**Faculty Senate Minutes**

Oct. 11, 2022

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

***Present***: Anthony Ciccone, Alex Yuan, Armen Ilikchyan, Ben Moulton, Brandon Ro, Bryan Sansom, Christ Witt, Christopher Goslin, David Frame, David Scott, Diego Alvarado Karste, Donna Fairbanks, Dustin Shipp, Eric J. Russell, Gareth Fry, Hilary Hungerford, James Duncan, Jennifer Shubert, Jessi Hill, Jim Price, 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, Nizhone Meza, Paul Morrey, Peter Sproul, Rich Paustenbaugh, Sam Gedeborg, Sandie Waters, Sayeed Sajal, Scott Lewis, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wioleta Fedeczko

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Christina Baum, Drew Burke

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

Approval of Minutes – Put the numbers of votes in past and future notes. Other than that, minutes stand approved.

**PROVOST**

* Evelyn Porter:
	+ There was a task force formed that mostly consists of the GE committee that has been charged by the President to look at some questions. Everything we are doing you can find on the website. You can also message the committee members through the website. We are trying to be as transparent as possible with this process.
	+ GE as required by R470: a minimum of 30 credits and a maximum of 39. We are about 27 credit hours with what we have right now. With current credit requirements, we are at 35. We are at the low end compared to what other institutions are doing.
	+ 21st Century Workforce: We’ve had questions on this and there is a link on the website that has more information.
	+ The questions we asked ourselves is can we enhance the GE experience? Is it providing crucial leadership skills for students? This is the basis of our discussion.
	+ We want a vote by Senate in March. We will try to have this to Hilary by the beginning of December.
		- Comment: 70% of our students at UVU are falling short of prerequisite courses. Are students should be getting more general education requirements, not fewer.
		- Question: If we are really trying to dissect this, how does every get class get a fair shake in the limited spots (like a third science)?
			* Hilary Hungerford: We are trying to take a step back and do a bigger picture. If you really want to make sure that this idea for a technology class or others are there, talk to your rep, Hilary, Wioleta or Evelyn and communicate with us. We aren’t ready to make decisions yet; we are still learning and looking at proposals.
* Christina Baum:
* DX Vision:

 -People & Culture

 -Vision & Strategy

 -Product & Change Management

 -Balance the Budget

 -Architecture, Standards, Processes

* This will be subordinate to Vision 2030. We will create affirmative statements of what the user experience is like and what technology is like when we are successful in our digital transformation. This will then flow into the projects that have we going and the major efforts to move the needle to those vision statements.
* There will be a data summit in January and we invite you to come and join to learn what is changing at UVU.
* We asked ourselves what is people can do as a result of the technologies we have employed? What does the world at UVU look like in five years?
* It’s really important that we have buy-in across campus. We want to make sure we share this and get feedback so we can ratify this and solidify it. It’s meant to be a funnel where it starts broader and works down to specifics.
* We want to find ways that students can be more involved in the work we are doing.
* We have purchased an AI chat bot that we can put across the website for 24 hour questions. We would like to build a TA in a box. We will have a focus group of students to see what they would like an IA TA to do. We would like to get faculty feedback as well.
* What is it that people can do at UVU? What is the experience they have? We would like to have a consistent experience from class to class and meet them where they are at.
* Support & Service: Monitoring our system so we know when the system goes down before everyone else does.
* Help clean up workflows, such as when you need to print something off, sign it and scan it.
	+ Concern: Weak wife and limited cell phone service
	+ Question: What does digital transformation contain?
		- Christina: All of the technology that we are using fits into DX: Canvas, One Drive, Banner, the website, mobile apps, etc. We want to hone in on what are the worst pain points.
* Question: What is the plan with Google Docs, Box, One Drive and Sharepoint?
	+ Christina: Gmail Google has started charging schools for storage. We are looking and testing things out. We know that we need to move, but we don’t have a timeline as we do this so it will be much cleaner when that time comes. We have people testing the difference between Box and OneDrive. We did extend Box for one more year so we can get it right. Still turn in work tickets so we know what is not working. There is a lot that the Microsoft ecosystem offers, but we want to be cautious on how we approach it but at the same time be budget conscious.
* Question: How far are we going to go on Microsoft? Not everything gets simple on the user end just because it’s all coming from the same company. It would also be nice if it would collaborate with Canvas.
	+ Christina: There is support for Canvas from the OTL. There is a stronger partnership we can have there to support them and faculty. We reach out to the Canvas developers and some suggestions get taken and some don’t.
* Concern: There are all these apps on Canvas that we can add but we aren’t sure what they do. We need to look at what digital transformation does. It sometimes takes faculty out. We want to make sure that the administration knows that faculty are what drives us. We want to make sure that is not lost in the digital transformation experience.
	+ Christina: Faculty are not replaceable. The care and the individualized attention to students is paramount to student success. Digital transformation is supposed to make things more convenient for students and faculty.
* Comment: Could you put it on your radar for faculty at large for big changes that come to come during down time, like Christmas Break, Spring Break or summer?
	+ Christina: We can do better to make sure people aren’t off guard. We tried to do this with migration of DUO to Microsoft. We had to add an extra to digits because of a security breach.

