**Faculty Senate Minutes**

April 12, 2016

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Kim Abunuwara, Christa Albrecht-Crane, Anne Arendt, Howard Bezzant, Debanjan Bhattacharjee, Dean Bohl, Mark Borchelt, Mark Bracken, Bret Breton, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, Josh Cieslewicz, David Connelly, Rob Cousins, Ken Crook, Karen Cushing, Courtney Davis, , Dustin Fife (Library), Doug Gardner, Lindsey Gerber, Barry Hallsted, Matthew Holland, John Hunt, Ellis Jensen, Robert Jorgensen, Lydia Kerr, Ryan Leick, Duane Miller, CheolHwan Oh, Jeff Olson, Jeff Peterson, Jim Pettersson, Karen Preston, Alex Ramirez, Robert Robbins, Matt Robins (UVUSA), Sheri Rysdam, Cyrill Slezak, Allison Swenson, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Violeta Vasilevska, Alex Yuan

***Excused or Absent***: Steve Allred, Brian Barthel, Joel Bradford, Alan Clarke, Marty Clayton, Debora Escalante, Ron Hammond, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Sherry Harward (PACE), Dianne McAdams-Jones, Gary Mercado, David Morin, Tyler Nelson, Stuart Stein

***Guests:*** Fidel Montero

Call to order – 3:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from March 8, 2016. Minutes approved.

SVPAA (Olson)

* Academic Master Plan Presentation
	+ Reviewed process leading up to the Academic Master Plan feeding into the Facilities Master Plan including what data, information, and groups that fed into the process.
	+ Recommended scenario is to integrate and make more extensive use of Orem and West campuses to maintain opportunities for interdisciplinary cohesion, reduce need for duplicate services, and note that transportation between campuses is still in question. Next buildings on Orem campus identified.
	+ Make more effective use of Orem/West Campus through various modalities of learning, priority booking of classrooms and specialized spaces, and that future enrollment projections can be met by incorporating the above changes and addition of currently planned facilities.
	+ Vineyard will house facilities that don’t fit on the Orem Campus such as a research/innovation park, athletic facilities, Emergency Management vehicles and training facilities, and standalone programs as necessary.
	+ Branch Campus Extension Sites will be established or expanded where most growth is expected and will offer programs appropriate for the community. Vineyard will be considered an auxillary of the Orem campus.
	+ Schools and Colleges structures will be reviewed and systematic changes made where appropriate.
	+ Engaged Curricula is one of five pillars and requires more specialized facilities, labs, and teaching spaces which will require remodeling and conversion. Will create a BYOD policy and virtual labs. Need to equip classrooms accordingly.
	+ Discussed Concurrent Enrollment and the increase of online offerings will allow students to complete strategic certificates and degrees.
	+ Holland reported that UDOT has been approached about a walkway to connect the two campuses. All buildings are a hurdle with the Legislature and we must demonstrate a need in order to make the argument as we move forward. He also responded that we got more aggressive on facility master plan in response to Faculty Senate’s input about traffic safety on campus. Hired a firm to examine traffic and safety implications. Will share analysis when complete. Holland expressed thanks to all for their input on the process and taking it seriously.
	+ Growth at UVU over the next 10 years is exponential compared to the U and Utah State. The Legislature is hearing this and is one reason why we have been able to obtain the buildings and funds needed.
	+ We have an active K-16 Alliance and are working more closely with teachers in the district to get the students more prepared to enter the university. Common Core continues to be an issue and are given support for increased rigor. Higher Ed has taken a role in assessing the standards to ensure students are better prepared for post-secondary education.
	+ Math Proposal for funding of high school teachers to help them be better prepared in math instruction. Partnership developed with K-16 Alliance.

