**Faculty Senate Executive Council Minutes**

February 2, 2022

Via Microsoft Teams, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present:*** Russ Bailey, Ben Moulton, David Frame, Hilary Hungerford, Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Ethan Morse, Joy Cole, Karen Sturtevant, Sandie Waters, Skyler Simmons, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Elijah Nielson, Kathren Brown, Evelyn Porter, Nizhone Meza, Dianne McAdams-Jones

***Excused or Absent:***

***Guests:***

Call to order – 3:03 pm

**PROVOST**

* Faculty and staff and families can now get COVID testing, a drive- through site now available, vaccines continue to be available. Hopefully we will pass this peak quickly.
* Question (Sandie Waters): Decisions have been made this semester about teaching and these have been addressed with the communication and actions and there continue to be concerns, what do you think is going on for those who have concerns?
  + Provost: There is a vocal group of those who are concerned, may not represent the majority of faculty, as Faculty Senate represents the official voice. We are trying to offer flexibility and give people choice with this. Overall it appears that many are comfortable continuing as planned knowing that they can pivot if necessary given the guidance given by the task force.
  + Waters: I have not been hearing much about this from people outside the letter. Looking into it more closely, the letter seems to have less energy now, but there seems to be very different views, a disjointed view of this situation when taken together. Provost: Most seem in support of health measures. And this is a polarized issue. It seems there is a large number of people who support the current policies, knowing the university is doing what it can given the legislature’s position. President: Unsure what to conclude about the letter, given that it seems that faculty have the flexibility needed. Overall, lessons learned from this. Express appreciation for living in a society that we can talk about this.
* President: Updates about University College given last week’s meeting. Request Provost to address how faculty feedback can be addressed.
  + Provost: We had discussions last fall for reorganizing University College, the biggest recommendation was to move the dean to an associate provost role, bring student affairs under a single umbrella under academic affairs. The goal was to better coordinate first year experience, continuation, etc. The pushback has not been about this particular change as much as the fact that only 4 programs would then remain and there is uncertainty about how to manage these. There has been discussion about moving some of these programs to Math, English, Education, and so forth. We put this forward on Friday and it was not well received. The next step is to engage the faculty on these concerns. Working with Nizhone Meza (a trained mediator) and Hilary, to create an environment in which faculty voices can be heard. Impacted departments will be invited to participate, to compile strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and address changes to the proposal. The key questions concern how do we align our structures to best meet the needs of our students. We would like faculty’s voice in this, have conversations, put people in place to facilitate conversation. Nizhone can be an impartial mediator.
  + Waters: Two questions: 1. If you were to characterize the most significant blockade from the meeting, what would it be? 2. Is this already decided and the discussion is only for transparency’s sake, or where are we in the process of the decision? Provost: This is not just for a dog-and-pony show, pretending to be transparent when a decision has already been made. The issue is there was a smaller group of people in these discussions, now we need to have a larger group give input. The concern is around the need for faculty to address support for our most vulnerable students, concern that these supports are seen as being removed. This realignment was seeking to bring similar programs together, to allow them to be delivered more efficiently. The decision is still to be made, there are a lot of conversations we could have that could encourage us to pivot as we move forward.
  + President: Conversations are already happening on this topic. Provost: Yes, and we are not trying to control the conversation, we are hoping for open, honest discussion.
  + Ben Moulton: You had mentioned that no one would lose their jobs with this realignment. The associate dean may be affected and math faculty may feel the Dev Math faculty may not meet the criteria for being in the department. Provost: We would want to discuss this, as this is one of the reasons for the discussion. Moulton: As engineering faculty in math, there is already concern around fitting these together. Provost: There might be concerns around criteria for faculty, RTP included, I do not see this as an obstacle we can’t address. President: Yes, we need to ensure there is protection of faculty. Provost: Tenured or not tenured? You would not lose tenure with a change like this. President: The promotion to full professor would also be a concern. We would need to make sure that the criteria would follow you through these changes. Provost: There are examples in other places where there are multiple tracks toward tenure, one focused more on research, one on teaching. President: An alternative model for tenure, this could be helpful in other areas across campus. Provost: We do not want to make a change that would impair our ability to serve our students.

**STUDENT GOVERNMENT**

* Ethan Morse (Student Government): This Thursday (noon in Reagan Theater) there will be a speaking event, then in 2 weeks there will be the first forum of the semester, focused on mental health and academics. We would love to have as many faculty and students attend, February 17 at 12 in the Grand Ballroom. Elections have begun for student government. <https://www.uvu.edu/uvusa/> is where you can find more information.

