**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**Special Session**

March 29, 2022

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

***Present***: Russ Bailey, Alex Yuan, Armen Ilikchyan, Bob Walsh, Bryan Cowley, Chris Witt, David Scott, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Elijah Nielson, Hilary Hungerford, Jessi Hill, Jim Pettersson, Jim Price, Jim Sutton, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Joshua Hilst, Joy Cole, Karen Preston, Karen Sturtevant, Kathren Brown, Kevin Smith, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Lauren Brooks, Lyn Bennett, Maureen Andrade, Melissa Heath, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mike Smidt, Natalie Monson, Nicole Gearing, Peter Sproul, Sandie Waters, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Trevor Morris, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Young Ham

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:***

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

Approval of Minutes – Minutes approved for 3/15/22 (3:01 pm)

**PROVOST**

* Kat Brown: Town Hall coming up in 2 weeks, we’ll add this to the weekly chairs update. Faculty can check with chairs to make sure they are receiving those. The Board of Trustees is meeting on 3/31, addressing policies as well as RTP decisions.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Bylaws. Hungerford: We have some changes to propose, which we address every year at this time. A few key proposals:
  + A proposed extension of Faculty Senate president by one year (to be applied to Hilary Hungerford’s successor). There can also be discussions of multiple terms.
  + We need to add a section on voting procedures. With meeting via technology, we have sometimes done “on the fly” votes and we need to formalize our procedures about this.
  + There is a proposal to have a Policy subcommittee as a standing committee.
  + We will be voting on these changes next week, so if you have comments or suggestions please share.
  + Sandie Waters: Is there also discussion about vice president terms? Hungerford: We can address this.
  + John Jarvis: Advantages of changing president terms. Re: Policy committee, the challenge of addressing policy as a senator. Hungerford: Yes, there is difficulty with a pause in our year over the summer as well.
  + Hungerford: Request for Lyn Bennett to address proposal about Policy subcommittee. Lyn Bennett: The policy committee is for revising and drafting, review of policy would still be for Faculty Senate. With a committee like this, policies would look better once they get to Stage 2. I would not support working through the summer for all, a subcommittee like this would allow faculty to have input on drafting and revising. We would not be held up on key policies. Faculty need to be able to sit down with stakeholders before it gets to Stage 2. These are the reasons why I am suggesting this. Hungerford: All policy drafting committees have a faculty representative. We would need to ensure that faculty are paid for the contract hours worked. Do we need a policy subcommittee? Dianne McAdams-Jones: We can’t expect people to want to work through the summer and we don’t want them to work without being paid for it. Wioleta Fedeczko: I like the idea of having a body conducting this work over the summer, we would need to make sure that faculty can join, receive updates from this committee. McAdams-Jones: Absolutely, keep it open for people to sacrifice and participate if desired.
  + Hungerford: Please let me know your thoughts on these, message or email me as we continue to discuss these. ExCo standing committee chair positions are opening up and we will be acting on these:
    - RTP&A
    - Special Assignments & Investigations
    - Service and Elections
    - Academic Technology Steering Committee
  + Please send nominations by 4/8, we will take self-nominations and day-of nominations, are not required to be sitting senators. Jon Anderson: The yearly ones do not need to be sitting senators, the others do need to be senators.

