**Faculty Senate Minutes**

December 8, 2020

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

***Present***: Maureen Andrade, Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Wendy Athens (OTL), Lyn Bennett, Kat Brown, Seth Christensen, Joy Cole, Suzy Cox, Karen Cushing, Shane Draper, Max Eskelson, Melissa Heath, Rick Henage, Jessica Hill, Joshua Hilst, Hilary Hungerford, Armen Ilikchyan, Greg Jackson, John Jarvis, Kyle Kamaiopili, Scott Lewis, Stephen Ley, Diana Lundahl, Mohammad Masoum, Jeff Maxfield, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Rick McDonald, Natalie Monson, Elijah Nielson, Matthew North, Alan Parry, Evelyn Porter, Kelli Potter, Audrey Reeves, Denise Richards, Leo Schlosnagle, David W. Scott, Dustin Shipp, Skyler Simmons, Peter Sproul, Karen Sturtevant (Library), Wayne Vaught, Ryan Vogel, Bob Walsh, Sandie Waters, Lucy Watson (UVUSA), Christopher Witt, Alex Yuan, Geoffrey Zahn

***Excused or Absent***: Lauren Brooks, Leo Chan, Paige Gardiner, Beka Grulich (PACE), Lisa Hall, Barry Hallsted, Young Wan Ham, Jeremy Knee (OGC), Chuck Knutson, Ronald Miller, Jim Pettersson, Brandon Ro, Zachery Taylor

***Guests:***  Nizhone Meza, Pauli Alin

Call to order – 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from December 1, 2020. Minutes approved.

**PROVOST**

* Automatic recording of classes and downloading in Canvas was turned off for those who did not request it after Thanksgiving. Have turned the system back on and the recordings will be downloaded to Canvas. Instructions were distributed to faculty on how to remove unwanted recordings from Canvas.
* Spring semester will look very much like fall 2020. Face-to-Face (F2F) courses will continue to be live streamed and downloaded to Canvas. Enrollments are down about 5%-8% depending on which measure using. Student Affairs (SA) has been running several campaigns to encourage students to enroll. Several reasons students are not enrolling are COVID fatigue or bad online experiences. Academic Affairs (AA) has asked deans to talk with their faculty and encourage them to contact students to enroll.
* Still waiting on the State to finalize COVID testing for students.
* SRIs will be counted for fall 2020.
* Fall 2021 registration has been pushed back to 4/19/21 to hopefully provide a better picture of what fall might look like. Have not made any decisions about summer 2021 yet.
* Tier 1 vaccine distribution appears to consist of healthcare and first responders as of right now. No other decisions have been made yet.
* Live stream options will be available in perpetuity. Preliminary conversations have begun regarding the pros and cons of recording courses. Do need to be sensitive and use in a way to maximize the educational pedagogical need.
* Summer travel restrictions will most likely continue and will still need a legitimate business purpose for essential travel. UVU will adhere to CDC guidelines for international travel, so have discouraged faculty from traveling into those countries.
* Post-COVID, a F2F class will have all the normal expectations of a F2F class requirements. In the event you are live streaming, it becomes a tool for students to have the ability to keep up on coursework if a student has a valid reason for missing class. Want to error on the side of safety.

**POLICY**

* 548 - *Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Clinical Program Students*
  + Faculty Senate wants to be sure definition of “clinical” is made more explicit.
  + Comment 3.2 Vote to support the comment – All in favor? 36; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 1. Vote passed.
  + Comment Title Vote to change the title of the policy to more accurately reflect the purpose – All in favor? 36; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 0. Vote passed.
  + Overall Vote to support the implementation of the policy if comments are addressed – All in favor? 37; Opposed – 1; Abstain – 0. Vote passed.
* 612 - *Establishment of Clinical Programs*
  + Faculty Senate wants to be sure definition of “clinical” is made more explicit.
  + Comment 3.1 Vote to support the comment – All in favor? 32; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 1. Vote passed.
  + Comment Title Vote to change the title of the policy to more accurately reflect the purpose – All in favor? 32; Opposed – 1; Abstain – 0. Vote passed.
  + Overall Vote to support the implementation of the policy if comments are addressed – All in favor? 32; Opposed – 0; Abstain – 1. Vote passed.

