**Faculty Senate Minutes**

December 6, 2016

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Kim Abunuwara, Christa Albrecht-Crane, Huda Al-Ghaib, Steve Allred, Anne Arendt, Brian Barthel, Howard Bezzant, Mark Borchelt, Mark Bracken, Bret Breton, David Connelly, Logan Cottle (UVUSA), Ken Crook, Karen Cushing, Debora Escalante, Steve Fellows, Sara Flood, Doug Gardner, Lindsey Gerber, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Jia He, Robert Jorgensen, Lydia Kerr, Ryan Leick, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Tanner McAllister (UVUSA), Gary Mercado, Duane Miller, Shalece Nuttall (PACE), Jeff O’Flynn, Jeff Olson, Hong Pang, Jeff Peterson, Jim Pettersson, Karen Preston, Robert Robbins, Anthony Romrell, Sheri Rysdam, Leo Schlosnagle, Tyler Standifird, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Robert Warcup, Paul Weber, Stephen Whyte, Alex Yuan

***Excused or Absent***: Dean Bohl, Matthew Holland, Kat Brown, Josh Cieslewicz, Alan Clarke, Courtney Davis, Darrell Green, Anthony Morris (Library), Denise Richards, Makenzie Selland, Stuart Stein

***Guests:*** Wayne Hanewicz for Alan Clarke, Greg Schwab for Darrell Green, Tiffany Yoast for Denise Richards

Call to order – 3:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2016.

SVPAA

* Expressed thanks for a great semester.

PACE

* Holiday Social will be December 15 from 11:30 am – 1:00 pm in the Grande Ballroom.
* The Office of the President is seeking nominations for the 2017 Board of Trustees and Presidential Awards of Excellence. Nomination form can be found at <http://www.uvu.edu/president/awards/index.html>.

SRI FOLLOW-UP

* Call for Nominations for Faculty Excellence Awards will go out this week. Make sure your faculty are aware of nominations. Craig Thulin is receiving the nominations and instructions will be sent individually. Note: According to the email, nominations should be sent directly to Department Chairs.
* Thulin sought clarification on three items.
  1. Suggestion B – “Online eval of teacher who did not develop course” means instructors are being evaluated for courses they did not develop but which they are merely implementing online.
  2. Question K - “What can we do to monitor class attendance?” No response.
  3. Statement R “Profs refuse to participate” means that SRIs should be considered as an option for Professors.
* Will include the proposed topics for SRIs next semester. [see handout] If senators have any additional input, please send to Craig Thulin.

PBA

* Faculty Senate did make a request to increase the number of awards. Deans were supportive of the proposal.

BYLAWS

* The Faculty Senate Constitution was approved by the Board of Trustees a year ago and the Constitution stipulates that the Bylaws needs to be approved by the Senate. Within the Bylaws, it states they would be approved by the end of the academic year and effective the next academic year. As they were never approved last academic year, they need to be approved now for this academic year.
* **MOTION** – Howard Bezzant moved to approve the Bylaws. Anne Arendt seconded. Rysdam inquired about the need to approve each year. Connelly shared that the Bylaws were removed from policy so that changes could be made any time. Bezzant also noted that membership changes each year and new members should have opportunity to approve. The Executive Committee has been reviewing and making changes this year and need to be updated.
* Page 6 – Election of Parliamentarian – Richards suggested adding an Item 5 - “Needs to demonstrate proficiency in procedure and protocols (Roberts Rules)”. Connelly commented that he’s not sure how we demonstrate it and that we don’t formally operate under Roberts Rules. We operate under a light version so as to keep good order and to facilitate conversation.
* Page 9 – Faculty Development Committee (FDC) – Richards suggested adding an Item 3 - “Stay informed on all Office of Teaching and Learning faculty development initiatives so there is more effective communication and opportunities.” Thulin responded that as chair of the FDC would like this included. Our role with the OTL has good synergy.
* Rysdam proposed changing the wording for the Parliamentarian addition to “will support Faculty Senate in the use of proper Parliamentarian procedures.”
* **MOTION** – Anne Arendt moved to accept both amendments. Karen Preston seconded. All in favor? Motion passed unanimously.
* **MOTION** - Original motion of ratifying Bylaws with amendments. All in favor? Motion passed unanimously .

Policy 607 - *Course Lab Fees*

* At issue is when there is a denial of a course lab fee whether or not the faculty member has the ability to appeal or the committee has final say.
* Section 5.1.1 - Ad hoc Committee felt it was not their role to rewrite the policy. Recommended that an appeal process be included in the policy by the sponsor.
* **MOTION** – Anne Arendt moved to approve comments with the additional comments recommended by the Ad hoc Committee. Craig Thulin seconded. All in favor? Motion passed unanimously.

