**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**Special Session**

April 12, 2022

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

***Present***: Russ Bailey, Armen Ilikchyan, Ashley Nadeau, Ben Moulton, Bob Walsh, Brandon Ro, Chris Witt, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Elijah Nielson, Ethan Morse, Evelyn Porter, Gareth Fry, Greg Jackson, Hilary Hungerford, Jennifer Shubert, Jim Pettersson, Jim Sutton, Jon Anderson, Joshua Hilst, Joy Cole, Justin Schellenberg, Karen Sturtevant, Kathren Brown, Kevin Smith, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Lauren Brooks, Laurie Toro, Leo Schlosnagle, Lisa Hall, Lyn Bennett, Matt North, Maureen Andrade, Melissa Heath, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mike Smidt, Nicole Gearing, Nizhone Meza, Paul Morrey, Peter Sproul, Sandie Waters, Scott Lewis, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Trevor Morris, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Young Ham, Zachery Taylor

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:***

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

Approval of Minutes – Minutes approved for 3/29/22 (3:01 pm)

**PROVOST**

* Warm welcome to faculty. We had a Town Hall yesterday, working to get more guidance out for video recording for faculty for the fall. I will talk about University College and how Student Success and the Provost’s office will be working together. We have a new Associate Provost for Student Success position and David Connolly will occupy this role, thankfully he was already overseeing many of the responsibilities of this role. The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management will have a “dotted” reporting line to Provost to make sure that this role is well coordinated with Academic Affairs. She will continue to have a direct reporting line to Student Affairs.
* We have also created a UVU Student Success Council, with representation from each of the academic units, Student Affairs, and First Year Experience among others. We want to hear from these units about their concerns and needs for support. Student Success happens in your classrooms, Academic Affairs is there to support. Concurrent Enrollment, Advising, Workforce Alignment, First Year Advising & Experience, Academic Support Services, Adult Learning, these will all be the responsibility of the AP for Student Success. We hope to continue to work for the retention of first year students. The Early Alert system is often relevant to Student Life concerns, not necessarily directly to academic concerns. Student Affairs will continue to handle this system and we will manage the academic side of that system, ensuring that academic supports are in place.
* The new Associate Provost for Academic Programs & Assessment will oversee OTL, graduate programs, curriculum, and scheduling. We are in the process of migrating accreditation into Academic Affairs. This person will help to oversee and coordinate university accreditations as well as department- and program-level accreditations. DEI Fellow (Dianne McAdams-Jones) will work with this Associate Provost.
* There will be a new Dean of Continuing Education, this is a return to a job title that was previously there, these are non-credit, non-degree programs on our various campuses.
* The last component involves a title change, Tammy Clark, Associate Provost for Academic Innovation. We are rebranding this as “Innovation Academy”, offering students to be engaged with internship programs, student-led research programs, study abroad, which have all been with Engaged Learning. Integrated Studies will move from being a department in CHSS to become a program in Innovation Academy. This way it can draw on resources from across campus, so faculty and students can develop innovative curricular options. These changes will be in place starting July 1.
* Question (Sandie Waters): A year or two ago, we discussed how students were responding to messages from the Early Alert system and they have changed the jargon somewhat. This year I have had very positive responses from the messages going out. Provost: Great, we want to make sure we provide continuity and not disruption of services, continue to make these systems better. Research suggests that if students get feedback within the first two weeks of class, they are more likely to succeed that semester. If a student fails a quiz in the first week, it’s less of a concern than if they fail 4-5 quizzes in those first few weeks. If faculty enter grades early on, it is easier to identify students who are having struggles.
* Hungerford: There are two positions you are hiring into? Provost: Yes, the Associate Provost for Programming & Assessment; and the Dean of Continuing Education (non-academic). Hilary: How do you see faculty being involved in those searches? Provost: Absolutely, I’ll keep you involved and in the loop on this process. Hungerford: There is some concern about imbalance, more positions in administrative roles. Provost: There is a net zero increase to executive lines with these changes. We discuss this regularly in cabinet and in PBA discussions, trying to keep appropriate balance. Faculty aren’t typically concerned about us adding more staff lines, but there is more concern about executive lines. We want to keep the money flowing into academic units, help them have the experience they need to have.
* Question (Elijah Nielson): We are a large institution without an ombuds-person for faculty. Are we looking into this? Provost: Yes, Anne Arndt and I discussed this in the past, we could pick this up again to provide faculty with a resource. I’m supportive of this and happy to look at it again.