PRESIDENT (Holland)

* Bringing presentation made to leadership to Faculty Senate. Noted that the problem with the budget planning cycle is when rolled out, faculty are gone over the summer.
* Provided history on how mission, vision, core themes, etc. were integrated. Core of what we are about is Student Success and achieved by being Serious, Engaged, and Inclusive. Being a “large” institution, we need to secure resources, manage growth, and operate effectively which means these should drive our planning process at all levels (President, Divisional, Department, and Individual).
* Mission statement affirms we are teaching institution focused on student success. To help fulfill this, we have core themes, administrative imperatives, objectives, and indicators to help drive, assess, and, measure.
* Planning Model
	+ Aim (Mission Statement, Core Themes, Administrative Imperatives, Objectives, and Indicators)
	+ Assessment
		- Institutional Review Process
		- Division/Department Review Process
		- UPAC (SWOT, Self-Evaluation)
		- NWCCU
	+ Planning
		- Annual Areas of Focus
		- Rolling 4-Year Strategic Plan; Annual Work Plans, Resources Requests
		- Ongoing Institutional Improvements; Institution-wide Plans (Inclusion and Completion)
	+ Action
		- Resource Allocation
		- Work Plans
		- Daily Activity
* Holland noted that this should be brought down to the individual level from the Administrative level. Want to make the process better.
* Areas of Focus 2016 in preparation for the next PBA Cycle
	+ Improve student retention & completion
	+ Expand and enhance the array of courses, programs, delivery methods to meet students’ goals, and the region’s education need.
	+ Strategically allocate divisional/departmental resources to achieve institutional objectives.
* Why These?
	+ Vulnerable on retention and completion
	+ Legislature will be looking more on graduation/completion rates
	+ Growing
	+ Student profile
* Data for Areas of Focus
	+ Unless continue to be strategic and deliver our academic product, will create challenges in the future.
	+ Student Profile – 76% employed; 56% work more than 30 hours; 45% married; 23% support 1 child; 37% work part-time; 41% 25 or older; 36% first generation students
	+ Keep these in mind as move forward and participate in the process.
* Olson noted that the Department Chairs were given this presentation in March and inquired how many senators were informed about the priorities and the planning process. Only two indicated that they were provided the information.
* Reminder about the NWCCU accreditation site visit in 2017. Need to focus on outcomes assessment. Faculty would like to see measurements in both quantitative and qualitative ways. Holland responded that he is philosophically and personally sympathetic. Pragmatically we have to do it. Departments should be determining how they can qualitatively measure in concert with other institutional things that will have to be numbered. Some of the best qualitative measures are to be done at the local level. Holland noted we are being held accountable for graduation rates and need to be better than we are doing for our type of institution.
* Olson commented that accrediting bodies want better evidence of outcomes for students. If the department has a systematic process for qualitative review and can demonstrate the outcomes for student improvement that would be acceptable.
* Holland is open to receiving formal feedback. Bracken will follow up with the Executive Committee for further direction.
* Need to make sure departmental and program review information is accessible to the public.
* Olson addressed what considerations are being taken when PBA decisions are being made.

UVUSA (Robins)

* Final Academic Senate Speaker is Max Greenfield on April 14, 2016 at Noon in the UCCU Events Center. He will be talking about the importance of arts in his life as well as stories surrounding his personal successes and failures.
* If you know of students seeking leadership opportunities, have them contact Matt Robins directly. Applications are due April 22, 2016 at Noon.

Miscellaneous

* Invite new senators to Faculty Senate next week so they can vote for the new executive committee members.

