**Faculty Senate Minutes**

March 7, 2017

CB 204, 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, Kat Brown, Josh Cieslewicz, Alan Clarke, David Connelly, Ken Crook, Karen Cushing, Courtney Davis, Debora Escalante, Brooklyn Fiscus (UVUSA), Sara Flood, Doug Gardner, Lindsey Gerber, Darrell Green, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Jia He, Robert Jorgensen, Lydia Kerr, Ryan Leick, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Duane Miller, Anthony Morris (Library), Shalece Nuttall (PACE), Jeff O’Flynn, Alan Parry, Jeff Peterson, Jim Pettersson, Karen Preston, Arianna Reilly, Denise Richards, Robert Robbins, Anthony Romrell, Sheri Rysdam, Leo Schlosnagle, Makenzie Selland, Tyler Standifird, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Robert Warcup, Paul Weber, Stephen Whyte, Alex Yuan

***Excused or Absent***: Dean Bohl, Steve Fellows, Matthew Holland, Gary Mercado, Jeff Olson, Hong Pang, Stuart Stein

***Guests:*** Jason Sweat, Pilar Hays

Call to order – 3:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from February 21, 2017.

ADMINISTRATION

* Trying to get Post Tenure in front of Faculty Senate before the end of the semester. If not, will be brought in fall.
* Academic Affairs is finalizing PBA requests. Legislature has restored 2% cut. Don’t have final outcomes on compensation.
* HB 344 – Academic Freedom and Protection Act did not pass.

LIBRARY

* Still holding Sunday hours and continue to see increased use.

UVUSA

* Student Government elections are taking place this week.
* Robbins requested all candidates put their signs in the recycle bin.

RTP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

* Morris shared findings on RTP Committees throughout USHE institutions and several peer institutions.
* Shared there are three levels of committees: Department, College, and University
* UVU current policy requires only a department level. Time from application submission to SVPAA approval is approximately 101 days. This is one of the shortest turnover times for USHE institutions. Most of peers and USHE institutions have more than one committee. Those that have only one are much smaller institutions. Eight of the 10 institutions had a longer timeline than UVU.
* Shared AAUP Policy recommendations. Faculty should have the primary role in evaluating faculty performance. If department committee does not have final authority, it should serve as the basis.
* Bracken will send the Library’s full review along with the chapter of the AAUP Policy.
* Pettersson then began discussion on Policy 637 – *Faculty Tenure* and encouraged all senators to review the proposed revisions. Faculty committee has worked to revise the policy along with Administration. He reminded senators that this committee is faculty driven. Feels this process has become a positive example of Shared Governance.
* Section 3.13 – Drafting committee recommended adding this new section and shift current sections down in the policy numbering.
* Section 5.6.9.1 – Based on input from committee and Administration defined committee, constitution, and terms of services.
* Section 5.6.9.1.2 – Committee will choose its own chair and the chair of the committee will have opportunity to serve for the balance of his or her term however long that will be.
* Section 5.6.9.1.1 – Because this will be the initial term for the committee, the committee will determine terms of initial service.
* Section 5.6.9.1.5 – The committee in consultation with Administration will develop an assessment instrument to evaluate portfolios. This is a living policy that is subject to change, modification, and growth of the institution. Pettersson clarified that the advisory committee will be reviewing all the portfolios and have no responsibility for denying or approving.
* Committee will recommend to the SVPAA whether the applicant appears to meet the criteria, appears to partially meet, or appears to not meet, and then make comment about which sections need to be reviewed more closely by the SVPAA’s office.
* Albrecht-Crane still does not understand what the committee does based on language within the document. Pettersson responded that the committee’s function is to review all previous reviews in relation to the tenure process. As an Appeal’s Committee, we have found that there have been problems at all three levels of review (RTP, Department Chair, and Dean) in the past. This Advisory Committee has an opportunity to have one more set of eyes to see if anything has been missed. Allred still concerned about the nature of the committee and it is a de facto committee and don’t like the idea of another vetting committee. Clarke feels the policy does not address a faculty member that has political motivation. Agrees that there should be another layer.
* Borchelt noted that Section 5.6.9.1.5 creates concern as department criteria should have primary weight. Pettersson noted the guidelines for the committee will be based on overarching university policy and guidelines. Departments can expand to meet their needs. Borchelt expressed concern about serving on the committee as Section 5.6.9.14 states an “Advisory committee members are expected to read and understand university departmental college RTP criteria…” Pettersson noted assignments will be made and portfolios should contain the departmental criteria that advisory committee members will reference. The Appeals Committee is trying to put something together to make the process more efficient and of quality.
* Richards asked about the instrument and how it will be broken down for departments that have different RTP criteria. McAdams-Jones responded that the instrument will be a standard for all departments. Pettersson reiterated that the advisory committee is not dictating to departments what their criteria should be.
* Arendt noted that this committee is to support the advisory committee. She also stated that if Faculty Senate is going to make RTP Committees more effective, what teeth are you proposing to enforce on the RTP committees to make them do their job better.
* Bracken commented that the committee is to review to be sure the portfolios have provided evidence of the criteria required for tenure.
* **MOTION** – Thulin moved to expand discussion time by 7 minutes. Breton seconded. All in favor? 3 Opposed. 3 – Abstained. Motion passed.
* Clarke noted there is a problem with the conception. Feels the advisory committee should be an appellate committee and only address problematic files. Schlosnagle supports Clarke’s comments. Who’s to say this committee will be any more effective and fill in gaps left by RTP Committee. Bracken noted that for one person to continue to process all portfolios of our size cannot continue. Thulin expressed that Faculty Senate has lost sight of what this policy is about. He noted there is one committee decision and three unilateral decisions. This proposal is that instead of having one committee other than university administration, University Administration is inviting faculty to review as any other mature institution and assist in the overall tenure review process. Each school/college will have a representative on this RTP Advisory Committee. Tolman commented that this is only a restructuring of the process not another level of decision-making. Brown clarified that the President has stated that all portfolios are to be reviewed.
* Albrecht-Crane expressed that the current language is vague and confusing and needs to be strengthened. Would like to see this committee flag problematic portfolios.
* Recommendation was to move the advisory committee to function earlier in the process. Pettersson responded this is not the function of this committee.
* Send feedback to Pettersson in preparation for discussion on March 21 and move to President’s Council on March 23.