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

* Curriculum: Ben Moulton: Institutional prioritaztion meeting is happening soon, several occurring in various colleges. We will be very busy addressing these. If there is over 25% revision, there may be a fine, a financial penalty. President: Please clarify what occurs in this process. Evelyn Porter: President’s council and deans are invited, there needs to be a prioritization due to limited funds. If a new program is approved, it siphons off the funding the dean would have access to more broadly. Because funding is limited, we seek to find programs that will affect PBA and budget moving forward and make difficult decisions about what moves forward. We have encouraged deans to invite the people who are making the proposals. Last year all proposals went through, we will see the costs for this year. Jonathan Allred: Let’s make sure everyone is invited to the meeting on 2/8. Porter: We can work to make sure everyone who submitted a program is invited, not just waiting for deans to extend the invite.
* Teaching: Joy Cole: Thank you for your support of the conference, presenters. We have received feedback on the peer evaluation process, will bring this forward. One of this committee’s responsibilities is the SRI procedure, this is on our radar and will be the next item to address after this conference. Faculty Excellence awards are in the works.
* RTP&A: Jonathan Allred: Our committee is moving forward with policies, two specific policies to move forward. Policy 644 writing committee came together today, there are more in the works. The RTP criteria we submitted in fall, we hoped to have those approved by winter. We are looking for a status update for our RTP chairs, feedback from academic affairs. President: RTP letters have come out, correct? Allred: Yes, and they have 5 days to respond, with a possible rebuttal. Vice President: Requesting more faculty members on the committee for 644 policy. What is the policy to recruit faculty to this? Jon Anderson: It should be announced at Senate, we could also encourage Sandie Waters to send out to various colleges. They do not have to be senators to be on this committee. Waters: I will send this out to chairs today. Anderson: Who should this be addressed to? Vice President: Address to Alan Parry, who is chairing this committee. Nizhone Meza: Please send me the faculty to be added on Teams. Allred: Faculty non-chairs requested.
* Special Assignments & Investigations: Elijah Nielson: Content for closed session. President: Discussion about evaluating the deans/chairs, we do not want this to only be HR focused. This discussion is moving forward. Please consider what questions we would like to ask in order to evaluate deans. Nielson: There are questions being used in focus groups, these may have come from HR and focus on leadership. Waters: Are the two documents you sent the same? Nielson: Yes, one link.
* Service and Elections: Sandie Waters: I was seeking to make my document transparent, but now I have individuals changing my document and entering incorrect information. I will have a master copy and then a separate one for reporting. Anderson: We can set it up so you are the one to allow the changes. Waters: A couple of chairs are not sharing information. In August, someone from dean’s office was my “cc” contact, tracking them down to make sure it is done. Now I “assign” them the item in the Teams space, we will see how that goes. So far, it has been about the same response. Positions are constantly changing on these committees, but the information on the document is kept current.

**SENATE AGENDA discussion**

* Discussion with provost about making sure people are aware about how they can give their feedback, have Nizhone present at Senate.
* President will give updates. For policy discussion, we will be voting on Freedom of Speech policy and also 115. We will be debating 326. 3rd Science GE discussion will occur. For the Part-time Shared Governance item, maybe we need to move forward with some recommendations from ExCo starting next time so we can wrap it up. Adjuncts need representation and may need compensation for this, so it may not be completed by next time. Joy Cole: Survey said most people felt there should be representation for adjunct, but not to vote on policies that primarily concern full-time faculty. President: This concern about a separate status, not having full voting rights was raised.
* We should make a taskforce to make a diversity statement for the syllabus checklist. Nielson: Do we want this on senate agenda? President: Let’s make a taskforce to address this. Vice President: Is this for syllabi or job postings? Nielson: Job postings. There could be similar language for syllabi. President: Perhaps Marilyn Myer (HR) would be open to adding language. Waters: Do you want me to start forming the committee? Neilson: Let’s work together at forming this task force? ExCo: Assent. President: Will reach out to Marilyn regarding possible language that is already used. There may be many topics to address on syllabi. Wendy Athens: There is a resource, a Google doc with language to use on a syllabus, a task force could curate this resource. Waters: It would help to be able link to policy. President: The focus is more on language that can be used. Vice President: It may be helpful for required content, e.g., religious accommodation statement. President: Sandie is forming a task force for this syllabus statement project. Will work with me. Dianne McAdams-Jones: Anything affecting students should include my group from the beginning

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**:

* Black History Month! Happy Lunar New Year (year of the tiger)! And Groundhog Day

Move to closed session (4:07 pm)