**Faculty Senate Minutes**

September 19, 2017

CB 511, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Mark Abramson, Kim Abunuwara, Huda Al-Ghaib, Pauli Alin, Jonathan Allred, Jon Anderson, Brian Barthel, Laurel Bradshaw, Bret Breton, Clay Brown, Kat Brown, Josh Cieslewicz, Alan Clarke, Suzy Cox, Ken Crook, Karen Cushing, Reid Elem, Nathan Gale, Lindsey Gerber, Phil Gordon, Darrell Green, Merrill Halling, Basil Hamdan, Dan Hoffman, Jamie Johnson, Lydia Kerr, Duane Miller, Anthony Morris (Library), Shalece Nuttall (PACE), Jeff O’Flynn, Jeff Olson, Hong Pang, Alan Parry, Jeff Peterson, Jim Pettersson, Karen Preston, Denise Richards, Robert Robbins, Sheri Rysdam, Leo Schlosnagle, Tyler Standifird, Mike Stearns, Matthew Taylor, Craig Thulin, Sean Tolman, Sandie Waters, Robert Warcup,

***Excused or Absent***: Howard Bezzant, Sara Flood, Matthew Holland, Gary Mercado, Margaret Mittelman, Terrance Orr, Meghan Roddy, Anthony Romrell, UVUSA, Paul Weber

***Guests:*** David Connelly

Call to order – 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from September 5, 2017. Minutes approved.

**ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES**

**SVPAA**

* Excuse President Holland as attending inauguration of new BYU-Idaho President.
* Final Enrollment Headcount for fall 2017 will be announced soon.
* Board of Regents ranked priorities for new buildings and the Woodbury Business Building was 3rd on list with all buildings close in the running. Depends on what kind of funding available as we move toward the new Legislative Session.

AVPAA

* RTP Committees received final portfolios from their faculty that are up for review this year.
* In final stages for interviewing a Faculty Relations Coordinator, position which will deal with Faculty Ombudsman issues.

Library

* Roots of Knowledge Speaker Series resuming this fall. Craig Thulin will be presenting “A Window in Roots of Scientific Knowledge” on September 26 at 1:00 pm.

PACE

* Discussion about PACE become steward of the UVU Goodwill Association. Would like a faculty representative to assist on the committee when details are finalized.

PRESENTATION ITEMS

* Financial Aid – John Curl
	+ Regulation from the Department of Education requires we only give financial aid to students who are taking courses in their programs of study. We will be monitoring more closely in the near future.
	+ Pell Grants for summer – Summer Grants have been reinstated and if students take a full load in fall and spring semesters, they can receive additional funds for summer as long as they take at least six credit hours in their major. If they do not take a full load in fall or spring, they will only be eligible for the remaining funds of their Pell Grant for the academic year.
	+ If a student is advised incorrectly and takes a course that is not needed, federal financial aid cannot be used or applied. That would be an institutional matter.
	+ ICHE available during summer – Olson reported that UVU has individuals looking at programs that can run year-round to assist in completion. Are working to let departments know about ICHE availability at least three weeks prior to submission of the summer schedules.
* RTP Faculty Committee
	+ Currently in process of verifying the membership of the advisory committee to begin training.
	+ General Tips and Considerations for Tenure document is located on the Faculty Senate website. Department Chairs should have made it available to their departments.
	+ The advisory committee is faculty driven and work collaboratively with administration.
	+ No changes have been implemented, but providing information so can be ready to operationalize the advisory committee.