**PROVOST reprise**

* Quick update on University College. We met with UC faculty last week about next steps. We were looking at the possibility of merging two departments and moving English Literature. Based on the feedback received, we will not do that but allow these departments to move to their academic homes (Science and CHSS). Based on the feedback, including an anticipated disruption to the culture of the departments, RTP concerns, too much to resolve so we determined to keep them in their own departments. There clearly needs to be more collaboration between the units, less silo-ing. English Language & Literature will move into Languages & Culture. Student Leadership & Success will move to the School of Education. That will bring the remainder of academic support programing under the provost’s office and associate for student success. This will help with reporting lines and administrative structure. First Year Experience will be under the portfolio of the new associate provost. All wrap-around services for student support will be under this Associate Provost. Improving retention and success will be very helpful for students as well as for the university and funding. We tried to address the concerns and the feedback we received.
* Trustees will vote on RTP (105 files) this week. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion fellows will next receive my attention, would like to begin conversations with them.
* Question (Hungerford reading from chat): Will there be an email that outlines these changes? Provost: Yes, we want to have as smooth a transition as possible. We want to support our students and support our faculty in supporting our students. I would like to take work off of faculty’s load if possible, such as the early alert system. Taking load off of faculty and supporting students will put us in a more desirable position.
* Question (Sandie Waters): My question in 3 parts: 1. University College is going away? Provost: Yes, but the service provided will continue, in a reorganized format under the new Associate Provost. 2. When is this taking effect? Provost: We are trying to have everything ready by July 1 and have things ready for students for Fall semester. We will have transitional meetings for those impacted. 3. For elections related to UC positions, do I wait or do it now? Provost: We can do it this way now in anticipation of the new structure.
* Hungerford: There was a concern about one of our university sponsors, Young Family Living, that is continuing to do business with Russia. Provost: That is not in my purview, but I can raise faculty’s concern with president.
* Hungerford: Questions about cost of living adjustment (COLA) and other raises. Provost: This is a large percentage, but it may not feel like much because of inflation. It’s a big raise that won’t cover the costs. Exciting but also challenging. There is discussion about putting as much in COLA as possible. Hungerford: Concerns about hiring faculty, difficulty finding people who can move and make enough to live. Provost: We need to do what we can to support our faculty. Part-time and adjuncts as well, they need more support.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Lyn Bennett: There is a policy that was unfinished last year and remains unfinished. Hungerford: Yes, we need to address this.
* SRI analysis taskforce. Earlier this year we partnered with Jessi Hill and Women’s Success Center to look at SRIs at UVU, especially addressing gender bias and racial bias. John Whitney and Tim Stanley are here to address this.
  + Tim Stanley: Questions guided our analyses, mainly conducted by John.
  + John Whitney: We used scores from Spring 2016 to Fall 2021, 11 million item scores. The overall distribution is highly skewed. 9 out of 10 scores are either 4 or 5. Average score is stable over time. No significant dip noted over 2019, if anything scores went up at that time. A score of 5 was somewhat more likely (69%) in 2021 compared to 2016.
  + On average, female instructors scored higher than male instructors, for all terms except for Summer 2017. Female instructors outscored male instructors on every item in the rating, with the largest differences on items “contacting instructor when needing help” and “instructor provided feedback”. Averaging course ratings by course gender composition, a slight trend toward more positive ratings from all-female courses compared to all-male courses. For courses that have more than 50% female composition, female instructors get slightly better ratings.
  + For race/ethnicity, there were not consistent results. In general male instructors from minority groups were rated higher than female instructors.
  + There is no clear relationship between the average grade for a section and an average SRI score. Average course grades are stable over time, average SRI ratings have slightly increased over time.
  + Questions (Hungerford from chat): What does “blank” mean? Whitney: You could have unknown in box for race/ethnicity, or could have no information. I retained both.
  + Question (Jessi Hill): What did the 0 mean? Whitney: Failing grade.
  + Question (Jessi Hill): Does this include adjuncts? Whitney: Not yet, this is everyone together. That is our next step.
  + Question (Hungerford): Questions about modality and block courses. Whitney: I already have these data.
  + Question (Hungerford): What are some next steps for us to take this forward? This relates to our discussion about revising the SRIs. Hill: We are in the baseline phase and would like ideas about what questions to pursue, would like input from senate.
  + Question (Hungerford from chat): Question about non-native English speakers. What about average score and response rates? Dianne McAdams-Jones: We need qualitative data, this would be richer. Why do we need to offer students points to rate instructors? We need to know how students think.
  + Bob Walsh: We were saying that these numbers were small differences, but these differences can be large in determining careers. There appear to be flaws in the system. We don’t mind being evaluated, but let’s do it in a way that makes sense.
  + Hungerford: Qualitative data is challenging. Some of the comments are not anonymous, name instructors by name. Walsh: We need to reevaluate the tools.
  + Stanley: The tool is protective of the student’s anonymity, which makes the analyses more challenging. The fact that everything is compressed, where 0.1 differences are seen as meaningful, how do we spread that out?
  + McAdams-Jones: Anonymity is important, but it also creates difficulty with trust and honesty and accountability in student culture. We need qualitative data.
  + Elijah Nielson: We need to ask the question about what we are trying to accomplish with SRIs. What is our purpose? Sandie Waters: Concur with Elijah. Hungerford: Yes, this is in our discussion today, whether we want to revise the SRI instrument. McAdams-Jones: If this is the purview of Teaching committee, they can reach out to others who have input. Jim Price: We treat students as our customers, I’m curious what we are trying to achieve, is this someone who confers knowledge or who makes the customer happy. Walsh: Echoing Jim and Dianne, discomfort with the process and unsure what we are evaluating.
  + Natalie Monson: It can be difficult to hold boundaries with students when we are being evaluated by students, and they can impact your job.
  + Gareth Fry: There have been a lot of great points made. I like SRIs and reading the comments, I pay attention to scores, nag students about it to fill it out, and find them helpful.
  + Hungerford: Do general education, or upper division courses matter? Valid questions.
  + Waters: I am not sitting comfortably with the results about how SRIs are filled out for female and minority faculty. I am not disputing the data, but I still feel that my needs are not being heard. I want to see how they can be improved so I can have feedback. Hungerford: This is valid. Waters: Other faculty who identify similarly have similar experiences.
  + Stanley: There is conversation about the qualitative analysis, we would love faculty support with this. Nielson: We have a taskforce to address this, look forward to working on this.

