**Faculty Senate Minutes**

Sept. 27, 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, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Diego Alvarado Karste, Donna Fairbanks, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Eric J. Russell, Hilary Hungerford, Jennifer Shubert, Jessi Hill, Jim Price, Jim Sutton, John Hunt, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Kathleen Young, Kathren 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, Scott Lewis, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wioleta Fedeczko

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Matt Serrao

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

Approval of Minutes – Minutes for 8/13/2022 approved at 3:02 pm

**PROVOST**

* Provost Wayne Vaught:
  + Gen Ed Review and Task Force will have some positive recommendations coming out fairly shortly.
  + RTP issues are going on. Kat Brown has been working on them pretty heavily.
  + SRIs are stilling going on. We are a little behind on it, but at the end of the day we will be looking at broader, better ways to evaluate effective teaching. We may be developing something that is pretty cutting edge. We can take a leadership role and other institutions can look to us.
  + Ethic & Leadership conference will be on Thursday. Both Hilary and Wayne will be participating in this.
  + Woodbury dean search: there will be public presentations that start tomorrow.
* Tammy Clark:
* SEGO Student Engagement Survey: we need to do a full-on assessment as we are going up for recertification of our Carnegie engaged campus classification. We are looking at academic engagement and there is a component of community engagement. The latter is more of a bonus if you are hitting these types of measures. We want to do a benchmark on what it looks like across the board right now. We need to do this every six years. We would like to administer this in every section in every course that is running this fall. Faculty Senate had approved that this was going to happen a few years ago, but it was delayed due to COVID. We’ve been meeting with some people in how we are going to administer this survey. We are going to put it as a survey in canvas courses. It cleans up the data so we can find what we are looking for. We decided to do an opt-out option to faculty who don’t want this. An email should be going out this week on what the SEGO survey is and questions that may be asked, plus how to opt-out. Jason Hill will be helping with this.
  + Question: Will we get the results from our own classes?
  + Tammy: It will be on canvas from Nov. 7-13 so it won’t coincide with other surveys. For every 300 completed surveys, we will give a $50 gift card for the Campus Store to one student and the faculty member whose class they are in. The data will be aggregated, then it will be available to anyone who would like to see it. Specific data to an instructor’s course will only be available to that instructor. Deans are not allowed to ask you to share that data. We want you to control it so if you do something really engaging, you can pull that into your RTP file. Lack of engagement doesn’t mean anything. We want the data to provide specificity but protect the faculty. You can request a SEGO in your class at any time. Reach out to Tammy if you are interested. We are working with Marcomm to help push this out to students.
  + Question: How many responses do you need? Is there a threshold you have to hit? Is there historical knowledge you can share with us?
  + Tammy: This is the first time we are doing it university wide. The Carnegie designation is also adding more community involvement. They are in flux because of COVID. For this one, as long as we show that we are developing tools that we plan on using and we are getting benchmarks, that is the critical part. We can learn a lot this time, see how useful that data is and see if there is a better way to do this.

**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.

**STUDENT GOVERNMENT**

* Jaden Muir:
  + Student senate is working on an activity for spring: Battle of the Colleges.
  + Trivia night, food drive, scavenger hunt, contests at athletics events that students can get points for their colleges. It would be calculated by percentages. We are trying to create a sense of pride for students and their majors.
  + What would get faculty invested and excited to participate in this and what would be helpful in getting students to participate in making this a collaboration between faculty and students?
    - Jim Price: Maybe faculty could participate in trivia night?
  + Jaden: Would a collaboration thing be fun for the faculty? Have a faculty college cup in addition to one for the students?
    - Jim Price: The main reason to support the effort is it would be valuable to students
  + General consensus from faculty: If you need us, we are there.
  + Jaden: If deans aren’t available would it be beneficial to have an expert (faculty from each college) for a Q&A?
    - As long as faculty are given advanced notice

