? 15; Opposed – 23; Abstained – 1. Vote failed.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Teaching for Learning Virtual Conference– 2/25, 9:00 am – 4:45 pm – OTL funded with the travel grant funds. Encouraging all faculty to attend. See link <https://www.uvu.edu/otl/calendar/index.html#community>
* Policy 649 – *Faculty Remediation, Sanction, and Dismissal for Cause* will have a drafting committee for Stage 1. More information will be available at the next Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.