POLICY

* Policy 605 – *Curriculum Approval Process*. Big issue was addressing the composition of the college curriculum committee. It is not policy on how that is done. What they have said is that each college would establish a charter. **MOTION** – Doug Gardner motioned to approve the policy with collected comments. Ryan Leick seconded. All in favor? 1 - Abstained. Motion passed.
* Policy 101 – *Policy Governing Policies* (Limited Scope). This limited scope is updating language so that all legal questions go to UVU Legal counsel then to Attorney General’s office. **MOTION** – Karen Preston motioned to accept the policy as is with no comments. Christa Albrecht-Crane seconded. Connelly expressed some concern about wording “as needed” sounds vague. Section 5.3.5 allows anytime, anywhere, any place. He noted that all policy must be reviewed by the specified entities. No solution recommended. All in favor? 2-Opposed. 2-Abstained. Motion passed.
* Policy 109 – *Contacting the Attorney General’s Office Temporary Emergency* (Limited Scope). Arendt expressed that Section 4.1.1 provides against seeking outside legal counsel and would there ever be a circumstance that a faculty or staff needs outside counsel. Would like clarification about individuals seeking outside counsel and when permission is needed to do so. Cushing read minutes from the March 8, 2016 meeting addressing this policy. Of specific note was Clemes indicating she would “carve out language to address specific situations when seeking approval from a supervisor.” Arendt expressed concern that it is written in such a way that outside counsel cannot be obtained. **MOTION** – Robbins motioned to extend discussion three minutes. Clayton Brown seconded. All in favor? 2-Opposed. Motion passed. Robbins supported Arendt’s concerns and believes the process is cumbersome. Leick noted that Clemes comments in the previous minutes noted a “primary” responsibility. **MOTION** – Ryan Leick motioned to table discussion to the next meeting. Dean Bohl seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

FACULTY EXCELLENCE AWARDS (Thulin)

* The Resolution is proposed to do five things: 1) expanding awards; 2) clarification and improvement of criteria for school/college excellence committees; 3) clarification and improvement for the process of nomination; 4) clarification and improvement application of the nominees; and 5) clarification and improvement on criteria and the process of selection of awardees.
* Albrecht-Crane expressed concern about not adding additional awardees and the use of recognitions. Thulin rebutted that the Faculty Excellence Award winner is traditional and should be recognized as such. The additional recognitions is a compromise. Albrecht-Crane argued that should have proportionality throughout the process. Another senator argued that judging each faculty member based on the same criteria regardless of the disciplines should be considered. Thulin noted that the committee felt to keep tradition and not create a university-wide committee. Albrecht-Crane wants a more equitable process and not just a “recognition.” Peterson supported Thulin’s argument that the individual schools/colleges determine who has achieved excellence within their school/college. Changing the term “award” to other options was discussed. The nomination process has changed over the years so the nominee is not having to create a huge proposal. Albrecht-Crane supports the increase of awards to recognize more faculty due to the lack of merit pay. **MOTION** – Christa Albrecht-Crane motioned to change all awards and recognitions to Faculty Excellence Awards. Robbins seconded. Bracken expressed concern over changing all to awards would potentially decrease the possibility of obtaining additional awards due to the amount of money requesting. All in favor? 7-Opposed. 7-Abstained. Motion failed. **MOTION** – Anne Arendt motioned to approve the motion with a friendly amendment to change the title of the additional recognitions. Duane Miller seconded. Albrecht-Crane would like an opportunity to ask more questions. Arendt pulled the Motion. **MOTION** – Motioned was made to table discussion until next week. All in favor? 3-Opposed. 1-Abstained. Motion passed.
* **MOTION** – Doug Gardner motioned to extend meeting for five minutes. Duane Miller seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.

SRIs

* Arendt motioned to adopt the new SRI questions beginning in summer 2016. Ellis Jensen seconded. Thulin reported that the additional questions make the new SRI more effective. All in favor? 1-Opposed. 2-Abstained. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

**UVU Faculty Senate Resolution Improvements to the**

**Faculty Excellence Awards**

Whereas:

The Faculty Excellence Awards are honors given under the auspices of the UVU Faculty Senate and are accolades recognizing faculty excellence, especially in teaching;

And whereas:

The current structure of these Awards does not result in proportional recognition of the UVU faculty across the University, compromising both participation in and significance of the Awards;

And whereas:

The Faculty Excellence Committees of the various Schools/Colleges-which select the Award winners-lack sufficient uniformity across the University but also need sufficient flexibility to make their selections as proficiently as could be;

And whereas:

The process for nomination for recipients of the Awards and the process of application by nominees for evaluation by the Faculty Excellence Committees are currently neither sufficiently clear nor optimal to facilitate participation in the process and the selection of the best candidates as awardees;

Therefore, be it resolved that:

1. The number of Senate Faculty Excellence Awards be expanded in a tiered fashion based upon the total number of full time faculty in each School/College.

