**Faculty Senate Minutes**

March 28, 2023

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

***Present***: Anthony Ciccone, Alex Yuan, Armen Ilikchyan, Ashley Nadeau, Ben Moulton, Brandon Ro, Bryan Sansom, Christ Witt, Christopher Goslin, David Frame, David Scott, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Diego Alvarado Karste, Donna Fairbanks, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Eric J. Russell, Evelyn Porter, Gareth Fry, Hilary Hungerford, Jennifer Shubert, Jim Price, John Hunt, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Kathleen Young, Kathren Brown, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Laurie Toro, Leo Schlosnagle, Maureen Andrade, Merilee Larsen, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mike Smidt, Ming Yu, Natalie Monson, Nate Jeppson, Nicole Gearing, Nizhone Meza, Peter Sproul, Raiden Gaul, Rich Paustenbaugh, Sandie Waters, Sayeed Sajal, Skyler Simmons, Trevor Morris, Waseem Sheikh, Wioleta Fedeczko, Zachary Taylor

Excused or Absent:

Guests: Barb Smith, Drew Burke, Nicole Ferguson, Cathy Jordan

Call to order by President Hilary Hungerford: 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes stand approved

**FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Hilary Hungerford: Remember your annual reviews open April 1st. Wioleta is your go to expert on faculty success.
* Wioleta Fedeczko: Please remember you have two this year.
* Hilary: Two big things happening on campus tomorrow: The shared governance symposium is the first one. I think it will be a really fascinating discussion. The President will give remarks. The Provost will join and he has a guest. Wioleta, Anne and I will also have panel. There is also an AI workshop. Huge shout out to Armen. He is really the brains behind this. I will find links to put in the chat.

**MYUVU WORKSPACE**

* Barb Smith: The change happens on Monday, April 3rd.
* Hilary: This will be critical for you to share with your departments so they don’t get surprises when they log in on Monday.
* Barb: The new MyUVU will be easy to use. We want this to be your communication hub and to be an easy space to operate in. We are also soliciting feedback. We have made continuous improvement. In 2020 we were able to reface the current MyUVU to make it more engaging, but it was built on a very antiquated platform. If it breaks, we can’t fix it. We were forced to make a change, but we wanted to make the change to begin with. We are now in the next phase. What you will see is a new, modern workplace that features UVU news. A lot of you don’t care about the news, but we will hopefully provide information and news that is enticing enough for you to share. We want to hear from you, even if it wasn’t considered newsworthy before (i.e., receiving large grants, presenting at a big conference). Campus news is where you mostly will live. You will have eight blocks total. The menu bar is now at the top. You will also have a workplace page customized to you. You will be able to see if you have things you need to approve. We are trying to save all of you time. We’ve started training on this. We will be sending out an email to everyone before the end of the week. We will be getting Emma and doing a campus newsletter that will push everyone to this new product. This is only for faculty and staff, not for students. This does not impact their current MyUVU at all, therefore it does not impact Canvas at all. That will be later; we only had funding for this one.
* Hilary: We would like to have the presentation posted in the chat.
* Raiden Gaul: Is this integrated with Teams? We’ve had a major issue with security with Teams. A few times over the semester I logged on to Teams and some of my files would be messed up. Yesterday a faculty member had files taken out of one class, including an exam key, and put into a student’s file. She was able to turn it off, then back on to fix the issue. I just want to make faculty aware.
	+ Barb: If you don’t mind, reach out to Brett McKechnie and let him know that something odd is going on.
* Sandie Waters: We would have a combination of One Drive and SharePoint, correct?
	+ Barb: That will be in the later phases. The idea is that in the end, you will be able to enter this portal at the beginning of the day and close at the end of the day without having to leave this portal.
* Jim Price: It sounds like we can bring a link into Canvas in our dashboard?
	+ Barb: I think that is one of the things they put into the faculty page, but I’m not 100% sure. This is due to funding and manpower.
* Jim: I’ve had problems with Teams glitching in the classroom and Media has made many trips to fix it, so there are problems with Teams.
	+ Barb: I think some of this is because of our internet on campus. For better or worse, we are now a Microsoft university.
* Hilary: I think this will be a real improvement and we wanted to make sure that faculty knew. If I want to get things in the faculty resource tab, who would I ask?
	+ Barb: Scott Dewar.
* Hilary: It would make sense that things on the Faculty Senate website are in the faculty tab on the new MyUVU.
* Skyler Simmons: Will the tabs work the same?
	+ Barb: Yes, we’ve just cleaned it up so it will be easier to get to.

