**Faculty Senate Minutes**

October 13, 2020

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

***Present***: Maureen Andrade, Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Wendy Athens (OTL), Lyn Bennett, Lauren Brooks, Kat Brown, Leo Chan, Seth Christensen, Susan Cox, Marianne Craven (for Joy Cole), Karen Cushing, Shane Draper, Max Eskelson, Beka Grulich (PACE), Lisa Hall, Young Wan Ham, Melissa Heath, Rick Henage, Jessica Hill, Joshua Hilst, Hilary Hungerford, Armen Ilikchyan, Greg Jackson, John Jarvis, Kyle Kamaiopili, Jeremy Knee (OGC), Scott Lewis, Stephen Ley, Diana Lundahl, Mohammad Masoum, Jeff Maxfield, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Rick McDonald, Ronald Miller, Natalie Monson, Elijah Nielson, Matthew North, Alan Parry, Evelyn Porter, Kelli Potter, Audrey Reeves, Denise Richards, Brandon Ro, Leo Schlosnagle, David W. Scott, Dustin Shipp, Skyler Simmons, Karen Sturtevant (Library), Wayne Vaught, Ryan Vogel, Bob Walsh, Sandie Waters, Lucy Watson (UVUSA), Christopher Witt, Alex Yuan,

***Excused or Absent***: Paige Gardiner, Barry Hallsted, Chuck Knutson, Jim Pettersson, Zachery Taylor, Lyn Wells, Geoffrey Zahn

***Guests:***  Nizhone Meza, Scott Cooksey, Melanie LaFranca

Call to order – 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from September 29, 2020. Minutes approved.

**PROVOST**

* UVU COVID numbers remain the same and continue to rely on self-reporting. UVU is receiving more reports, but fewer positive cases.
* Scheduling deadlines continue to be problematic. Need to confirm course scheduling before students begin to registering with the knowledge that there will always be some last minute adjustments.
* Workload recommendations taken to the Council of Presidents who have asked that a discussion now occur among the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs).
* If faculty are aware of students with COVID, they are encouraged to ask students to self-report.
* Brown does inform department chairs when students send issues to Academic Continuity. Most complaints are not used for disciplinary measures unless Title IX is involved. Student names are withheld for anonymity.
* Any exposure whether in the clinical setting or not do need to be self-reported to UVU. This is includes those being tested for COVID.

**POLICY RELATED DEBATE ITEMS**

* Review of new policy debate process. Comments forwarded to stewards will be a unified voice of Faculty Senate. Would like senators to submit as many comments as possible prior to the senate meeting. Policy comments will now be due the Sunday prior to the actual senate meeting. New comments are now allowed during debate. Once comments are reviewed, they will be voted on individually and forwarded to policy steward.
* Policy 104 – *External Advisory Boards*
  + Section 3.5 – No discussion
  + Section 4.7.1 – Editorial comment - Change “receipt” to “receive and record”
  + Section 5.1.2 – No discussion
* For every policy, will vote on each comment with a final vote for the overall comments as voice of senate.