**POLICY**

* Policy 532, University Student Groups.
  + Marissa King: We had an outdated policy, all it did was designate UVUSA as governing body. There are free speech and other concerns from other groups besides UVUSA. We are wanting designations for student groups, have them grounded within university units that can have oversight for them. We also have a category for student clubs. We have moved away from requiring a faculty adviser, gives students more autonomy, but students can still have a staff mentor. Faculty used to be asked to oversee these groups, it was time consuming and they had less time to do their job. Our employees need to be fairly compensated. For freedom of speech concerns, we want our students to be able to exercise their voice. Student clubs are registered with the institution but the institution is not responsible for them, they can exercise their free speech rights.
  + Hungerford: There is a comment in the document, we need to make sure that the definition of student is aligned across policies. King: I will check on this to make sure.

**NON-POLICY**

* Curriculum procedures
  + Evelyn Porter: We received no comments on this, I am unsure if we are ready to vote. The major changes are mainly due to the changes in Northwest (accrediting body) and to bring curriculum policy into alignment with this.
  + **MOTION**: Sandie Waters: I move that we vote on the curriculum changes (seconded by David Frame). Waters called to question. Motion passed. Porter: We are looking for people who want to be involved, likely with a retreat in the summer to address this, so please let me know if interested.
* Peer observation tool and teaching excellence model
  + Joy Cole: PowerPoint shared for the model. We hope that we can make better evaluations. Before we tackle SRIs, we need to have a good definition for what we are supposed to be teaching and this is how we arrived at these documents. The model articulates teaching expectations and provides examples of evidence for teaching portfolios. A definition of teaching excellence is given, in line with Vision 2030. You will see how the model speaks to multiple documents, and the SRI does not yet align with this and we would hope that an evaluation tool would be aligned. The Teaching Observation Form is a way to receive formative feedback from peers. Overview of the development of the form, advantages of the form. <https://www.uvu.edu/otl/teachingexcellencetools.html> We are looking for the Faculty Senate to vote to sanction the use of this model and tool.
    1. Question (Jim Price): Peer evaluations are required in the RTP process. Even though the results belong to the faculty, they may still be shared with evaluators. Cole: You can choose which to share.
    2. Question (Michaela Sawyer): Having been involved with the teaching excellence committee in the past, I am interested in how this related to the committee in the CHSS teaching excellence. Is the college-level committee going to continue? Cole: The committee has a representative from each college. This is not prescriptive, but we offer it as a resource of aligned and evidence-based method for faculty use. Sawyer: There is a concern about the teaching model being one-size-fits-all and how do we address pluralism.
    3. Hungerford: Plan to vote on this in our final senate meeting.
* Academic Integrity statement
  + Cole: The syllabus checklist is under the purview of OTL. We have a repository of statements to use, both required and suggested. People can submit ideas for these and the Advancement of Teaching committee can review these. The Academic Integrity statement came about as students shared content online. Please read the statement and I welcome comments. Hungerford: I love the Syllabus Checklist, allows faculty to choose what they share. We will vote on this Academic Integrity statement next time. Thanks to your committee and to OTL for support.
* SRI revision
  + We will vote today on whether we would like to revise the SRI.
    1. Jim Price: What do we replace it with?
    2. **MOTION**: Sandie Waters: Move to further discuss the revision of SRIs (Joy Cole seconded). Called to question. Motion passed.
* Hungerford: Comment from chat, a suggestion to extend an invitation to newly elected senators to join next time. This is a great idea.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Hungerford: Kansas is in the Final Four, very exciting.
* Nielson: In the end of the semester when things are stressful, look for positive things going on in our lives.
* McAdams-Jones: Ketanji Brown Jackson graduated from Tuskegee where I graduated as well.
* Pirates of Penzance production at Noorda, get your tix!
* Hungerford: Much appreciation to all of you
* Postmodern Jukebox next year at the Noorda

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 pm.