The current practice of recognizing at graduation one Full-time Faculty Excellence Award winner and one Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award winner from each School/College is an important tradition in a public graduation ceremony that should be retained.

However, the wide disparity in the sizes (as seen in the full-time faculty count) of the various Schools/Colleges of the University results in an inequitable opportunity to win and distribution of the award (both money and prestige), as Schools/Colleges with as many as 130 faculty members receive the same number of awards as those with less 30 faculty members.

Continuing the tradition, a single Full-time Faculty recipient will be chosen in each School/College. In addition, *one additional* Faculty Excellence *Recognition* will be given in each School/College *for every 25full-time faculty members beyond thefirst 25.* (This is the same rule that governs the number of representatives in the Faculty Senate. Thus, while a small School/College of 30 full-time faculty would continue to have both an Adjunct and Faculty Excellence Award winner, they would not be granted any extra Faculty Excellence
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Recognition recipients. By contrast, a larger School/College of 130 full-time faculty would have both an Adjunct and Faculty Excellence Award winner and four Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients).

The Faculty Excellence Award would continue to include $2,000 cash award as it has, and Faculty Excellence *Recognition* would include $1,000 for each awardee. (Note: These dollar amounts are not yet funded. See Appendix VI.)

Similarly, a single Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award recipient will be chosen in each School/College, with additional Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognition given for proportional representation among adjunct faculty, equal to and not to exceed the number of full-time Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients for the School/College. The Adjunct Excellence Award would continue to include $1,000 cash award as it has, and Adjunct Excellence *Recognition* would include $500 for each awardee. (Note: These dollar amounts are not yet funded. See Appendix VI.)

These awards-including full-time Faculty Excellence Awards and Faculty Excellence Recognitions as well as Adjunct Faculty Excellence Awards and Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognitions-will be selected by the School/College Faculty Excellence Committees, employing a single nomination and application process for all of the awards

and selecting from that pool of applicants (one pool for the full-time awards and another for the adjunct awards).

1. Criteria and guidelines for the constitution of School/College Faculty Excellence Committees (FEC) be clarified and improved.

Faculty Excellence Committees have been insufficiently consistent across the University and have lacked clarity. The guidelines for the constitution of these Committees are delineated in Appendix I of this Resolution. These guidelines supplant those in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

1. The process for nomination for Awards be clarified and improved.

The nomination process for the Faculty Excellence Awards has lacked clarity and (perhaps as a result) participation. The nomination process as improved is delineated in Appendix II of this Resolution. This process supplants that in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website. Because there is frequently confusion among the general faculty about the process, each year the Faculty Senate President will send out a succinct "Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations ", which will also be published on the Faculty Senate website (see Appendix V of this Resolution).

1. The process for nominees submitting applications to the FEC be clarified and improved.
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Submission of applications by those nominated for the Awards has lacked clarity and uniformity across the University, resulting in unnecessary burden to some Faculty Excellence Committees and an insufficient basis for selecting awardees by others. The application process as improved is delineated in Appendix III of this Resolution. This process supplants that in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines

previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

5. The criteria for selection of awardees by the FEC be clarified and improved. Selection of faculty to receive Awards should have some uniformity across the

University; but it needs to be recognized that differences across the academy justify

variations and adaptation from one School or College to another. The selection criteria as clarified are delineated in Appendix IV of this Resolution. These criteria supplant those in the Faculty Senate Faculty Excellence Award Guidelines previously published each year on the Faculty Senate website, and will be published on the Faculty Senate website.

(Note: Text in appendices I through IV that is shown in black is taken verbatim from existing FEA guidelines. Changes are indicated in red text.)
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**Appendix I**

**Faculty Excellence Awards School/Colle&e Faculty Excellence Committees**

Each School or College from the list below should have a regularly constituted Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC) composed of a minimum of five committee members.