**GE UPDATES**

* Evelyn Porter: I want to start out with a huge thank you for everyone that has participated.
* GE Proposal: Keep GE at 35 credits hours, but expand the third science, expand the wellness category to personal well-being, expand the ethics and values category and remove prescriptive GE requirements. We will work with programs that have special accreditation.
* Huge Caveat: The State GE task force and Board gets a vote. They are proposing reducing to 27 or 30. Expect a decision by June and then Fall 2024 for implementation, though some say Fall 2025. We won’t know until the taskforce presents the Board and the Board votes. If the vote is 27, then there is nothing more. If it’s 30, then a committee will have to meet to reconstitute the existing committee. Whatever that committee does, they should build on the work that has been done. All of this has happened outside of our GE taskforce’s ability to influence it. There has been a lot of vocal voices out there that feel different than we did to keep it at 35.
* Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer: I just want to thank Evelyn and everyone on that committee for the incredible work they have been doing. It must be frustrating to run into this.
* Hilary: The U of U and SUU are pushing for 27. Those are two loud pushers. We’ve tried to resist as we can and comprise as well.
* Kathleen Young: What is the reasoning on lowering the amount of GE requirements?
	+ Evelyn: In reality, it’s about the transfer. From a legislative/state level, it looks like it helps the GE transfer cleanly.
* Skyler: What is the feel in the room about UVU creating our own graduation requirements?
	+ Hilary: We already have the GI and WE, but they aren’t courses right now. They are more of endorsements.
	+ Evelyn: Right now they are embedded in courses. The committee hasn’t yet talked about what it would look like to add more graduation requirements and what those would look like.