**NON-POLICY RELATED ACTION ITEMS**

* Curriculum Procedures
  + Faculty Senate reviewed responses from UCC on how they addressed senate concerns.
  + Porter reported that UCC incorporated many of the changes recommended. Some changes were not made as UCC answers to the Board of Trustees (BOT), and NWCCU. They dictate some of what is in policy.
  + Made changes with cross listing and changes within procedures to soften language. Worked with GE to deal with attributes. A student will need to choose which course they want to receive credit as they cannot receive credit for both courses in the cross listing due to accreditation requirement.
  + Hoping to get all curriculum including course proposal phase into CourseLeaf for tracking purposes. Porter will be sure to include program development in the summary section.
  + AAC will review on 10/27 unless can squeeze in on 10/20 agenda.
  + Have looked at moving the 9/15 deadline, but the problem run into is with Scheduling office. Once new procedures are fully implemented, might be able to adjust again.
  + Policy 605 – *Curriculum Process* does allow for adherence to the curriculum procedures.
* Bylaws
  + Currently 22 proposed changes leftover from spring 2020. No additional comments received.
  + **MOTION** – Elijah Nielsen moved to redirect Bylaws to voting stage. Sandie Waters seconded. McDonald proposed friendly amendment to conduct voting offline for individual items. Nielsen accepted friendly amendment. All in favor? 36; Opposed - 0; Abstained – 1. Motion passed.
* Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs)
  + ELOs drafted by a taskforce with a charge from President’s Council. Taskforce to review comments from senate and incorporate where appropriate. New draft to be distributed to all campus faculty, AAC, and other campus entities for review.
  + Overall/Comment 2 – ELOs are for an audience of the community to include faculty, students, staff, and community.
  + Reasoning/Comments 3 & 5 – What is the intent of the term “original?” Arendt will follow up with taskforce. Originality should be part of reasoning.
    - **MOTION** – Kelli Potter moved to delete the “originality” comment from the comment summary. Rick McDonald seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
  + Quantitative/Scientific 1 & 6 – Editorial comment will be addressed. Both Quantitative and Information Literacy should focus on access to information, how it is gathered, and evaluated.
  + Will continue debate at the next senate meeting. Parry will reopen the comment document until 10/25.

**INCOMING PROPOSALS**

* This section of the agenda deals with senate deciding if the proposal warrants a discussion. If so, then senate needs to determine how they want to pursue the proposal.
* AVPAA Midterm, Tenure and Review Tips and Considerations and RTP Checklist
  + **MOTION** – Sandie Waters moved to discuss further in Faculty Senate. Lyn Bennett seconded. All in favor? 31; Opposed – 4; Abstained – 2. Motion passed
  + **MOTION** – Waters/Cox to open document for comment. All in favor? 30; Opposed – 0; Abstained – 0. Motion passed.
* Resolution on the Role of Part-Time Faculty
  + **MOTION** – Rick McDonald moved to discuss further action on adopting a formal resolution in Faculty Senate. Skyler Simmons seconded. All in favor? 26; Opposed - 15; Abstained – 3. Motion passed.
  + **MOTION** – Denise Richards moved to open a taskforce to explore options for the inclusion of part-time in shared governance. Taskforce will include Jon Westover and/or Maureen Andrade, four senators and one administrator. Suzy Cox seconded. All in favor? 23; Opposed - 11; Abstained – 2. Motion passed.
* Chicago Principles for Free Expression
  + Miller provided a brief overview of the Chicago Principles and the intent for the proposed discussion.
  + **MOTION** – Suzy Cox moved to discuss the signing of Chicago Principles or something similar. Sandie Waters seconded. All in favor? 27; Opposed – 10; Abstained – 2. Motion passed.
  + **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett moved to have a strategic discussion followed by the formation of a taskforce. David W. Scott volunteered to lead the taskforce. Potter reminded all that free speech is already protected. Kelli Potter seconded. All in favor? 29; Opposed – 5; Abstained – 1. Motion passed.
* Required use of Digital Measures for Rank and Tenure Portfolios
  + Rank, Tenure, Promotion & Appeals (RTP&A) Committee has already begun to investigate the required use. Would like additional feedback from Faculty Senate.
  + **MOTION** – Does Faculty Senate want to hold a discussion on this topic? All in favor? 35; Opposed – 6; Abstained – 1. Motion passed.
  + **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett moved to accept ExCo recommendations of 1) RTP&A currently gathering more comments/questions/concerns - need these from chairs and deans, too, 2) RTP&A set up meeting with Laura Busby regarding technical questions, 3) RTP&A set up meeting with Academic Affairs regarding policy/RTP questions, and 4) RTP&A summarize and report. Sandie Waters seconded. All in favor? 30; Opposed – 2; Abstained – 0. Motion passed.
* Educating for Democracy Demands Educating Against White Supremacy: A Statement by U.S. Educators and Educational Scholars
  + Statement could be approached as a resolution. Came out of K-12 arena and moved into the Higher Ed arena. In response to the current administration’s statements regarding anti-racist movements in education and withdrawal of funding for schools that talk about certain issues. This statement is related to Chicago Principles for Free Expression but a more specific position.
  + **MOTION** – Does Faculty Senate want to hold a discussion on this topic? All in favor? 26; Opposed – 5; Abstained – 5. Motion passed.
  + **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett moved to entertain further action on this proposal. Executive Committee recommends that Suzy Cox lead a strategic discussion at a future Senate meeting. Sandie Waters seconded. All in favor? 26; Opposed - 2; Abstained – 1. Motion passed.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Potter read a prepared statement on Senate Procedure and the Purpose of Senate in response to her position at the last senate meeting. See attached. She proposed Faculty Senate hold a strategic discussion on this topic.
* A Qualtrics survey will be coming out to seek start dates for the academic year 2023-2024.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Statement on Senate Procedure and the Purpose of Senate  
  
