**Faculty Senate Minutes**

April 4, 2017

CB 511, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Christa Albrecht-Crane, Huda Al-Ghaib, Anne Arendt, Brian Barthel, Howard Bezzant, Mark Borchelt, Mark Bracken, Bret Breton, Kat Brown, Alan Clarke, Ken Crook, Courtney Davis, Debora Escalante, Jensen Astle (UVUSA), Sara Flood, Doug Gardner, Lindsey Gerber, Darrell Green, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Jia He, Robert Jorgensen, Lydia Kerr, Ryan Leick, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Anthony Morris (Library), Jeff Olson, Hong Pang, Alan Parry, Jeff Peterson, Jim Pettersson, Karen Preston, Arianna Reilly, Denise Richards, Robert Robbins, Sheri Rysdam, Leo Schlosnagle, Makenzie Selland, Tyler Standifird, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Robert Warcup, Paul Weber, Alex Yuan

***Excused or Absent***: Kim Abunuwara, Steve Allred, Dean Bohl, Josh Cieslewicz, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Steve Fellows, Matthew Holland, Gary Mercado, Duane Miller, Shalece Nuttall (PACE), Jeff O’Flynn, Anthony Romrell, Stuart Stein, Stephen Whyte

***Guests:*** Karen Clemes, Scott Wood

Call to order – 3:00 p.m.

Final Senate meetings will be held April 11 and 18. We still need a quorum to take any action.

Approval of Minutes from March 28, 2017. Minutes approved.

SVPAA

* Expressed thanks to Faculty Senate for all the work being done on the policies.

LIBRARY

* Thanks to faculty for helping make Sunday hours a success. Attendance is between 400-500 each week.

UVUSA

* Applications for student senators are open through April 7.

POLICY 633 – *ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEWS*

* Leick reported that he took all the previous comments and the eight guiding principles and put that into suggested language for the policy. Reminder, these are only suggestions. Reviewed slides that touched on the eight guiding principles. See attached. All comments are listed in the summary of comments document.
* Referencing mid-year hires, faculty would need to write an annual plan for the remaining evaluation period. Olson noted that this could be a comment that Senate puts into the process.
* Departments could develop criteria for non-tenure track faculty and contain them in the general criteria or create a separate document. Olson reported that in WSB, under AACSB accreditation, they are supposed to have Professionals-in-Residence who are evaluated on their professional contributions. They are not tenure track or tenured, they are three or four-year renewal contracts. In order to be renewed, they have to satisfy certain criteria. Clarke noted that either the criteria applies to all faculty regardless of position or that non-tenure track are always going to be teaching. Brown reported that the RTP criteria has not in the past, but it can include information for non-tenure track faculty. Clarke would like to see language clarified specifically for non-tenure track faculty. Add comment to clarify status of anyone on the non-tenure track that says something to the fact that they will be evaluated based upon criteria upon which they were hired or rehired if continuing contract.
* Richards recommended that the evaluation process be moved to a calendar year basis to so that faculty aren’t waiting until May to complete their reviews as waiting for SRI results to be posted. Brown’s prefers the spring because if there is a negative annual review and the faculty member is going up for tenure or rank advancement and wants to be sure the annual review is appealed, they have enough time before submitting application materials to their committees and have the appeal concluded.
* Section 5.1.6 – If a faculty member has not received an annual review due to no fault of their own, what can a faculty member do? Leick noted that a faculty member would be responsible to submit a self-evaluation and if there is no response from supervisors, then it would be generally accepted. Recommendation was also made to include language that if a faculty member fails submit their annual review, they would receive a negative review for that year. Also, that if a faculty member and department chair fail to meet after multiple good faith efforts, and faculty member fails to show, a negative review will be delivered.
* **MOTION** – A motion was made to extend discussion by five minutes. Thulin seconded. All in favor? 32. 0 Opposed. 0 Abstained. Motion passed.
* **MOTION** – A motion was made to accept the comments with the modifications made and forward to the steward. Clarke seconded. All in favor? 30. 0 Opposed. 1 Abstained. Motion passed.

POLICY 637 – *FACULTY TENURE* (Limited Scope)

* Borchelt expressed concern from the School of the Arts in regards to the formation of the overarching RTP Advisory Committee, have a school/college Advisory Committee that would assist in going forward to the SVPAA. This would keep the issues localized and addressed at this level. It seems onerous on how the new process would work.