Policy 601 – *Classroom Management*

* Deals with religious accommodations bringing UVU into compliance. Another change was if a modification was going to be made to a syllabus after the beginning of the semester it needed to be approved. A revision was made that it be with consultation of Department Chair. Rysdam expressed concern about the attempt to cover everything. Olson shared that the language was taken primarily from Federal Regulations. Peterson inquired about religious situations conflict with other things such as students who state they can’t be on a team with a woman for “religious” reasons. Olson reported that policy directs them to counsel with the Legal Department for direction.
* Section 4.5.2 – Attendance – Albrecht-Crane feels the word “may” is problematic because she does not do such things as approved absences. Would like the steward to review and see if the language should be changed from “class may be permitted” to indicate if academically feasible to make up a class then the professor can oblige. Connelly recommended adding language such as “with appropriate documentation.” However, if not feasible, then the professor should not be under obligation to fulfill student’s request.
* Section 3.1 – Approved Absences Definition - Albrecht-Crane feels she should have the ability to say she does not do “excused absences” because she doesn’t allow make up. She feels the language is too prescriptive. Peterson asked if we could add language noting the feasibility of allowing the work to be made up, but setting up an organic lab is not feasible. Connelly again recommended adding “with appropriate documentation.” Olson recommended including language in the definition for approved absences. Albrecht-Crane also inquired about the withdrawal policy for students in regards to prolonged absences. Would like to see a reference to Policy 503 – *Add/Drop/Withdrawals* in this section for prolonged illnesses.
* Section 4.7.4 – Questioning the EO/AA *Guidelines for the Accommodation of Sincerely Held Religious Beliefs and Practices*. Robbins would like a link to reference the guidelines in the policy. Concern that faculty have not seen or read the guidelines and yet are supposed to be following them. Olson stated that these are mandated in order to be compliant and continue to receive Federal financial aid.
* Rysdam expressed concern that our policies tell us to not do things that are illegal. She asked why we make statements about some protected classes and not others. Connelly shared that some of the statements included are to protect the institution.
* **MOTION** – Anne Arendt moved to table the discussion until the next Faculty Senate meeting. Sean Tolman seconded. All in favor? 1 Abstention. Motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

* Jeff Torlina would like to spread the word that a group is forming to improve the quality of education within Higher Education. One way to do this is to get the voices of the faculty and staff in the trenches to have some input at the state level. All campaigning at the Legislature is mostly done by the University Presidents and Lobbyists. Next month, there will be an informational meeting about how the grassroots campaign will be put together. It will be held on Wednesday, January 18, 2017 from 3-4 pm. Room TBD. Stay tuned for more information. Title for the campaign is “Coalition for Higher Education in Utah.”

Role of Adjuncts

* Arendt referenced a summary document she has created related to Adjuncts. The link is <http://www.uvu.edu/tm/pages/research/adjunct.html>. Any questions, contact her directly.

FLSA

* Policies 325 – *Workload for Full-time, Non-Faculty Employees*, 326 – *Special Pay for Staff* (Deletion), 327 – *Overload for Exempt, Non-Faculty Employees* (Deletion), 328 – *Responsibility for Scheduling and Reporting Working Hours* (Deletion), and 351 – *Annual Compensation and Benefits Plan* are coming through as a bundle. Would like Senators to review over the next few weeks. We will have an online discussion and move the item to an Action Item on January 10, 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Academic Master Plan (AMP)

* Connelly provided an overview of what has been done in all areas of the institution over the past several years in helping guide the AMP.
* Question for faculty to address is “How would you measure Student Success, Serious, Inclusion, and Engaged from an academic perspective with a focus on teaching?”
* Exercise – Break into tables for discussion the six topics listed on the handout.
* Using a single word – what is student success?
  + Life improved
  + Facilitate their progress for their desire future
  + Empowered citizenship
  + Critical thinking
  + Getting a job
  + Increased opportunities
  + Know how to learn
  + Find direction
  + Educational empowerment
  + Encourage continuous learning

Teaching Evaluation Topics

from

Faculty Senate Discussion of November 15, 2016

First, some questions for clarification:

1. Ambiguity from the suggestion B (see below) “Online eval of teacher who did not develop course”. Is what was meant a) instructors are being evaluated for courses they did not develop but which they are merely implementing online, or b) something else (and if so, what?)?
2. Ambiguity from the question K “What can we do to monitor class attendance?”. Is the question whether or not non-attending students should participate in SRI’s? Or is it whether attendance can be somehow incorporated into SRI data (perhaps to observe any possible correlation with SRI results)? Or is it perhaps that attendance can (and should?) be used as a measurement of teaching quality?
3. Ambiguity from the statement R “Profs refuse to participate”. Is this meant to express the idea that there is a problem because some faculty members refuse to ask their students to do SRI’s? Or does it refer to some other idea? (Or is it the suggestion that an option that might be explored is the option to allow faculty to choose to participate in SRI’s or not?)