* Question (Lyn Bennett): I am curious about why Integrated Studies will not be housed within a college but within Innovation Academy. Some of the faculty are concerned and surprised about how it will not be a part of an academic unit. Provost: The question we considered was where do we best place this very unique program to best support it and place faculty who are involved in integrative ways. We believe that it would fit nicely here and serve the entire campus rather than the academic unit in which it was housed. The conferral of degrees that includes minors from programs within academic units remains unchanged. We are hoping that it has a broader reach, similar to Honors Programs in institutions. Academic Affairs is not interested in having academic programs, merely in making it easier to support this program.
  + Greg Jackson: Faculty have met with Tammy Clark twice and we were enthusiastically happy with where we got to in our discussions. What we have landed on, it operates like a department in many ways and maintains our independence and autonomy, protects our ability to work how we want to.
  + Bennett: Would this be considered for other studies programs across the university that are also very interdisciplinary? The rationale seems quirky. Provost: We ask how do we best support integrative programs, this makes sense for this particular program and raises the question of how can we support other programs with strong interdisciplinary focus. I’m happy to continue the conversation on this.
  + Hungerford: Yes, it opens the door for other programs, for example, what about Gender Studies or Ethnic Studies? Their coordinators are not compensated now. Where is the equity, how do we pick and choose which things are celebrated and which are not? Provost: I will add this to the agenda for next year, let’s take this up.
* Question (Nielson): Circling back to the ombuds question, it seems like Faculty Senate gives voice but does not have the power to create the position. Are there plans to create a position? Provost: It would have to come from a PBA request. This question came up previously, then the pandemic occurred. There is not room in the current PBA. In a new PBA cycle I would actively support the creation of this position. We should start discussing it now, Hilary Hungerford and Kat Brown.
* Question from the chat about Annual Reviews. Hungerford: There is now a check box about whether or not we complied, this does not seem to require reflection. There is a need to address this.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Welcome to new senators and farewell to those transitioning off of Faculty Senate! Today we will be voting on positions and bylaws (incoming senators) and then there will be specific votes for sitting senators.
* Faculty Senate bylaw recommendations. There are two:
  + As discussed in last Senate and in ExCo, we will vote on Senate Presidency and VP term changes to be 3 years instead of 2. This will take effect after Hilary’s current term. We are also voting on making sure that it starts in the Spring, so there is overlap between incoming President and outgoing President to address policies in continuation as well as observing the RTP Appeals process.
  + A recommendation for creating a policy subcommittee. We discussed this in ExCo, that with the overlap in president terms, we will address the continuation of policy initiatives over the summer. Because we would not be on contract, there would not be votes on policy. Based on ExCo discussion, it was recommended to not have a policy subcommittee. Waters: Could we please have a reminder to new senators on whether they are voting or not? Hungerford: Yes, these two votes are for incoming and continuing senators. Anderson: If you did not receive the link and you’re a new senator, yes.
  + **MOTION** (Sandie Waters to vote on the recommendations for the bylaw changes that will take effect in the next academic year; Elijah Nielson seconded). Hungerford called to question. (Vote for Presidency term passes, vote for policy subcommittee does not pass).
  + Wioleta Fedeczko: We read the votes out loud when we believe they are decided, but the final, fully tallied vote is stored on Teams.
  + Waters: We have a break between the end of June and a need to address the gap. Hungerford: To clarify, the election will be this fall so that we don’t have a gap. Jon Anderson: This is why we had to make this change this year, to prevent the gap.
  + Hungerford: We are moving on now to elections to ExCo positions.
    - The Advancement of Teaching Committee, Jonathan Allred. This is a ratification of their decision.
    - We will read over the nominees and you can nominate someone today.
      * RTP&A: We do not have any nominations for this position right now. This comes with a course release and a Summer stipend. You work on the RTP appeals, facilitate the hearings and appeals, work closely with Provost’s office. Summer work needed in May and June with appeals. Bob Walsh: Term? 2 ½ year, with a semester overlap.
      * Special Assignments & Investigations: Incoming senator John Hunt has been nominated. 1 year position, entertaining other nominations. John Hunt accepts the nomination, Laura Ricaldi also nominates herself. John Hunt withdraws.
      * Service and Elections: Sandie Waters has been nominated to continue, accepted the nomination. Duties? Task forces, service and elections chairs in the colleges to run their elections. Manage the team of chairs. A lot of bookkeeping is involved.
      * Academic Technology Steering Committee: Attend Senate and ExCo. David Frame nominated, accepted the nomination.
      * John Hunt has been nominated for RTP&A.
      * **MOTION** Elijah Nielson to open the voting, seconded by Sandie Waters. Discussion, clarify that incoming and continuing senators are the only ones who vote on this. Hungerford called to question. Vote given in chat. Fedeczko: All positions have been approved.

