**Faculty Senate Minutes**

Sept. 13, 2022

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, Diego Alvarado Karste, Donna Fairbanks, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Eric J. Russell, Emmy Bell, Erika Johnson, Gareth Fry, Hilary Hungerford, Jennifer Shubert, Jessi Hill, Jim Price, Jim Sutton, John Hunt, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred. Justin Schellenburg, Kathleen Young, Kat Brown, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Laurie Sharp, Leo Schlosnagle, Maureen Andrade, Merilee Larsen, Michaela Giesenkirchen Sawyer, Mike Smidt, Ming Yu, Nate Jeppson, Nicole Gearing, Paul Morrey, Peter Sproul, Raiden Gaul, Rich Paustenbaugh, Sandie Waters, Sayeed Sajal, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wioleta Fedeczko, Zachary Taylor

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Christie Dennison, Clark Collings, Drew Burke, Kyle Reyes, Laurie Toro, Linda Makin, Susan Dunn, Trevor Morris

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

Approval of Minutes – Minutes for 8/30/2022 approved at 3:01 pm

**PROVOST**

* Provost Wayne Vaught:
  + We have couple of town halls (tomorrow at noon for faculty) and a staff town hall at 1:00 pm.
  + Gen Ed evaluation task force is going well so far. We will give you regular updates as they make progress throughout the semester.
  + There is an SSRI group that will be looking at those this semester.
  + There is an ongoing RTP criteria review and evaluation.
  + Enrollment is looking at around 43,000. It’s a good sign of continued growth.

**Vision 2030 Update**

* These are things we would like to see in our vision. It’s our proclamation to the world.
* Wayne Vaught: There was a question on whether there needed to be a community college in Utah County. Part of the document’s creation was to tell our story and to capture all the work that has been done and all of the strategic planning. We are in a unique position because most schools aren’t experiencing growth.
* Question Raiden Gaul: There seems to be a conflict on whether we are a university or a community college. We need to define where we are at. We need to figure out which direction we are going with this and from there where faculty should focus.
  + Wayne Vaught: We are a dual mission college and Vision 2030 is trying to capture this. There should be some scholarship, but the scholarship and teaching go hand in hand.
* Comments on Vision 2030 Draft:
  + It seems like we are using DEI instead of EID.
    - Through most of the document we are using DEI.
  + What does it mean by politicization of higher ed? We should throw out that word.
    - Linda Mankin: It’s because of that concern we need to keep that in there. Higher education was being used by political action groups for or against certain candidates. The word politicization is a softer word than the original word that was there. The political environment can be a potential threat to academic freedom.
  + Comment Diego Alvarado Karste: We don’t sell education, we sell transformation. We change lives. If we can use this vision to communicate that we transform lives, maybe we can get rid of that weaponization of education and that threat we have. We are change makers.
  + Question/Comment John Hunt for the term “on demand education”: Are we becoming Netflix? What does this mean? Faculty are already stressed and this sounds like we are digging deeper into corporate education.
    - Jeff Peterson: People have options for getting education. An example of this is Google. Students can go on there and get certified through short classes. It’s competition. We must be aware that these types of things are going on.
    - Kyle Reyes: On demand—How nimble can a university be now a days to meet some of the disruptions that are coming. Are we providing some options that are more accessible and nimble but still run through the full rigors of what an academic enterprise needs to do?
    - Wayne Vaught: We need to let ago of the notion on what a traditional university experience is like. We have a lot of working adults and parents with families. We are giving these students what they need when they need it. We have flexibility to meet a diverse group of people. If we want to be successful, we have to see where the competition is. We don’t want to become the Blockbuster of the educational experience.
    - John Hunt: We should meet the students where they are, but they should rise up at the same time. History students want the traditional education and degrees. We are losing students who are feeling left out. We need to also protect the four-year university and not just those getting a certificate.
    - Hilary Hungerford: we don’t want to lose what we know is successful in the midst of these changes.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Advancement of Teaching Ratification: Jonathan Allred put forth the motion that Hilary Demske from SOA be part of the committee. No objections. We stand ratified.
* Special guest Christie Denniston (Associate VP for Strategic Engagement): The inaugural campaign is coming up. It will be the largest fundraising campaign in the school’s history. We are inviting faculty to share their stories. Tuesday, Oct. 18 9-10 am in the Vallejo Auditorium will be the comprehensive campaign kickoff celebration. Will be highlighting faculty for giving and why they have chosen to give to the University. We will be broadcasting live at the ball on Oct. 22nd with President Tuminez and will be featuring faculty and staff for about half an hour before she speaks. 90% of the success of this campaign will be the stories. Faculty are a critical component of this campaign.
* Three pillars: Innovative teaching, health and success, community.
* Each dean has communicated their top three priorities.