Now, the salient suggestions for topics:

* How good/limited/poor of an instrument are SRI’s? (A composite of A, I, L, and P; totaling 31 votes.)
* How much weight should SRI’s be given in the RTP process? (A composite of C and H; totaling 20 votes.)
* How do we address student participation rates in SRI’s? (A composite of G, J, and N; totaling 18 votes.)
* What additional evaluations can be used (and how useful are they)? (A composite of F, M, and Q; totaling 16 votes.)
* How are verbal (i.e. non-Likert-scored responses) to be used? (A composite of D and O; totaling 15 votes.)
* How can we ensure that evaluation is pertinent to the appropriate instructor? (Suggestion B, 14 votes.)

This leaves topics E, K, and R (totaling 17 votes) as miscellaneous topics that perhaps can be covered in a “miscellaneous” category.

Raw data:

All of the suggestions/questions that received at least three votes are recorded here:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | #votes | Suggestion / question |
| A | 17 | What aspects of teaching can and cannot be measured through student evaluations? |
| B | 14 | (negative) Online eval of teacher who did not develop course |
| C | 12 | How much weight should SRI’s be given for RTP? |
| D | 12 | Negative comments evaluated in tenure evaluation? |
| E | 10 | Customizable SRI’s at instructor level |
| F | 9 | Peer/Supervisory evaluation rarely results in something meaningful. |
| G | 9 | Why don’t all students participate in SRI’s? |
| H | 8 | Deemphasize SRI’s |
| I | 7 | How valid is the assumption that SRI’s are not scientific (i.e. they can be manipulated by how teachers act)? |
| J | 5 | Process for getting full participation? |
| K | 4 | What can we do to monitor class attendance? |
| L | 4 | How do we account for the racist and sexist nature of SRI’s? |
| M | 4 | External evaluation (outside college or univ.) can be very useful. |
| N | 3 | Require all students to eval instructors |
| O | 3 | Verbal comments are more accurate than #s (Likert) |
| P | 3 | Quantitative Assessment of teaching is problematic |
| Q | 3 | Use peer evaluation |
| R | 3 | Profs refuse to participate |

The first column is merely a referent for convenience. “#votes” means number of votes (not a hashtag).

**Faculty Discussion about Measures for an Academic Master Plan**

**December 6, 2016**

**Context**

**UVU Core Themes and Objectives**

"Collectively, the core themes represent the institution's interpretation of its mission and translation of that interpretation into practice." (Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities)

**Student Success**

UVU supports students in achieving their educational, professional, and personal goals.

Objective One

UVU supports students' preparation and achievement of academic success at the University.

Objective Two

UVU provides a meaningful and well-rounded university experience.

Objective Three

UVU prepares students for success in their subsequent academic, professional and lifelong learning pursuits including serving as leaders, people of integrity and stewards of their communities.

**Engaged**

UVU engages its communities in mutually beneficial collaboration and emphasizes engaged learning.

Objective One

UVU faculty and staff engage students using real-world contexts within the curriculum and activities outside the classroom to increase professional competence and confidence.

Objective Two

UVU fosters partnerships and outreach opportunities that enhance the regional, national, and global communities.

Objective Three

UVU serves as a portal of civic engagement and an engine of regional economic and business development.

**Serious**

UVU fosters a culture of academic rigor and professional excellence.

Objective One

UVU champions learning through outstanding teaching in an academically rigorous environment.

Objective Two

UVU supports a culture of scholarship and creative work and promotes accomplishment in cultural, academic, and co-curricular/extramural endeavors.

Objective Three

UVU attracts, develops, and retains high achieving students and highly qualified faculty, staff, and administrators.

Objective Four

UVU is recognized for high quality, efficient, and effective programs and services.

**Inclusive**

UVU provides opportunity for individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds and perspectives and meets regional educational needs.

Objective One

UVU provides accessible and equitable educational opportunities and resources for all students.

Objective Two

UVU provides opportunities to improve intercultural competence in an increasingly complex, diverse, and globalized society.

Objective Three

UVU provides an inviting, safe, and supportive environment for people from diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

Objective Four

UVU offers an array of courses, programs, and delivery methods designed to reflect students' goals and the region's educational needs.

**Questions for Discussion from an Academic Perspective with a Teaching Focus**

**Student Success**

What is student success from an academic perspective? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Serious**

What is serious teaching that leads to student success? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Engaged**

What is engaged teaching that leads to student success? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Inclusive**

What is inclusive teaching that leads to student success? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Research in Support of Teaching**

What is research in support of teaching that leads to student success? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Service in Support of Teaching**

What is service in support of teaching that leads to student success? How do we measure it? What are the challenges of these measures?

**Dual Mission**

How do the answers to these questions differ for applied technology programs, if at all?