NON-DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

* Combined requirements from various statutes to state you cannot discriminate. Statements should be on all recruitment and application materials. The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has released a combined documents telling us how to comply with all of these at the same time.
* Referenced statement can be found on website [www.uvu.edu/compliance/required-disclosures.html](http://www.uvu.edu/compliance/required-disclosures.html). Not something we have to do, but something UVU has chosen to do to be inclusive.
* If your printed materials do not have this statement, you can add a sticker or reprint.
* Any questions if something should include the statement, contact Jason Sweat.
* Office of Risk Management went live today. Contains everything that risk management handles at UVU. See [www.uvu.edu/riskmanagement](http://www.uvu.edu/riskmanagement).

WINDOW COVERINGS

* Olson sent a statement to Bracken to be read in Faculty Senate that due to the questions from the senate, that the Infrastructure Committee will take it under advisement and re-evaluate.
* Robbins shared a faculty member’s concern about privacy for religious beliefs.
* Bracken would like senators and faculty to send comments to the following link as to why faculty need privacy in their office. Link <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-KC14bEy2wv4YdL7KmDkdTd0ZOlb_f1Jhwqd_TbbsW4/edit>
* Nuttall noted this is not only a faculty issue, but a staff and student issue.

POLICY

* Both Policy 606 – *Adoption of Course Materials and Textbooks* and Policy 633- *Annual Faculty Reviews* are in Stage 2 until March 23rd. There is nothing behind these policies in Faculty Senate cue. If review the list of policies coming up for Stage 2, there are about 10. It takes three senate meetings at minimum to get through our process. Briefly reviewed policies coming up for Stage 2.
* Policy 606 – *Adoption of Course Materials and Textbooks*
  + First table is summary of initial comments. Second table is original comments. When comments move forward, all names are stripped.
  + Item A - Peterson noted that academic freedom is not the right to choose what textbook is used. Clarke adamantly disagreed. Leick commented that we are not trying to define what academic freedom is in the policy and refocused conversation back to actual comments. Clarke shared that he should have the right to select a book that is appropriate for the topic/subject matter he is teaching. He does not support the overall process the policy is addressing in regards to course materials and textbooks. Leave comment as is for now.
  + Item B – Non-Text Materials. Suggestion on how to reword “course materials” and redefine to state “textbook or purchased items from bookstore.” Peterson shared that many faculty are beginning to use more than a text. Leick noted that the definition of Section 3.2 addresses course materials that could be “acquired” which could also addresses OER materials. Clarke shared that he should be able to reference the New York Times that is pertinent to his course and share that information in class. Abunuwara restated that if we strike “course materials” or “acquired” does not fall within the purview of the policy. Peterson noted we need to find a balance to be sure providing quality materials as well. Parry feels that this policy should only be addressing course materials/textbooks that address COI. Hays reported that the committee addressed both issues of COI and quality of course materials. Hays recommended clarifying language by stating “optional textbooks or other course materials that were intended as primary instructional materials in the building of the course.” Senate stated no. Hays referenced the seven required items from the Regents policy. Parry feels this policy should not control at all what course materials a faculty member chooses. Price shared that sometimes a faculty member has special expertise that no one else has. Clarke shared that most of Faculty Senate feels that the policy should state the faculty should obey these criteria with the exception when it relates to Conflict of Interest (COI).
  + **MOTION** – Clarke moved that this policy address COI only and leave choice of textbook and course materials up to the faculty within the criteria related to the course. Thulin seconded. All in favor? 3 – Opposed. 5 – Abstained. Motion passed.
  + Discussion timed out so moves to next meeting.
* Policy 633 – *Annual Faculty Reviews*
  + Item 3 – McAdams-Jones shared a template of criteria. Brown clarified that the template was a draft developed by the Shared Governance Committee. The template was removed from policy because it was a practice not policy, but would be used as the basis for review. Bracken will send the template to the Faculty Senate, but Department Chairs should have provided faculty with a copy. Thulin clarified that the template is a practice. Cieslewicz would like language to state that the template be approved by a body. Brown recommended that language include Faculty Senate and the SVPAA. Connelly also recommended that language include it will be reviewed every five years. Schlosnagle expressed concern that reviews take too much time to accomplish. McAdams-Jones noted it is a process that must be done. Schwab surveyed senators to find out who is currently doing annual reviews and only about half the departments are conducting them. Feels that there is task saturation. Richards shared that we should expect to be accountable and hold annual reviews, just as we expect to hold our Deans and Administration accountable. Clarke does not disagree to have performance reviews, just does not want them to be onerous. Need flexibility for small departments and requiring an RTP to conduct a review. Robbins feels the process should be stream-lined and simple. Cieslewicz noted that departments could be in control of the review. Leick noted the committee wanted to create a process that is simple and looks back one year and forward one year, then evaluates what goals were accomplished and sets new goals for the next year.
  + Item 4 – Richards would like language to be more explicit on term “evidence-based.”
  + Bracken asked all senators to review the policies, then review the comments and line out what they don’t want and circle what they want to keep. Officially there is only a 60-day window and comments could be closed if we miss the window. He noted if this Annual Review is not in place, it could place our accreditation in jeopardy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.