**POLICY**

* Policy 607: Course-Based Fees for Credit Courses
	+ Skyler: Based on the comments that have been received, I have summarized them as shown on the document. If anyone has any objections, you have them before you.
	+ Raiden: Our SIM department is wondering why it only mentions computer fees because we have a lot of other lab fees. I added it as a comment a couple of hours ago, though we aren’t seeing it.
	+ Wioleta: There was an issue to the link in the agenda to this policy, so you may have put it there.
	+ Sandie: I put comments on this one as well that I’m not seeing.
	+ Wioleta: Raiden’s comments are in the other one.
	+ Sandie: My comment had something to do with procedure for verifying the lab fees, such as some kind of gatekeeper.
	+ Skyler: Let me address Raiden’s comment first. I believe that was something that Culinary Arts was addressing last week as well. Let me add a quick summary item to 3.4.
	+ Sandie: Mine is something with the process of regular check-ins for managing course fees.
	+ Skyler: That will depend whether this goes on a vote today or not.
	+ Sandie: I’m okay if it goes to a vote without it.
	+ Laura Ricaldi: I have a comment on 5.3.2. I’m on the committee for this and the reason the statement says at least three people, one from each school or college, need to be on the committee is a mechanism for the schools and/or departments to ensure the fees are reviewed. Is this a comment about this or something else?
		- Skyler: Is it three faculty members only.
		- Laura: It says at least three faculty members with no more than one from each college or school.
	+ Peter Sproul: What if there is only three?
		- Laura: That means we can get started on reviewing.
	+ Peter: Right now the policy doesn’t stipulate that every college or committee needs to be represented.
	+ Jim: Why don’t we ask for language to be add that says no fees shall be rejected without proper consultation with the source department with the affected department.
		- Peter: I’m completely fine with this.
		- Hilary: This makes sense. It’s preparing for the worst-case scenario in the future.
	+ Sandie: Has it ever been a problem that departments don’t get back to you timely? Do we need something like having two weeks to respond to these comments?
		- Laurie: Laurie Sharp handles that. There are deadlines, but I’m not sure how she deals with that.
	+ Nicole Gearing: It says in 5.1.6 that the Course Fee Review Committee shall communicate the findings of the review and recommend any changes or deletions to the chair or dean.
	+ Peter: When you see the policy, what you see in writing and what actually happens can be presented in different ways. The language is there, so I do agree.
	+ Skyler: Are you satisfied with what you see in there?
		- Peter: As long as we are following due process, I’m fine with you deleting 5.3.2
	+ Sandie: I wonder if we should keep it because it’s good to have things in writing. Will it hurt to keep it in there?
		- Skyler: It appears to be in there, just in a different section.
		- Jim: If people are worried, you can just but the comment right next to the statement that the department chairs will respond.
	+ Skyler: We do have an additional couple of weeks that we can discuss this one. Because of the time we are limited to on the agenda, we need to move on.
* Policy 654: Faculty Merit Pay
	+ Skyler: I have these grouped according to theme.
* John Jarvis: I don’t think we should include the first box showing that merit pay should be a fixed percentage pay increase instead of a dollar amount. There are some colleges that are paid significantly higher and I’m not sure there is any way to really say that their merit is worth more than anyone else.
* John Hunt: This is more than a general idea that this is weighed heavily towards teaching instead of research. If we are going to be a real university, we need to have real people with real research. The UVU culture is having the SRI be the end of all in gauging good teaching. This could be a form of punishment against good teachers.
* Skyler: We have it that another teaching evaluation should be used other than the SRIs.
* Michaela: The point that scholarship should be valued more than teaching would be good to have separately. We are making efforts right now to change the process of evaluating, but until there is more headway, there is a danger of counting the SRIs like four times or at least three times.
* Ming Yu: I have a comment from my department that seems opposite. Our department has 80% weight on teaching. If service and scholarship were less in the department level evaluation, that creates imbalance. That is going to cause some confusion.
	+ Skyler: I’ve summarized that departments can modify their criteria to match this.
* Sandie: Because we are primarily a teaching institution and are just getting into scholarship, I think the line about scholarship is a little too heavy handed for where we are in our progression. Right now there are several departments that are heavy in teaching.
* Skyler: That’s definitely something that is going to vary by department and by the make-up of the faculty. Maybe each department should set their own criteria.
* Peter: I think it might be okay of scholarship in all forms should receive more weight because scholarly work is defined differently from department to department.
* Sayeed Sajal: How do we currently get merit pay?
	+ Hilary: It’s based on your tenure right now.
* Sayeed: If we approve this merit pay, will another employee get the previous version of this? How will we handle this?
* Hilary: At least we will get it every year instead of every five years. I don’t know what the difference in amounts is.
* Jon Anderson: The current model is finished this year one way or another. It was only $1,500. There are lot of reasons we are getting away from the five-year model, but it is done. There is no continuing of it. There are too many issues with trying to playback past years and trying to look at past models. We intend this to be a fresh start. If we don’t come to an agreement, then it won’t happen until we get something we are happy with. If this policy doesn’t pass in Fall, there will be no merit pay until we do and it will be delayed in the transition.
* Hilary: We can vote on 607 next week and 654 in the last Senate. There is still time to get feedback on merit pay.
* Policy 168: Whistleblower Anti-Retaliation
	+ Drew Burke: The changes include creating a notice investigation which is a hearing procedure that is specific to these types of complaints. There is also added language to allow meritless complaint dismissal. We’ve also deleted language saying a retaliatory action occurs when an employee is engaged in a protected activity.
	+ Hilary: I think it would be helpful for you to explain how retaliation is different in this one than other policies?
	+ Cathy Jordan: This is different than a discrimination retaliation claim because the employee has to engage in a protected activity. After they engage in that protected activity and they feel like they are being retaliated against, then it goes to a protected class.
	+ Hilary: So if I feel like I’m being retaliated against because of a comment I made and not because of a protected class, it would be this policy, correct?
		- Cathy: Yes, that is correct. If you have just general complaints and it’s not based on a protected class or activity, it may not be a policy violation. You are welcome to file a complaint to the Title 9 Office.
		- Jim: You can also make a complaint according to the grievance policy and claim a hostile work environment.
	+ Hilary: What is the whistleblower policy?
		- Cathy: If you feel retaliated because someone is violating the law and you speak up, that is under this policy.
	+ Jim: Is there a statute of limitations?
		- Nicole Ferguson: You have to report the retaliatory conduct within 30 days.
	+ Jim: I would like to see language that both parties know of the allegations and evidence in sufficient detail so that they can make a meaningful response.
		- Cathy: This policy doesn’t deal with the complaint, but the retaliation and the actions from the complaint.
	+ Hilary: Who has burden of proof to show?
		- Jim: It says UVU, but I’m not sure at what point.
		- Cathy: It’s under a statutory that says the employer has the burden of proof in these cases.
		- Jim: I would request that it would be made clear what UVU is showing as the burden of proof.
		- Drew: To provide more clarification, some of that due process you are asking about is actually contained in the lot itself. This includes disclosure of whatever evidence you have for the parties.
	+ Hilary: We are going to discuss this in two weeks. We may invite you back to help us understand the wording. For Senate, this is your homework over the next two weeks.

