**Faculty Senate Minutes**

February 20, 2018

CB 511, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Kim Abunuwara, Pauli Alin, Jonathan Allred, Jon Anderson, Brian Barthel, Howard Bezzant, Laurel Bradshaw, Clay Brown, Alan Clarke, Suzy Cox, Ken Crook, Karen Cushing, Nathan Gale, Phil Gordon, Darrell Green, Merrill Halling, Matt Hasara, Dan Hoffman, Matthew Holland, Jamie Johnson, Chelsie Kraczek (UVUSA), Jeff O’Flynn, Jeff Olson, Hong Pang, Alan Parry, Jeff Peterson, Karen Preston, Denise Richards, Robert Robbins, Rodayne Esmay for Anthony Romrell, Sheri Rysdam, Tyler Standifird, Mike Stearns, Matthew Taylor, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Sandie Waters, Robert Warcup, Paul Weber

***Excused or Absent***: Mark Abramson, Bret Breton, Kat Brown, Josh Cieslewicz, Reid Elem, Sara Flood, Lindsey Gerber, Basil Hamdan, Reza Kamali, Lydia Kerr, Duane Miller, Margaret Mittelman, Anthony Morris (Library), Shalece Nuttall (PACE), Jim Pettersson, Meghan Roddy, Leo Schlosnagle

***Guests:*** Justin Jones, Steven Kroes,Pilar Hays, Jeff Johnson

Call to order – 3:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from February 6, 2018. Minutes approved after correcting Hong Pang’s attendance.

**PRESIDENT**

* Legislative Update
	+ The Legislature requires us to perform a 2% cut exercise. There is potential to reduce the number of Legacy Waivers which could have a negative effect on our revenues. The net affect would at a minimum force a tuition raise and possible a hiring freeze. Holland optimistic that one or both might be restored. Legacy Waivers are waivers that legislature allows for children of institutional graduates to receive even if they live out of state. Find out how many legacy students currently have.
	+ Revenue estimates will come in shortly and this is when Higher Education will have a better sense of the impact.
	+ Design money for the Business Building did get prioritized. MTEC building was approved. If can push through for this year, positive for getting the full funding next year.
* Community Matter
	+ Palos Verde Neighborhood Project –Private developer purchased the land and plans to develop it into student housing. UVU feels this is a good move for both the university and the neighborhood; however, there are still concerns from residents. Would provide about 1600 beds for on-campus housing that we would not have to maintain. Would mean decrease in traffic and congestion. The developer has been very responsive to city concerns.
* Academic Master Plan
	+ Reviewed the original development of UVU’s Mission and Core Themes of Inclusive, Engaged, Serious, Large. Campus community asked “to what end” do we want the first three and what evolved was Student Success. Large then led to three Administrative Imperatives: Secure Resources, Manage Growth, and Operate Effectively.
	+ UVU continues to deal with growth issue and noted that the greatest growth is within our junior and senior classes since 2008. This means UVU is offering programs at all levels and continuing through graduation.
	+ The Quill Project – A new partnership between UVU and Pembroke College at University of Oxford. Nicholas Cole has developed a sophisticated algorithm and set of software to study negotiated texts. Has taken all the digitized texts and put them into one user friendly format, label and categorize them, then assemble and brought into conversation. Provided example with Constitution. UVU students are assisting with the research on the project.
	+ Reported that just a few years ago only about 4% of Culinary Arts students would achieve a four-year degree. Now in 2017, Lyn Wells’ original goal was to just obtain a certificate and begin working. She has now received an AAS degree, then BS, now in MBA program. This is just one example of the great power of the dual mission model. The Academic Master Plan is a way to examine how we move forward while being effective and efficient.

**AVPAA**

* Hays spoke with the Policy Office to begin posting Stage 3 instructions for submitting comments and a document explaining types of policy actions within the policy library system.
* Merit Pay Policy is now in Stage 3. Submit comments to Cara O’Sullivan or Pilar Hays.
* Policy 638 – *Post-Tenure Review* has moved into Stage 4. Reviewed some of the changes that were made. Can review changes and comments in the Policy Pipeline. Olson clarified changing “retention” to “remediation” is designed to message the process is about helping someone to stay. Clarke would like more clarity on what they mean by repeated failed attempts of remediation. Hays reported that President’s Council did not want to remove all the language. “Failed attempts” refers to a refusal to meet any remediation attempts or something is preventing them from performing their duties. Parry inquired if it is still possible for this policy to still be used to be the sole cause for termination. Olson responded that the terms of Policy 648 would have to be satisfied and describes the various ways a faculty member’s employment can be terminated. Refer to the Policy Pipeline for specifics to Policies 638 and 648.