POLICY 606 – *ADOPTION OF COURSE MATERIALS AND TEXTBOOKS*

* Two Guiding Principles
  1. Mandatory review by the Curriculum Committee needs to come into play when there is a potential Conflict of Interest (COI).
  2. All other course materials would be a responsive policy if there was a problem, question, or concern raised by a student, faculty peer, or administration, would be sent to the department curriculum committee for review.
* Clarke’s recollection was that the review for textbooks should only be a retrospective process and faculty should be able to choose their own textbooks with the exception of adjuncts. Peterson agrees in theory that generally faculty should be able to select their own textbook, but there also needs to be oversight to be sure specific codified knowledge that needs to be had in order to flow to another course.
* Section 4.1.3 – Question is do we want to give departments ability to vote on the textbook or continue to allow faculty full rights to select their own textbook. Brown shared an example that the entire department except one faculty member would like to move to an online textbook they feel is better and would save the student money, but has one holdout who wants to use another textbook which costs more. She noted that one reason for the proposed language is for the department as a collective body of individuals to say this direction is in the best interest of the students and the program. If there is an outlier, it’s not harming the department or program.
* Crook expressed the practical application of the department’s assessment of course materials for accreditation and the ability to show how course materials were assessed.
* Leick reiterated that it sounds like senate is generally acceptable of allowing departments to vote on a standardized textbook for some courses. Senate confirmed. If this is the case, we still need an approval process and a reactive process. Olson noted that even the AAUP Redbook basically describes it the way Leick is presenting. Thulin noted the perceived conflict is not a conflict if we state the department must at least have a responsive policy. Leick believes this is actually a third guiding principle that in the case the department approves a standard textbook, you have a process to do this. Clarke responded that at minimum a department needs to have a reactive process. A department can choose to do more. If so, they can define what that more is.
* Olson expressed that there really ought to be a faculty committee to make these decisions. Thulin feels that this is the department as a whole, a subset of the whole, but not just the department chair.
* Gardner provided overview of perceived COI, which would go to a department committee and not go beyond a school/college level committee. If there is no perceived COI, then a faculty member should keep the royalties. Clarke noted there is always a COI. Need to distinguish between trivial and the internet textbooks that could be problematic.
* **MOTION** – Dianne McAdams-Jones moved to extend discussion for five minutes. Darrell Green seconded. All in favor? 32. 1 Opposed. 0 Abstained.
* Discussion about the incentives for faculty to write quality textbooks if they don’t receive compensation. Question to be addressed is if a faculty member authors a textbook, receives department approval, UVU students are using it, do they get to keep the royalties.
* Arendt proposed to resolve the issue by stating that if it is a peer-reviewed book and you get a royalty that’s less than 10% of the cost of the book, then it’s insignificant. Will bring back in another week.

POLICY 637 – *FACULTY TENURE*

* Pettersson reported the committee received feedback and has integrated the suggestions into the policy and provided an overview of the changes. Bracken noted that AAC provided one suggestion in regards to the number of faculty reviewers.
* Pettersson noted that after consistent review of dean, department chair and RTP assessments that you can recognize if there is disconnect or misunderstanding between the reviewers. Brown also shared that in terms of making sure all components are included in the portfolio, a check list was created to assist applicants that can be condensed to assist departments. She would like to also identify additional criteria that departments have added to assist the reviewers.
* Section 5.7.9.3 – Albrecht-Crane expressed concern about the language indicates the advisory committee would be reviewing the portfolio quality. Clarke clarified that he meant the committee might look at the quality under limited circumstances and triggered by something in the evidence. Olson hopes there would be something of this type of qualitative comments in the review.
* Borchelt provided a scenario in which the RTP Committee has a split vote on the qualitative nature of the portfolio and to put to another body that does not know the discipline is problematic. Peterson reminded senate that the advisory body is looking at the quality of meeting department criteria.

POLICY 162 – *SEXUAL MISCONDUCT /* POLICY 165 – *DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT, AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION*

* Overview
  + USHE implemented an active counsel policy for students. We needed to implement this. Updated other items to make more user friendly.
  + Made sure that all parties (staff, faculty, or students) have an advisor at the hearing.
  + Laid out the steps for hearing and the Lay Hearing Panel.
  + Shored up and clarified hearing process.
  + There are specific items to each policy that needed to be addressed.
* Clarke inquired about the hearing that is after the investigation portion and the process when a victim does not wish to testify. Clemes noted that there are procedures to protect the victim(s) and questions could go through the hearing panel and they can participate remotely. Counsel for the alleged perpetrator can submit questions to the hearing panel in written form. If a respondent chooses not to participate, the process will still move forward. If the respondent is an employee and completely ignores the process, they could be suspended without pay.
* Bezzant notified that email should not be an official way of communication. One of the main concerns in his department is that the university’s representative automatically assume against the faculty member. Need a mechanism that assumes the faculty member has done the right thing. Clemes noted that the university has to remain a neutral body. UVU has an investigative model. She reviewed the overall process.

POLICIES 251 – *TRAVEL FOR FACULTY ON UNIVERSITY BUSINESS* / 252 – *INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL FOR FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND STAFF*

* Background - Both policies were put into temporary emergency last fall and will be timing out this summer. Two sections were added to both policies regarding faculty or staff lodging with students or travel with spouse/guests.
* Clarke expressed concern about having to attend a training in order to travel outside the U.S. Wood responded that when they do those trainings they have placed time constraints. Olson responded they have adjusted those items when not traveling with students.

ANNOUNCEMENT

* Faculty Forum on moving beyond the SRI “Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness” is Friday, April 7, from 12:00-4:00 p.m. in CB 511.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.





