**POLICY**

* We are voting on our comments for Policy 532, University Student Groups.
  + Skyler Simmons: There were a few more comments that were made since last week.
    1. Existing clubs need to not be redundant. Guidelines about UVU name and trademark. Minimum students for a group to receive university funding.
    2. **MOTION**: Elijah Nielson to vote on the comments as they currently stand. Seconded by Sandie Waters. Hungerford: Call to question, reminder this is only for standing senators not incoming senators. (All comments passed, approved).

**NON-POLICY**

* We will be voting on things that are not policy-related, four items today.
  + The peer observation tool and teaching excellence model. The Advancement of Teaching Committee has been piloting these tools. This is not required of a department to use, this is an endorsement from senate that we feel these are measures of teaching effectiveness.
    1. Question (Leo Schlosnagle): What is the evidence that this measure has convergent or divergent validity? Joy Cole: Everything included on these tools came from collaboration from several scholars who went to the literature and thoroughly searched. The tool itself has been piloted but not validated, with positive results. Wendy Athens: Chickering and Gamson principles are the foundation of these tools and the basis of their organization. We are looking for evidence of those 7 principles in teaching. The Teaching Excellence Model is to give ideas for how someone would show excellence, the intent is to open minds about how to show excellence. The foundation of the peer observation tool is the 7 principles.
    2. Bennett: It does not preclude faculty from using their college’s model or other models. It’s an option that is available for faculty.
    3. **MOTION** (Lyn Bennett to vote on whether we endorse the use of these tools, seconded by Sandie Waters and David Scott). Hungerford called to question. (Fedeczko: Passed, the senate endorses the evaluation tools).
  + Academic Integrity statement. We do not currently have such a statement at UVU and want one that can be used in the syllabus checklist made by the Advancement of Teaching committee. We would be voting on whether to endorse this statement on Academic Integrity.
    1. Question (Joshua Hilst): I continue to have grave concerns about syllabus bloat. I question whether these statements are being read by students. The signal-to-noise ratio is becoming poorer. Hungerford: Good point, we do have required statements and other statements are optional, you can choose to include. Some faculty put links in the syllabus. Point well taken.
    2. Michaela Sawyer: Yes, you can link, but the Academic Integrity statement is very important. As a legal consideration, this is needed because plagiarism is a concern. I want to see something like this on my syllabus.
    3. Heather Wilson-Ashworth: Why doesn’t this statement include a definition of what plagiarism is? Joy Cole: It’s covered in student rights and responsibilities.
    4. **MOTION** (Lyn Bennett, to endorse; seconded by Joshua Hilst). Hungerford called to question. (Passed).
  + We voted last time to revise the SRIs. This will be done, by policy, as a partnership between Academic Affairs, Advancement of Teaching, UVUSA, and Senate. There would be a small summer working group to move forward on this. Next year there would be very broad participation. This greatly affects us and our jobs.
    1. Question (Leo Schlosnagle): I have 20 years of experience in psychometrics and can think of numerous ways in which the current form would be improved. I’m concerned that changing the SRI would lead to negative consequences if not handled properly. Piloting data, factor analysis, making sure it is a valid and reliable measure of what it is proposed to measure. It needs to be researched, which requires years, a painstaking process. This is done with measures that have lower stakes than a tenure process. We need psychometric design and peer review otherwise we run the risk of having a measure that is even worse than the current SRI.
    2. Wilson-Ashworth: One area outside of the tool could be training students about what professional evaluation means, for example not commenting on appearance, what are the appropriate things to be addressing.
    3. Hungerford: The current version was created 7 or 8 years ago. No one is expecting it to be a fast process, perhaps by the end of next academic year we may be ready to pilot it. I believe it’s time to re-evaluate it.
    4. Wilson-Ashworth: Anton Tolman started the first round of revisions to the SRI about 10 years ago. He re-vamped the tool and then was shut down, we should check with him to make sure that it is a productive process.
    5. Hungerford: Yes, this is high stakes. We do not need to rush in changing it.
    6. **MOTION** (Sandie Waters—on whether we accept the recommendation to move forward on the SRI revision taskforce, seconded by Lyn Bennett). Hungerford called to question, clarified that the vote is for standing senators. (Passed).
  + Meetings for next year, do we want to meet via Teams or in-person.
    1. Comment (Joshua Hilst): Do we want to wait whether we vote on this? Right now, everything seems great but it’s hard to know how the pandemic will be in August. Could we wait on this vote? Hungerford: You could move to delay the vote.
    2. Comment (Michaela Sawyer): Valid point and if we move to in-person, some of us would not be able to attend and we would need a replacement. Nielson: It’s helpful for senate to know now what to expect. We can always revisit it later if we need to change.
    3. **MOTION** (Elijah Nielson, to vote on Teams versus in-person today).
    4. Question (Bob Walsh): will there be an option to have both in-person and on Teams? Anderson: We don’t have good practices in place for votes, etc., if we go to hybrid.
    5. Motion seconded in chat by Jennifer Shubert and Michaela Sawyer, to hold the vote today.
    6. Waters: Friendly amendment to go with Teams or in-person and not a 3-way decision with hybrid.
    7. Hungerford: Call to question. Fedeczko: Request for clarification, is this vote between strictly in-person and on Teams. There would be an exception for in-person. Anderson: If we meet in person, we would need to have a way to participate online. Fedeczko: If there is an extenuating circumstances exception for people to be online, it needs to be part of the vote.
    8. Anderson: Point of order, further comments need to apply to this conversation since the question was called. Schlosnagle: Could someone reiterate why vote on it now or delay the vote? Nielson: Good question, I believe it’s important to have the clarification now so that planning can move forward. There needs to be time to prepare for the hybrid situation should the need arise. We can still revisit it in the future, we have a semblance of certainty for the business of the senate. Hungerford: This is incoming senators voting.
    9. Hungerford called to question again and Fedeczko posted the vote. (Results: Senate will continue via Teams in the Fall).