**UVUSA**

* Student Voice Forum on the GE Re-envisioning Undergraduate Experience will be March 1 from 12:00-1:00 pm in the Ballroom.
* UVUSA Student Elections – March 5-9, 2018 – Please encourage your students to vote.

**OFFICE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING**

* Open Educational Resources (OER) – State of Utah has annual event this Friday, February 23, in Murray. Contact Seth Gurell for details.
* Academic Awards Event honoring online faculty who have designed courses will be held March 2 from 2:00-4:00 p.m. in OTL.

**LIBRARY**

* Next Roots of Knowledge speaker will be Courtney Davis on March 8.

**PRESENTATION ITEMS**

* Thulin read a statement on Faculty Role in Shared Governance.
* Academic Master Plan [3:39 pm]
	+ Olson provided brief background of the AMP process and noted the development of 10 statements. Holland decided to have the plan be more conventional and integrated with the Facilities Master Plan and the Strategic Plan for Managing Growth. AAC held several meetings to develop goals and strategies. Holland then decided to bring in a consultant, Steven Kroes, to broaden the scope. AAC participated in an exercise to reduce the 10 statements into six goals with strategies and indicators. The document does include supplemental text for review.
	+ Current stage is to use the policy review process and have faculty post comments between now and Friday, March 3. Faculty Senate will review the comments at the March 6 meeting.
	+ On March 1, this draft will also be provided to the All Leadership Meeting which the department chairs also attend.
	+ Discussion about the various components of the plan to review and consider in guiding faculty comments. Link can be found in the agenda for distribution to faculty departments along with link for comments.
* Flex Learning Strategic Plan [3:53 pm]
	+ Evidence that not all of UVU’s online or hybrid courses are of excellent quality and that’s what the strategic plan addresses. Reviewed current support structure for course specialists and the proposed Hub & Spoke model for instructional support technologists. Want to elevate course specialists designed to support specific departments as a support to Department Chairs. Department Chairs would have their own plans for strategic planning on what courses need to be developed. OTL wants to reorganize to provide the labor. Hub and Spoke model would bring information and technology tools to improve the quality. Intention is that within one year’s time, can refresh everything with this model and make courses accessible. Requires faculty to take more responsibility for running their Canvas courses.
	+ Provided context for the proposed revisions. Utah trend loves online learning; however, UVU has not grown their online offerings given the total enrollments. Reviewed course modality and referenced Nathan Gale’s English 1010 example on the level of improvement.
	+ Clarke commented that rigor is missing from the plan. Athens responded that they are required to make the courses equally rigorous for face-to-face, online, and hybrid. The institution also has the course design rubric that sets the standard and they score against the rubric. OTL would quality review every online course and refresh on a regular basis. The review would be set by the faculty within the department. Clarke would like a two-step process: 1) quality review and 2) ensure departments do not go rogue.
	+ Green concerned about implementation issues such as SMEs. No problem with certification, but recertification and the costs associated and who pays for it.
	+ **MOTION** – Alan Clarke moved to extend discussion for five minutes. Jonathan Allred seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
	+ Connelly noted that schools and colleges do not use the PBA process to request funds to pay for adjunct training. He also noted that Faculty Senate felt it was inappropriate for Department Chairs to have access to Canvas Courses. Faculty Senate would need to make a fundamental change to say there is the ability other than the faculty member themselves to review the course.
	+ Rysdam concerned about certification process in Section A1. Recommends changing language to “required certification or equivalent.” Concern in Section B2 is about faculty not maintaining control over their curriculum. Inability to make changes without a certifying body is worrisome.
	+ Bartholomew noted in technology field always have major changes to make in course. Found that online/hybrid courses have lower SRI scores. If want cooperation for faculty to teach and certify online, need accommodation for the discrepancies.
	+ Green inquired if OTL has the appropriate staff in place to accomplish these goals. Athens noted that Department Chairs would be managing the courses for their departments and wise use of instructional design in order to prioritize appropriately.
	+ **MOTION** – Darrell Green moved to see an implementation of the plan with the comments currently received. Bob Robbins seconded. Richards proposed amendment for senators to review in depth the full document. Anderson will create an online document for comments. Green accepted both as friendly amendments. Comments due 2/28. All in favor? 32. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 0.
* Propose Revision/Creation of a Policy on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators [4:22 pm]
	+ Proposal is that Senate vote to take action to begin the process to revise/create a policy on faculty evaluation of administrators. Robbins provided background and reasons to begin the process of evaluating administrators. Sequence envisioned is for the Librarian to research other institutions and their processes, review research, review/modify the mechanism that can be used on an annual basis. Objective is to produce a mechanism for faculty to comment on administrator (executives, deans, and department chairs) functions. Olson reported that AA currently has a process to evaluate deans, but there is not a process where faculty can evaluate central administration.
	+ **MOTION** – Alan Clarke moved to conduct a fact-finding mission with the potential to create an Executive Summary that would lead to revision or creation of policy. Bob Robbins seconded. Ken Crook inquired “to what end?” Clarke reported that there have been cases where votes of no confidence led to dismissal. Richards feels that this is an opportunity to lead to more accountability. Olson noted that under current policy that executives serve at the pleasure of the President which includes vice presidents, deans, and associate vice presidents.
	+ **MOTION** – Alan Parry moved to extend the conversation for five minutes. Alan Clarke seconded. All in favor? Motion passed unanimously.
	+ This matter was addressed in a 2015 senate meeting and could be used as a starting point. This would bring a legitimate voice to faculty concerns and provide a forum to address those concerns and generate transparency on decisions. The proposed process is to note consistent patterns in the evaluation process. Olson noted there is an executive policy noting terms under which an administrator who has tenure, can go back to faculty. He also expressed concern about referencing the level of SRI evaluation given faculty’s perspective.
	+ All in favor? 31. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 0.
* Propose the Revision of Policy 640 – Faculty Sabbatical Leave [4:42 pm]
	+ Given current dialogue around sabbaticals and clearly defining the criteria for sabbaticals, the Executive Committee proposes the Faculty Senate investigate revising Policy 640 to clarify items.
	+ **MOTION** – Alan Clarke moved to conduct a fact-finding mission with the potential of creating an Executive Summary that would lead to revision of the policy. Ken Crook seconded. All in favor? 31. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 0.
* **ACTION ITEM** [4:45 pm]
	+ Policy 655 Comment Reviews
		- Section 4.5.1 – Tolman shared that Bailey provided a clear reason why directors should not be eligible. Clarke feels this is a problem. Olson provided clarification on the type of council UVU chose to follow. Discussion about purpose of the Graduate Council and the role of the Program Directors. All in favor? 28. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 3.
		- **MOTION** – Jonathan Allred moved to extend the discussion five minutes. Alan Parry seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
		- Sections 4.2.2.1/4.2.3.1 – Alan Parry moved to delete the comment. Ken Crook seconded. All in favor? 29. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 1.
	+ **MOTION** – Alan Parry moved to send comments forward. Jonathan Allred seconded. All in favor? 30. Opposed – 0. Abstained – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Statement for February 20, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting as read by Craig Thulin