**NON-POLICY**

* Hilary: There are some of our standing committee chairs that will have positions available, so if you want to do one of those, you should start thinking about it. We will be voting on those a month from now. Also now is the time when we start making changes to our bylaws. If you are thinking about changes to how we do things in Senate, then send those to me, Wioleta or Jon Anderson.
* Protcorio Syllabus Statement: Last time we talked about how the vocabulary wasn’t taking into account everything that could happen in a remote testing situation. We made some small changes to the syllabus statement.
	+ Bryan Samson moves to vote on policy as written.
	+ Sandie Waters seconds the motion.
	+ John Jarvis: Can I pull it or will it be exactly as written?
		- Hilary: The other ones are exactly as written so this one will be too.
* Kathleen Young: If the students are concerned about the instructor seeing their surroundings, they can get a room in the Library; the students can make the accommodations for this.
* Sandie Waters calls the question.
* Voting Results: Passes with 27 agree, 3 disagree, 2 abstentions.
* Hilary: We have a few concerns that were brought. There has been a lot of problems with rank advancement this year, especially as we are in this limbo during this time where we don’t have an approved rank criteria. Has anyone else had this problem?
	+ Jim: We are still working on our rank policy and it has been a long process.
* Question/What is the status of the faculty ombudsman?
	+ Academic Affairs is moving it along, but there is talk of a different kind of ombudsman.
* Dustin Shipp: Regarding rank advancement, our department noticed that there have been some instances where there is a document given that is being used as if it were policy. We really appreciate it if everyone followed policy.
	+ Hilary: We definitely need to clarify it next season.
* Jim: Remember the work from home policy? What happened to it?
	+ Hilary: We aren’t entirely removed from it, but I think we won’t be required to get work from home agreements. The rules will still apply to us though. That is entering stage 3 right now. Now is the time to still put comments in.
* Sandie: If someone were going up for rank advancement, would we be leaning towards suggesting them to wait for the guidelines? Should they get in now because it’s more loose?
	+ Hilary: You can apply for rank advancement even if you don’t have rank criteria. I don’t think there is a best answer to that. I think there were more issues with rank advancement this year than tenure.
* Jon Anderson: The new HR software for hiring committee processes is incredibly problematic. If anyone has experience using it, please reach out to Nizhone so we can compile a list to give to People and Culture.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:01 pm