**NON-POLICY**

* Statement on Senate Procedure and the Purpose of Senate
  + What is the purpose of the Faculty Senate responses to policy drafts?
  + How can we encourage debate and have our feedback be the result of that debate?
    - Give senator and individual feedback and opinions as there is always a variety.
    - Robust discussion is critical. Senators have seen the impact and how they affect departments and faculty differently. Consider breakout groups so can examine deeper.
    - Faculty senators should ensure their constituents know about the policies, discuss them at department level, and bring that to the comment section.
    - Debate helps senators understand current conditions, but also what future interpretation or impact a policy might have.
    - Most important place for faculty input is in Stage 1, otherwise it is only a recommendation. Determine if faculty can be more active in drafting committees.
    - Senators need to work with their departments on how they want policy discussions to occur.
    - Stage 2 should be a unified voice of Faculty Senate with individual comments submitted in Stage 3. Comment document is just a starting point for debate.
    - Faculty need to read policy in order to understand how they are going to be affected. Determine how to strike a balance of all the activities faculty need to participate in.
    - Important that some feedback be the result of senate dialogue which allows all to see commonalities and differences.
    - Another process issue that should be reconsidered is the process of voting for "Senate supports policy if comments are addressed". This is problematic, because we (Senate) never actually verify whether or how the comments are addressed, and yet we're putting our "support" behind the policy (and some policies would be very problematic if comments are not fully addressed). It's entirely possible that the comments are not addressed, or that the comments are misunderstood and "addressed" incorrectly, that only some comments are addressed, etc. This process is analogous to getting an F grade paper from a student, giving the student comments, and telling the student "I'll change your grade to an A+, if you address my comments", and then giving them that A+ without ever verifying whether or how they addressed the comments. Presumably, no professor would ever do this, and yet that's basically what Senate does when we vote for "Senate approves of the policy if the comments are addressed". Addressing of comments should be monitored by Senate President during President’s Council and by all during stage 3.
  + What process can we use to satisfy the need to respond to sponsors and stewards on a timeline but also allow for rich debate to form a unified Faculty Senate voice?
    - Consider holding smaller subgroup policy discussions as Senate might be too large to hold effective conversations.
  + **MOTION** – Jessi Hill moved to form a taskforce to investigate and propose some procedures Senate could use to engage in debate. Kelli Potter seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
* UVU Workload Priority Report
  + Reviewed taskforce members
  + Reviewed Workload Credit Hour Equivalent (WCHE), Instructional Credit Hour Equivalent (ICHE), Academic Credit Hour Equivalent (ACHE) ACHE, and Governance Credit Hour Equivalent (GCHE) definitions
    - Service is not tracked as part of WCHE.
  + UBHE Concerns and Recommendations
    - Total WCHE of 30 varies by institution
    - There is a universal formula when applying to large classes, labs and high impact practices (HIPs), but not all institutions apply it the same. Would like to consider formulas that represent the type of university.
    - Need to account for accreditation standards in schools and colleges such as WSB and CET that only allow faculty to teach a specific amount of ICHE.
  + UVU more specific concerns and recommendations
    - Lab definitions
    - Total 30 WCHE
    - Accreditation accommodation
    - Service and Scholarship Tracking
    - Yearly distribution of 24 ICHE
    - Differences in calculation formulas
    - Atypical credit hours (non 3 divisible) and partial credit banking
    - Hiring and 4/4 language
    - Technological demands and inequalities
  + Taskforce is trying to align administrators with faculty interpretation; however, deans broad experience across different departments can be both beneficial and problematic.
  + Faculty role statement discussion has not been part of this workload discussion.
* Update on RTP Checklist and Recommendations
  + Academic Affairs Council (AAC) has been asked for feedback on both documents. Cox feels that tenure and rank advancement are a faculty issue and really wants faculty members to drive the discussion, but have not received much feedback from them.
  + Consider creating breakout discussions on opposing Senate meeting dates.
  + Feedback document links: 1) [RTP Checklist](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qo2wlevYjGbm8LibfJHttdsRzHSmeGtrVRRi6UXMysA/edit?usp=sharing) and 2) [RTP Tips & Considerations](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RP8PKs7ixhromwi6pVJkWjQpd_H2pBVz5c1iLHXFOyE/edit?usp=sharing)
  + Cox will summarize the comments from AAC.