 As Senators in the Faculty Senate, please encourage your colleagues to bring their concerns to you, and please do your part in making this body effective in pursuing the faculty’s interests in the shared governance of the University.

 This is the appropriate and productive channel for faculty voices. Faculty that have concerns can approach you as their Faculty Senate representative, they can approach any of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members including myself, or they can submit their concerns through the Questions/Inquiries Form on the Faculty Senate webpage, even anonymously if they so desire.

 The recent issue concerning sabbaticals, for instance, is better addressed through our channels of shared governance. ***I*** certainly understand the value and importance of sabbaticals in contributing to the quality of the education we give our students, and *you* certainly understand the value and importance of sabbaticals as well. But the average reader of the Daily Herald might not; and when they see a headline that says “Faculty concerned growth may mean fewer sabbaticals”, they might think that it is the faculty that need to reevaluate their perspective, not the administration. Furthermore, many state legislators might see the value and importance of sabbaticals much more like the average reader of the Daily Herald does, rather than like you and I know them to be, legislators who can make decisions that bind both the administration and us as faculty. We as the faculty can work within shared governance for the betterment of the University. The Faculty Senate is more than just an advising body, and can take action to revise and seek new policy, as we will be doing today, including on the issue of sabbaticals.

 If there is anything that I have done to cause anyone to doubt the utility of the Faculty Senate as the means of addressing their concerns with respect to shared governance, I apologize. I am fully committed to improving our discussions and to encouraging faculty to join in shared governance. But I want to remind everyone that ***I*** am not the Faculty Senate. *You* are. Please let’s join together with our faculty colleagues to improve UVU and the faculty’s situation at UVU by making the Faculty Senate the most responsive and positive instrument for shared governance that we can make it.