DEBATE CALENDAR

* Policy 641 – *Salaried Faculty Workload*
	+ Section 5.3.2.1 – Date changed from May 10 to March 7. Needed to move the date to match the Annual Review policy and allow for appeals and HR to finalize salary data.
	+ Annual Reviews need to be completed in February of a given year, but Departments have the ability to determine whether they use the calendar year or previous academic year for the review.
	+ Remove parenthesis at end of 4.1.3.
	+ **MOTION** – Sean Tolman moved to accept the change and vote now. Karen Preston seconded. Anderson amended the motion to reorder the agenda to vote. Tolman accepted as a friendly amendment. All in favor? 36. 0 Opposed. 1 Abstention. Motion passed.
* Policy 654 – *Faculty Merit Pay*
	+ Thulin reminded all senators to submit comments by the Thursday prior to the Senate meeting. This allows Clay Brown and Jon Anderson to organize and summarize the comments for discussion. Several comments came in at last minute and are not included in the summary of comments.
	+ Connelly provided brief history of how the policy process began and why. 1) Need for transparency component and 2) Sustainability. First question was what administration could work with in terms of funding that would be available ongoing. Amount that Makin was able to confirm was $250-350K. This drives the structure and sustainability of how the policy is developed and ensure a merit increase.
	+ If faculty do not want a merit policy then when the Legislature designates funds to be awarded based on merit, it would be difficult to award merit to faculty without a policy.
	+ Richards shared her insights on the development of the policy as a committee member. Connelly noted that the Annual Review is the primary factor in determining merit increases. Richards reported that this is an opportunity to receive an increase other than tenure or rank.
	+ Merit funds will be set aside along with tenure and rank before the full pot of funds gets distributed. Discussion about including language to award (restore) merit to those who should have received, but due to Legislative cuts did not.
	+ Comments Discussion
		- Why limit policy to tenured faculty? Connelly noted that the committee feels could sustain and provide a sufficient increase. Also commented that the institution needs to revisit the amounts awarded when receive tenure and consider an award at the third year review. Peterson noted that need sufficient motivation to seek merit once achieve tenure. Connelly responded the amount of funds to distribute is limited, could not address the increases for non-tenure track. This is a first step in a process. Recommendation made to rename the policy Tenured Faculty Merit Pay.
		- Parry expressed concern about this policy only addressing tenured faculty. Would support idea of clarifying that this is a merit pay policy for tenured Faculty. Thulin informed Senate to make substantive recommendations when submitting comments.
		- Discussion regarding ability to receive merit, but not necessarily obtain full professor. Olson commented that at most universities in the United States, most faculty do not achieve full professor.
		- Section 4.2 Line 31 – Increase goes to base salary and is permanent.
		- Sections 5.2.5-5.2.8, 5.4 – Dates need to be tight. Reviewed current timeline in policy. Delete March 16 and March 21 duplicate entry in timeline on page 6.
		- **MOTION** – Sean Tolman moved to extend discussion 15 minutes. Suzy Cox seconded. All in favor? 38. 0 Opposed. 0 Abstained. Motion passed.
		- Section 5.1.1 Line 59 – Inconsistent language on who is approving, recommending or verifying eligibility throughout the document. Connelly reported that committee felt there needed to be a certain number of recommendations in one-direction vs another direction. Going back to the Annual Review, you go back to an arbitrary component while at the same time it has a robust adjudication process. If do not agree with Annual Review, need to challenge immediately as it will be used to award merit. Recommend tightening up language.
		- Clarke feels there are some substantive comments that are not consistent with what Connelly has eluded and keep sneaking into procedure. Believes Section 4.2 being misinterpreted.
		- Section 5.2.3 Lines 64, 66 – Richards shared that this was intended for checks and balances. Consider adding language that “committee should consist of at least five members. If school/college has fewer than five departments, the school/college determines how representation will be established in consultation with Faculty Senate ExCo.”
		- Section 4.1 Line 21 – Connelly will provide a draft of the *Guidelines for Merit Award* in two weeks.
		- Sections 4.1, 4.2 Line 29 – Thulin proposed rewording to read “Together with Faculty Senate…” to clarify that it is a joint venture in reference to the development and maintenance of the *Guidelines for Merit Awards*. Olson commented that to develop and maintain is an administrative function, which is an appropriate thing for an administrative office to handle and, in consultation with Faculty Senate, is appropriate in terms of developing the substance of what goes to President’s Council for approval. Discussion about removing comment.
		- **MOTION** – Alan Parry moves to extend debate for 23 minutes with provision to end earlier if appropriate. Ken Crook seconded. All in favor? 34. 1 Opposed. 2 Abstained. Motion passed.
		- Section 3.0 – Add basic definition of the “College/School Merit Pay Committee.”
		- Section 4.5 Line 48 and Section 5.1.1 Line 53 – Addresses financial viability. Cox expressed concern about modifications to forms and guidelines, the impact to faculty, and how things might change during the five-year cycle. Connelly noted that the bigger issue would be what happens if a Department Chair changes during the cycle. He also noted that the policy is to be reviewed every five years to be sure it is fulfilling its intent.
		- Section 4.4 Line 45 – Change language to read “…whether or not a faculty member applies or is awarded merit pay.”
		- Tolman requested input from the drafters of the policy to understand the intent. Connelly reported that merit is first and foremost a function of teaching as that is the primary mission of the institution. Clarke interprets Section 4.2 of the policy “if and only if you exceed the expectations of teaching and don’t flunk the other two.” Connelly rebutted a faculty member must be meeting the standard of the institution in all categories. Clarke reiterated his stance that you can only receive merit “if and only if you exceed expectations in teaching” which most people will not. Another problem he identifies is that the policy should not be a one size fits all as his department is different. Richards expressed the intention was to keep this policy very simple and recommends tightening the language. Connelly reminded all that the decisions were left with the departments in the Annual Reviews.
		- Tolman read policy philosophically and that the mission of the university is primarily teaching and that research and service should inform and complement teaching.
		- Gordon recommends wording in Section 4.2 should be changed to “exceeding” in any of three areas and meeting in the other areas. Al-Ghaib expressed support for more equality in weighting the three areas of evaluation. Robbins shared his department sees teaching, scholarship, and service as an integrated of the whole. Parry shared we want all faculty to excel at teaching. Consider language “exceeding in any one of three areas and meet or exceed in teaching.”

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

* Special Assignments & Investigations
	+ Committee on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness has met. If Faculty Senate wants the committee to work quickly, need committee members asap. Preference would be one from each school/college.
	+ **MOTION** – Anderson moved to ask for one nomination from each school/college and vet through ExCo. Bret Breton seconded. Friendly amendment made that if no recommendation provided, ExCo can recommend. All in favor? Unanimous. Motion passed.
* Curriculum
	+ All faculty that want to use CourseLeaf must be trained. Contact Chris Alldredge to set up training.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

* Faculty Senate Dinner with President Holland, September 26, 2017, 5:30 pm at the President’s home located at 602 College Drive. Cushing will send out a calendar invite.
* Duo Authentication will be required starting October 1st for all employees.
* Banner Outage on October 20th at 5:00 pm through the 21st at noon. Will affect everything (including Canvas).

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.