**POLICY**

* Policy 646
  + Bring up section 4.5.1 before voting on it. This isn’t about the faculty making a mistake; this is about the reviewers clearly making a mistake during the process of reviewing your portfolio.
  + When going through that policy, the part that needs discussion is if there is an issue about the process leading to the decision that doesn’t follow policy affects tenure. This isn’t about that. It’s in relation to appeals. You have to make your case before you file it.
  + There are clarifications for the re-eval committee and the appeals committee
  + Skylar Simmons moves to vote on the comments as they stand
  + John Hunt seconds the motion
  + Hilary calls the question
  + Vote: passes by a majority
* Policy 112
  + Matt Serrao: When I came in, I was presented with a document that was done from an agency. They looked at UVU digital spaces and found out that UVU has 800 plus social accounts out there and many of those are inactive. We are locked out because the person who set those up is gone. For someone who would like to find out what is happening and more about the university, it is difficult to find the right information. This isn’t written out of nowhere but is being taken from experience. I went through line of line of the policy to fit what I thought was the best practice taking into the account what the university has pre-written and what is happening in the real world.
    - Question: Will we have to get approval for anything we want to post? Will this prevent us from really engaging with students or using it in ways that we think are appropriate?
    - Matt: I don’t want to approve everything—I don’t have time for that. It’s not about content at all. The only place where it does address that is where it looks like it’s breaking other policies. The other area where content is addressed is where other people participating are using hate speech or other derogatory language.
* Admins on account: We just want two people from each area so if one person leaves, we still have someone with access and can still use it.
* Additional training: It’s very loose because we don’t want to have everyone do training for this. We will ask some basic questions at the beginning, but that will be it. Other areas may want to engage and don’t know how, we are there to support them. There is nothing that is regulated though.
* Question: Clarification on “publishing or publication”. Does everyone in a photo need a consent form?
  + Matt: I’m not sure, but we can check on this with Legal. We are already taking photos of students and posting them around campus.
* What about re-posting things from other organizations? Do we have to track down permissions?
  + Matt: Social media is set up to help keep us in line within the platform. As long as it is in the same platform, it is okay. If it’s a screenshot somewhere else, it is violating copyrights.
* Concern/Question Bryan Sansom: We calculate that we have 800 accounts within our department because of things like Discord. We are worried that if someone has to approve content, this will take away part of their being able to be on the cutting edge of things. Would we be our stewards of our accounts or do we need to report to a higher level? We are developing content in social media that doesn’t exist. Can we figure out something that protects our department and the use of teaching digital media as a technology and a tool of our trade?
  + Matt Serrao: we are missing a piece of this. We can talk through this more and see what it does look like. From the marketing side, we are asking all of that to roll up so we can pull data and see the traffic that these posts are driving.
* Comment Emily Hedrick: can we request a social media management system so we have more oversight? Digital Media will volunteer first over Woodbury.
* **Comments/Votes:**
* Skyler Simmons: Given the feedback, he will move that we take a vote that this policy be returned to stage 1 so changes can be made that we discussed.
* John Jarvis seconds the motion
* Hilary Hungerford: Are there any comments on the motion? If Matt’s willing to work with us, is stage 2 still okay?
* Wioleta Fedeczko: Amendment for motion: if it goes back to stage 1, make sure we have faculty on the committee.
* Bryan Sansom: I will be part of that because it affects us very heavily.
* Skyler Simmons: We will need to make a motion that faculty be involved.
* Hilary Hungerford calls the question.
* Vote: Passes by a huge portion to be returned to stage 1.
* Policy 210 & 251
  + No comments
  + Skyler Simmons moves to vote on the policies as they currently stand.
  + Paul Morrey seconds the motion
  + Hilary Hungerford calls the question
  + Vote: Passes by a majority
* Policy 324
* Skylar Simmons: New comments have come in: change the word “merely” to a term that does not connote condescension. Cannabis will also stay in your blood a lot longer so you may test positive if you had taken it awhile back. Dealing with employees who do have addiction problem: if you let HR know, they have grounds for dismissal. So if you are trying to get help, you could be fired. Maybe “substance abuse” isn’t the right term either. Maybe just use addictions.
  + - It went from a 4 page document to a 14 page document. These policies are really about covering loopholes and that there is a stigma against addiction in the wording and the regulations. What does it mean that you can’t use cannabis during work hours? If you have a medical card, it is legal.
    - Colleagues are worried about mandatory drug testing when the university has a reasonable suspicion. This also includes a remote work location. Also, they will be removed from their work space and transported to a testing site.
    - The expansion of this policy seems punitive. The overall tone is concerning.
    - Keep in mind how far reaching this could be in private space. They can stick tentacles in what a person does in at home.
    - What is employee time? If one has a beer at dinner and then goes back later to grade papers, is that considered under the influence because of that? What is a reasonable amount of alcohol?
    - What is the purpose of this policy? It is mostly to protect students.
    - Protecting students can also be used as an argument that there are other interests. We all want to protect the students but this is going too far because the faculty need to be protected as well.
    - Jim Price moves to extend time 15 minutes.
    - Sandie Waters seconds it.
    - Jon Anderson: Votes passes with a majority
    - Consumable alcohol v. denatured alcohol.
    - Skylar Simmons: Moves that we vote on the comments as currently presented. If you don’t support the policy, vote no on question 1.
    - Jim Price seconds the motion
    - Send comments forward but object to the policy as a whole.
    - Hilary calls the question
    - Vote: 31 disagree, 3 agree, four abstained. All of the comments also pass.

**NON-POLICY**

* Academic Program Assessment Committee:
* Jon Anderson: Strategic plans are due by Friday. If you don’t submit anything, the previous one will roll over.
* Advancement of Teaching Committee:
* Jonathan Allred: we are going over the syllabus check list that OTL uses in their online course development. We need you to take this back to your constituents so they can get the required policy added to their syllabus as we develop new courses.

**Good of the order**

* Hilary Hungerford: There are lots of good things going on at campus this week. Ethics Symposium, nuclear conference tomorrow with national security studies
* Wioleta Fedeczko: Shout out to Hilary who will be presenting at the symposium tomorrow.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:10 pm