Schools and Colleges which will each have a Faculty Excellence Committee: 1. School of the Arts

1. School of Education
2. Woodbury School of Business
3. College of Aviation and Public Services
4. College of Humanities and Social Sciences
5. College of Science and Health
6. College of Technology and Computing
7. University College

The Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC) is to consist of the following individuals:

* The chair of the committee is the representative of the Faculty Senate Faculty Development Committee (FDC) from that School/College. The chair will have a vote the same as all committee members. It is the responsibility of the chair to organize the committee and preside over meetings, handle any committee disputes, ensure the adherence to guidelines within the committee, and keep the FDC informed on the functioning of their award committee. (If the chair is nominated that year for the FEA or has an ethical or moral conflict of interest, the co-chair will assume the duties of the chair, in coordination with the FDC chair.)
* The co-chair of the committee is the previous year's FEA full-time faculty recipient from that School/College. The co-chair will have a vote the same as all committee members. It is the responsibility of the co-chair to assist the chair with meetings or disputes or tasks as assigned by the chair. The co-chair works with the FEC Committee for one year following his/her receipt of the FEA.
* At least three members of the committee will be from various departments within the college. Members of the committee other than the chair (the FDC representative) and the co-chair (previous year's FEA recipient) will be selected by each School/College according to the School/College's chosen process, should serve for a minimum of three years, and their service will be tracked by the Faculty Senate Service and Elections Committee to ensure continuity. Ifa committee member is nominated for the award, they should recuse themselves and a new member can be selected to serve for that year on the committee.
* Department chairs, associate deans, and deans are not permitted to sit on this committee unless they are the winners of the awards from the previous year.

Note: Any exceptions to deadlines, disputes, or other issues need to be agreed upon by a majority vote of the FEC.
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**Appendix II**

**Faculty Excellence Awards Nomination for Awards**

ELIGIBILITY

1. Full-time faculty members must have completed at least two years of teaching at UVU and be currently employed at the University. At least 50% of his/her workload must be teaching.
2. An adjunct faculty member must be in at least his/her third semester of teaching at UVU and must have taught a minimum of one class each semester.
3. FEA recipients are not eligible for the award until the fifth year following the year in which they received the award. For instance, if a faculty member receives an Award in 2015, they would not be eligible again until 2020. The Award is intended to recognize excellence during the last five years, not over an accumulative career. Recipients of Faculty Excellence Recognition are not eligible for Recognition or the FEA until the third year following the year in which they received Recognition.

NOMINATION PROCEDURE

1. Nominations may be provided by full-time and adjunct faculty members (including self-nominations) to their department chairs or by the faculty member's chair by the appropriate date listed. The department, as a whole, provides input and assists the department chair in selecting the nominee that will best represent their department.
2. Nominations need consist of only the nominee's name and a brief justification of the nomination. Though these justifications will be communicated to the FEC, they are not the basis for selection of the Awards; the Award Application is. Nomination is not done via any online form, but can be submitted to department chairs via email or other written communication.
3. Each department will nominate one candidate to represent their department's

full-time faculty (including lecturers), or two candidates from a department that has more than 25 full-time faculty.

1. Each department will nominate one candidate to represent their department's adjunct faculty, or two candidates from a department that has more than 25 adjunct faculty.
2. Nominated faculty members will be notified of nomination by and subsequently submit their Award Application to their FDC representative by the appropriate deadlines, following the Award Applications guidelines.
3. The college or school's FEC Committee will review the applications and select the FEA recipients according to selection criteria on the Faculty Senate website.