**POLICY**

* Policy 646
  + The faculty senate supports the implementation of this policy if our comments are addressed.
    - 3.1 The definition mentions a “trained” pool of faculty in the case of an appeal. Specific details of this training (who receives it, how they obtain it, what is included in it, etc.) are not spelled out in the policy and should be clarified.
      * In-debate comments
* The Faculty Senate should be involved in the training mentioned in these sections. Suggested re-word: “The RTP&A committee, along with the OGC together keep the training materials current and in line with policy.”
* In-Debate:
  + Hilary Hungerford and Sandie Waters: We should spell out exactly what the Faculty role in this training should be. Suggested: “The RTP&A committee keeps the training materials current”, or Perhaps “The RTP&A committee, along with the OGC together keep the training materials current and in line with policy.”
  + John Hunt: What form would the training take? (Likely in-person or over Teams, relevant to the specific department/college/case)
* 3.6 Suggested re-wording: “The method of storage should be in compliance with Policy 637. By default, this is the official Electronic Submission Platform.”
  + SW: Vague wording may be to our advantage if we switch off of Watermark.
  + Drew Burke: This may also allow for an accommodation (such as via the ADA) for certain faculty members.
  + John Jarvis: This should be cross-referenced with the policy for tenure (637)
* 3.6 and 3.13 Definitions include “faculty portfolio”, “tenure portfolio”, and “promotion portfolio”. Are all three definitions necessary? If not, any superfluous definition should be removed.
  + In-debate comments
* 4.5.1., item 1 The standard “substantially influenced” should either be defined in narrow, specific terms or removed. Possible re-word: “Denial of promotion or tenure must be consistent with UVU policies and procedures at all levels and should allow the candidate due process.”
  + Jim Price: It seems that “substantial” would have to be determined after review. If it changed the outcome, then it would be substantial.
  + Ashley Nadeau: It seems you have to prove your case before you’re allowed to file it.
  + Jim Price (John Jarvis): It seems that the word “substantial” should be struck.
  + David Scott: If a candidate inadvertently fails to follow a rule (even incidentally, such as a clerical error), that may be grounds for denial of tenure. On the other hand, those reviewing that file should not be allowed to make similarly small errors that deny tenure without appeal. Summary: nobody should be denied tenure purely on procedural grounds. Decisions should be based on substance.
  + Ashley Nadeau: Certainly failure to follow policy should be grounds for an appeal.
  + Sandie Waters: The term “influenced” may also need to be considered.
  + Michaela Sawyer: It seems the standard should be the same for both parties.
  + Drew Burke: The term “substantial” was chosen specifically to get around minor infractions.
* 4.5.1, item 1 Would “failure of the RTP committee to follow policy" or any higher-up group in the RTP process warrant an appeal?
  + In-debate comments
* 4.5.2 The standard “clear and convincing evidence” should be defined in narrow, specific terms.
  + John Jarvis: Office of General Counsel likely won’t let this change – this is well established in legal terms.
* 2.2 Correction: “American Association of University Professors,” (change “for” to “of”, replace the apostrophe with a comma).
  + In-debate comments
* Policy 112
  + No comments
* Policy 210
  + No comments
* Policy 324
  + The policy should distinguish between consumable alcohol (i.e. ethanol) and other chemical alcohols (e.g. isopropyl)
    - In-debate comments

**NON-POLICY**

* SRI revision committee is starting. If you know of any others who want to join, send them Hilary’s way. We have about 25 right now. If you don’t want to be part of the committee, you can still listen in.

**Good of the order**

* Sandie Waters: CARES Funding is coming to an end. Now is the time to take advantage of those stipends.
* Hilary Hungerford: The tomato party was a blast!

Meeting Adjourned at 4:50 pm