**INCOMING PROPOSALS**

* Non-Tenure Track and Non-Tenured Faculty Giving Feedback on RTP Criteria
  + RTP&A Committee reviewed all criteria and provided feedback. Questions have arisen about who gets a say in both crafting of the RTP criteria, participating on RTP committees, and voting such as non-tenured faculty writing criteria for the department or for the rank of full professor.
  + Part of issue is whether Lecturers have a long-term interest in being involved in the RTP discussion outside of the qualifications for Senior Lecturer. Departments can choose whether or not they want Lecturers involved. Involving Lecturers on committees with expectation of service or research is problematic from a legal perspective.
  + Policy 632 – *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank* and Policy 637 – *Faculty Tenure* reference who votes on RTP criteria. Multiple layers: 1) who votes on the department RTP criteria, 2) who has input into the development of the criteria, 3) exploitation of non-tenure track faculty, 4) knowledge of the scholarship and service aspects for tenured/tenure-track faculty, and 5) assistant professor’s level of expertise in crafting criteria for rank of full professor.
  + **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett moved to entertain a future discussion of RTP Criteria. Rick McDonald seconded. All in favor? 36; Opposed – 5; Abstain – 2. Motion passed.
  + **MOTION** – Lyn Bennett moved to start a more strategic discussion which would lead to potential future policy changes. Rick McDonald seconded. All in favor? 26; Opposed – 1; Abstain – 1. Motion passed.
* Proctorio
  + Issues:
    - Pushback from faculty and students on the use of proctoring online testing, digital surveillance, biometrics in the recording of data by companies including Proctorio when exams are taken, and accessibility. Faculty would like to discuss the usefulness of Proctorio or something similar, and the ability to have more say in what is used for testing.
  + Articles
    - Initial post <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/11/12/test-monitoring-student-revolt/>
    - NYTimes <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/29/style/testing-schools-proctorio.html>
    - UBC Call to Action <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1117835S2RQkQN_-Ij8nZ2qEzCKgNWqle-O70nKdzpaA/edit>
    - Berkeley ending online proctoring <https://www.dailycal.org/2020/04/05/online-exam-proctoring-no-longer-allowed-for-uc-berkeley-classes/>
    - UCSB Faculty Association advising against ProctorU <https://dailynexus.com/2020-03-16/ucsb-faculty-association-issues-letter-advising-against-the-use-of-proctoru-testing-services/>
    - Proctorio’s response to criticism <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/university-venus/response-proctorio>
    - Peer-reviewed study of algorithmic test proctoring (Proctorio asked publication to retract) <https://hybridpedagogy.org/our-bodies-encoded-algorithmic-test-proctoring-in-higher-education/#:~:text=Algorithmic%20test%20proctoring%20encodes%20ideal,exclusion%20from%20the%20educational%20community>
  + One suggestion is having OTL run a learning circle or workshops to help faculty think through alternative testing approaches that would not require proctoring and how faculty can pay attention to the needs and stresses of our students during this pandemic and in the future.
  + **MOTION** – Rick McDonald moved to entertain further discussion. Max Eskelson seconded. All in favor? 27; Opposed – 7; Abstain – 1. Motion passed.
  + Conversation needs to include some form of remote testing capability and confidence in the results as not only covers our classes, but also student placement.
  + **MOTION** – Kyle Kamaiopili moved to hold a future strategic discussion in Faculty Senate and discussion in Academic Affairs Council. Elijah Nielsen seconded. Lundahl reminded senators that there is process not only to investigate alternatives, but how to get them approved. Bennett would like to make a friendly amendment to include all the appropriate divisions or stakeholders needed to be included in the discussions. Amendment accepted. All in favor? 25; Opposed – 2; Abstain – 0. Motion passed.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Deadline for course cross-listing is 12/18.
* Faculty need to remember to take care of themselves during the holiday in order to rejuvenate.
* Nominations for Senate President and Vice President will be opened in January 2021. Begin asking faculty if they would like to run. Voting will be conducted in early February. All other positions will be voted on in the last senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.