Kelli D. Potter

Associate Professor of Philosophy

Utah Valley University  
10/13/20

At the end of senate last time I opened up a can of worms with my criticisms of current senate debate procedures. In this statement, I will explain more clearly what I take to be the purpose of faculty senate, the role of debate in senate procedure, and flaws in the current system.   
  
I realize that at UVU the faculty senate is merely a recommending body. But let’s look at the word ‘recommend’. It’s actually a very strong word. Etymologically it comes from the Latin ‘recommendare’ which means to ‘re-commit to the care of’. In the modern usage, it can mean ‘to present as worthy of acceptance or trial’ or ‘to *make* acceptable’. It can also mean ‘to suggest a course of action’ or ‘to entrust’. These all seem significant to me. Recommenders are important. Let’s not downplay our role just because we are not a legislative body. For me, ‘recommend’ means that we should do all of the above. We should take great care to try to help make our policies the best that they can be from the point of view of the faculty on campus that we represent. We should make our recommendations as strong and as ambitious as we need.   
  
We are not here to be editors. We are here to have a powerful voice on the big issues (and there are many). And our voice is more powerful when it is not just a bag of individual insights, but a developed perspective that arises from the way that only rational and civil debate can do. Debate is absolutely essential because it forces us to think together rather than individually and, thinking collectively, our perspectives open up and new issues arise. Debate is the best tool to dig down into the issues that many of the policies present. And via debate we can often form a consensus view (with a dissent of course) that we can confidently say is the voice of the senate and not just the individual voices of individual senators. After all, there is a time in the policy process for individual comments. But our voice needs to be more powerful than an individual voice and we can only get to a unified perspective on a policy by having dialogue and debate.   
  
It is clear to me that the current procedure on policy recommending does not encourage debate and even, at times, hinders it. Part of what we recommend about a policy should involve a unified statement that represents the senate’s voice. Of course, we should also have recommendations for *substantive* changes to the text that might address concerns. We are not editors and so we should not be catching typos or making other merely grammatical changes.   
  
The comment spreadsheet documents that we currently use are problematic and should be used only for individual comments and not senate comments. Note that these are the types of spreadsheets that an editor might create, but it individualizes our evaluation of the policy and it atomizes the content of the evaluation as well, not achieving any kind of overall perspective. These comment spreadsheets are not necessary (we didn’t always use them) and, in fact, are a hindrance. The senate is a *recommending body* and not an individual, or even JUST a collection of individuals. The informational structure of our recommendations should reflect this.   
  
Another problem with current procedure is that debate on the floor has been limited by the comments on the spreadsheet. Some have suggested that many of us don’t do the reading and that’s why this restriction is in place. But this is condescending and unnecessarily punitive. Debate on the floor should be open. The reasons are (i) that many issues arise only out of debate and (ii) debate can help us develop a unified view. Our recommendation should be the result of our debate.   
  
I don’t have time right now to propose the protocols for new procedures. But I have talked with Jessi about this and I feel like there are some good options for making changes to meet my concerns. I will send recommendations for changes to ExCo soon, but I think it might make sense for us to have a senate discussion about this issue as well.