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Ethan Morse: You are all invited to the Mike Conley speaking event happening 4/14. You will not be turned away if you are having difficulty getting tickets.
* David Frame: Everyone is invited to the Engineering Tech Fair on 4/21 & 4/22, showing off mechatronics that have been built.
* Elijah Nielson: We may need a motion for a resolution that we support further discussion of the creation of the ombudsperson person.
  + **MOTION** (Elijah Nielson, seconded by Jim Price.) Anderson: Since we do not have time to draft a resolution, we can vote on whether faculty Senate supports the creation of an ombudsman position. Elijah Nielson accepted this as a friendly resolution. Sandie Waters and Jim Price seconded.
  + Schlosnagle: If this ombudsperson were created, it could have implications for faculty across the university. Since it’s just been brought to question today, I would want to take this back to my department before I’m comfortable voting on it. Hungerford: Anne Arndt was working on this question before the pandemic, perhaps we need to revisit whether there was a vote previously. Matt North: Yes, there was discussion but not a vote. I want us to revisit this in the fall. Nielson: My hope is that it is reflected in the minutes and records. Anderson: That’s what this should accomplish.
  + Nielson called to question. Fedeczko posted the vote in the chat for current senators. (Motion passed).
* Matt North: Please attend The Pirates of Penzance, a family-friendly show. Support the school for the arts, events in the Noorda are awesome.
* Dianne McAdams-Jones: With regard to reducing bias in academia and promoting a reduction of bias among students, now through OTL there is a badge certificate course, Anti-Racist Pedagogy. You will receive a badge, $1000, asynchronous over 8 weeks. I and my team will work with you in implementing these. Wendy Athens: We are accredited to include this course for the advanced HEA and this is a way to complete one of the pathways.
* Hungerford: Welcome, new senators! We will have an ExCo retreat and I will be in touch about that.
* The new process (since last year) for choosing a commencement speaker moved forward. Hilary will be carrying the torch, so come for that!

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 pm.