**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 332
* This policy has in place since COVID. If you want to grade with other people in the living room, that is just fine. Hopefully the others won’t be looking over your shoulder.
* Concern: Faculty don’t work regular hours.
* Drew: Think of it as the work box. With this and the drug and alcohol policy, it’s while you are actually doing the work is when this policy would apply. Some of the provisions are written loosely because it also applies to staff. It’s written to be more flexible. In many ways, this won’t impact the faculty whatsoever. Outside of the work box, we have very little interest in what you are doing or why you are doing it. 99% of our workforce is already doing this. This codifies a lot of the expectations that you already have. It wouldn’t require any faculty to change how you are currently operating.
* Question: What will the remote agreement be for faculty?
	+ Drew: Originally this wasn’t included for faculty, and then it became more vague. Does it really make sense for everyone who works remotely to sign it? The pro is it does provide protection for the employee and supervisor that it is in place. The agreement is just a summary of the policy.
* Comment: It may be better for faculty and staff to have separate sections in the policy and/or different agreements.
* Concern: If the agreement is denied, what if there are no appeals, especially when faculty have found benefits in remote working?
	+ Drew: This is more for those who are teaching in person.
* Concern: There is an issue with an emergency policy that was created to help with COVID-19 that rolls into something that just becomes policy. Did this go through faculty senate? We didn’t have a chance to look at it and comment on it previously. If administration wants to have limits if you don’t sign these documents then it might open a Pandora Box that administration doesn’t want to open. There is a worry about faculty being judged by a policy that states staff and says it doesn’t really concern us. We need to look at this selectively.
	+ Drew: It says designated work schedule and I’m sure that you will be told just to continue to do your work where and how you do it.
* Concern: When you start setting limits on people on one side, it naturally sets limits on the other side. Sometimes it doesn’t always work out the way people intend it to.
* Concern: It just doesn’t work this way. You can’t put up a policy and say, “it doesn’t work this way”. What is on the paper is to be in our office during work hours unless we have special permission. There would have to be a separate process to make sure the university is protected and for faculty. This policy as it is needs to be just for staff. There needs to be a different one for faculty.
	+ Drew: I’m not sure this discussion is capturing the difference between an exempt and non-exempt employee. I’m also not sure there is a full understanding of the intent behind this for faculty. There are assumptions that it is going to change how faculty work but that is a highly unlikely outcome.
* Comment: We are seeing in the absence of confirmation that there are questions and concerns. The assumption is that it treats exempt and non-exempt the same way.
* Question: This was passed during COVID without faculty being notified. Are we all in violation of this policy by not having remote agreements in place? We weren’t aware this was policy until recently. Why weren’t we made aware of this during COVID? What do we do if we are in violation of this?
	+ Drew: Faculty were intentionally left out of this until we got to this phase of the process. Only staff were included originally and not faculty.
* Comment: Stage 2 doesn’t end on this for another month, we still have a bit of time that we can devote to this. We will take this up at the next Senate.
* Question: It feels like the cart is before the horse. It feels like it is a done-deal sort of thing. Can we still make significant changes to the policy?
	+ Jon Anderson: Historically, there are policies can be held in stage 2 for a long time or sent back to stage 1. It’s ultimately up to the President’s Council, but there are mechanisms that allow this to be addressed without assuming it’s going to be final.
* Policy 324
	+ Follow up from last Senate with Drew Burke and James Duncan
	+ James Duncan: The best way to get this started is to go through the summary of comments. We have already made changes for some of these comments.
		- We have included an alcohol definition
		- We got rid of the word “merely”
* Section 4.5 Cannabis for medical purposes: The focus of the policy isn’t on the timing of the consumption but rather if the employee is impaired while actively performing work for the University. We want to make sure you are taking the medication responsibly and in a timely way. The extra care is important. It will keep you safe and others safe. Cannabis users won’t be required to disclose use outside of working hours. We aren’t looking for a medical disclosure, but if medications might impair you, you might want to reach out to Cameron Evans for ADA accommodations. If he knows you are on it, he can have that conversation as opposed to being drug tested. This is mostly if you will be operating heavy equipment as opposed to administrative duties.
* The blurring of lines that remote work causes: Because we want to be a flexible workplace and be responsive to that need there is going to be some overlap. We won’t be policing those boundaries but rather we want you to know you can’t be impaired. We want to make sure we are coherent when we are doing work on behalf of the University.
* Reasonable suspicion: The clarification would be that there would be a second person from People and Culture who would go in and verify this. There is a lot built into the process that provides a significant amount of protection.
* Concern: this could still be weaponized by students. They could band together against someone they didn’t like. They would use it as fake news.
	+ James: There is a definition in the policy of what reasonable suspicion is. This has to be based on specific facts that are consistent with recent consumption of one of these controlled substances. A third party is built into this.
* Concern: Not many faculty members and students are trained to detect behavior from someone who is under the influence. If you have limited knowledge, your perception would be different. We need to be explicit. We have been mowed over by things that were assumed or inferred when it wasn’t intended. We need to have it in writing to have us protected.
* Question: A typical student/person isn’t trained. Even if they were, how can you verify it? It would be a subjective statement without concrete evidence.
	+ James: This is built into the policy. Cameron Evans is very well versed in facts that will constitute a reasonable suspicion. We don’t want to engage in this process unless there really is a reasonable suspicion. They won’t be satisfied with someone’s subjective belief. That is what will inform this decision. We want to protect our faculty and staff when safety is the issue. This is paramount.
* Comment: We need protection for those who go to HR with their addiction confession so they won’t be fired. This isn’t clear in the policy.
	+ James: One of the revisions we’ve made with employees seeking assistance is that we are giving them a chance for assistance. If they disclose, this won’t be the basis for disciplinary action.

**Good of the order**

* Hilary Hungerford: It’s Fall Break Thursday and Friday. The fall colors are beautiful as well.
* Sandie Waters: Shout out to all the faculty members who participated in the discussion.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 pm