TIMETABLE

A. Each ear the FEA rocess will roceed with the followin deadlines:

1st Tuesday in December Call for nominations distributed from Faculty

Senate President
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| znd Tuesday of Spring sem | All nominations due to department chairs |
| 3ro Tuesday of Spring semester | Department chairs to send one (or two) full-time faculty and one (or two) adjunct faculty member's name as decided by that department to the School/College Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC). Department chair will inform nominees and the School/College FEC. |
| 4t11 Friday of Spring semester | Nominees' applications are due to their FEC chair (the School/College Faculty Development Committee representative), who forwards the applications to the rest of the FEC. |
| 5t1t Tuesday of Spring semester (on or about) | The FEC Committee meets to evaluate applications and rank at least the top two nominees in each category (plus additional Faculty Excellence Recognitions if applicable). |
| 1st Tuesday after Valentines Day | Faculty Excellence Award and Recognition potential recipients' names are sent to the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL). OTL then forwards the names of potential recipients to Human Resources and Academic Affairs. |
| 1st Thursday in March | After receiving clearance from Human Resources and Academic Affairs, OTL reports findings to the Faculty Center, Faculty Senate President, Campus Awards Committee and the institutional awarding officers and entities. |
| Friday following 1st Thursday in March | Faculty Senate President as awarding officer (or designee) notifies FEA recipients, chairs, deans, and College Marketing. |
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**Appendix** III

**Faculty Excellence Awards Awards Auulications**

Nominees will submit applications electronically (i.e. in the form of a PDF document) to their Schoolf College FEC chair (FDC representative). Applications should be complete but succinct, avoiding production of a tenure portfolio. Nominees should familiarize themselves with the Criteria for Award Selection (available on the Faculty Senate website). School/College FEC Committees have latitude to adjust these application guidelines to fit the needs of their individual School/College should they choose to do so.

The application will consist of one to two pages for each of the three areas: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Listing of previous awards, honors, and recognition should include information allowing verification (e.g. website for the organization that granted the award, or a link to a published citation of a recognition). Original evidence-such as certificates, etc.-is not to be included. Evidence should be limited to the past five years.

Some examples of possible evidence may include, but is not limited to:

Teaching -A brief statement of teaching philosophy, listing of teaching awards, peer and supervisor reviews, participation in teaching workshops or related faculty development programs, and student ratings of instruction (SRI's), etc. SRI's may be summarized, or included in entirety, at the discretion of the FEC. SRis should be from the past two or three years.

Scholarship - Evidence of professional development, scholarly activities, evidence of presentations, publications, creative projects, etc. Papers themselves are not to be included, though abstracts-or titles with links to publications online-are appropriate. Evidence of mentoring and involvement of students in scholarship is encouraged.

Service - Evidence of commitment and collegiality and service to the department, school, college, university, or the community, peer or supervisory evaluations, awards and recognition, grants, committee appointments, writing letters of recommendation for students, etc.

Applications for the Adjunct Awards will focus on the Teaching area only. School/College FEC Committees may wish to distribute examples (wherein identifying information has been deleted or changed) of successful applications from the past as models for new applicants.

If further evidence is required, the School/College FEC Committee will request them from the faculty nominee.

Applications are to be turned in to the FEC chair (FDC representative) by the fourth Friday of Spring semester.
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**Appendix IV Faculty Excellence Awards**

**Criteria for Awards Selection**

The FDC encourages the FEC of each individual School/College to devise their ownselection procedures. The final selections for the Awards (one full-time Faculty Excellence Award and one Adjunct Faculty Excellence Award) and Recognitions (one Faculty Excellence Recognition given in each School/College for every 25 full-time faculty members beyond the first 25, and additional Adjunct Faculty Excellence Recognition given for proportional representation among adjunct faculty, not to exceed the number of

full-time Faculty Excellence Recognition recipients for the School/College) will be selected by the FEC Committee.

Regardless of the criteria employed, the FEC Committee will weight Teaching the most (50%) and will establish the relative weights for Scholarship and Service up to a combined total weight of 50%. FEC Committee will evaluate the nominee based on the supporting evidence and documentation submitted in the nominee's application. As a guideline, the FEC could base selections according to the rubric included below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate's Name | 4 pts | 3 pts | 2 pts | 1pt | Overall Ranking |
| *Teaching-Includes any of thefollowing:** Student evaluations
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Statement of teaching philosophy
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Teaching awards
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Peer and supervisor reviews
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Participation in workshops
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarship/Creative Work- *Includes any of thefollowing:** Evidence of publications,

presentations or creativeprojects that advance discovery integration or application within discipline |  |  |  |  |  |
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4pts x 9 boxes=36 total points possible

50% of pts go towa rds teachi ng and the rest of the 50% pts combine scholarship and service. NOTES:
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Appendix V

Faculty Excellence Awards Call for Awards Nominations

The following is an example of a succinct Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations to be posted on the Faculty Senate website (perhaps as an HTML document, not just a document to be downloaded or opened by the user) as well as sent out to the entire faculty each year near the beginning of December (the first Tuesday of December, as called for in the timetable) from the Faculty Senate President.

Call for Faculty Excellence Awards Nominations

Each year the UVU Faculty Senate sponsors the

Faculty Excellence Awards and Recognitions

One full-time faculty member and one adjunct faculty member from each School and College,

With additional Recognitions in larger Schools or Colleges.

Nominate your faculty colleagues that you believe to be deserving of this honor, including colleagues among the adjunct faculty as well as the full-time faculty.

Self-nomination is acceptable.

Nominations are to be sent to your department chair,

who will direct the department as a group in choosing the final nominees (one full-time\* and one adjunct\*) who will represent your department for evaluation by the School/College Faculty Excellence Committee.

Nominations should be based on Teaching, Service, and Scholarship.

You may include a brief justification for your nomination, though it is not required.

Send your nominations to your department chair by the deadline:

the second Tuesday of Spring Semester.

For more information, please see the Faculty Senate website at Link.

\*departments with more than 25 faculty may select two nominees
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**Appendix VI Faculty Excellence Awards**

**Funding for Awards & Recognition**

The University administration has indicated agreement to increase the funding for the Faculty Excellence Awards in order to accommodate the additional Recognitions.

However, specific funding levels have not been approved, pending an early PBA request in the Fall of 2016. Below are the present expenditures and the forecast expenditures for the expanded FEA with Recognitions at three different funding levels. The Faculty Senate should decide on a level to request in the PBA process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current process: |  |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $24,000.00 |

Proposed process: (higher funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $1000 | $13,000.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $500 | $6,500.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $43,500.00 |

Proposed process: (moderate funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $750 | $9,750.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $350 | $4,550.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $38,300.00 |
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Proposed process: (lower funding level)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # Full-time awards | 8 | x $2000 | $16,000.00 |
| # Full-time recognitions | 13 | x $500 | $6,500.00 |
| # Adjunct awards | 8 | x $1000 | $8,000.00 |
| # Adjunct recognitions\* | 13 | x $250 | $3,250.00 |
| TOTAL |  |  | $33,750.00 |

Resolution on Faculty Excellence Awards Page 12 of 12

**SRI Proposal from the Faculty Development Committee**

**Whereas:** New SRI questions have been developed over the course of the past five years (the process began in early 2011) and have been piloted in several departments for three or more semesters and then campus-wide (alongside the current SRI questions) during Summer 2015 and Fall 2015 as well as the current semester.

**And Whereas:** Analyses of the piloting of the new SRI questions have shown them to be at least as effective as the current questions and completely compatible in terms of quantitative aspects; and the additional new questions add significantly to what we learn about the effectiveness of teaching and learning at UVU.

**Therefore be it resolved:** That the new SRI questions be adopted for permanent use across campus, beginning Summer term 2016.

**It should be noted** that this is NOT a discussion of how to affect student participation in the SRI process, nor is it a discussion on the overall topic of how teaching quality should be measured (including the role SRI's should play in that evaluation). Those are two very

important discussions that the Faculty Senate should engage in, and will take up at the beginning of Fall; but this present discussion is limited to whether or not we should adopt the new SRI questions."