**Faculty Senate Executive Council Minutes**

March 1, 2022

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

***Present:*** Russ Bailey, Ben Moulton, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Elijah Nielson, Ethan Morse (student rep), Evelyn Porter, Hilary Hungerford (President), Jon Anderson, Jonathan Allred, Joy Cole, Nizhone Meza, Skyler Simmons, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko (Vice President)

***Excused or Absent:***

***Guests:***

Call to order – 3:02 pm

Minutes approved – 3:04 pm

**FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Information about the SEGO survey was included on the Academic Affairs notice and a request to get the word out about it via the Office of Engaged Learning. They are making it a validated survey instrument, collecting baseline data from students across campus, integrated into our Canvas courses assignment.
  + Question about when this was created and approved. Evelyn Porter: I recall a past discussion about an additional survey, could search the minutes. Jonathan Allred: This is coming out of the Office of Engaged Learning with Tammy Clark. Hungerford: This has IRB approval, see the example shared via Teams. This may support our Carnegie designation. Students can decline to participate if they choose. It seems problematic that this will be posted in all of our Canvas courses. There are questions about how this will be used, what comparisons will be made.
  + Wioleta Fedeczko: Aren’t there other ways to share this to be completed by students? Porter: They don’t even post SRIs in courses, so why can’t we have that within Canvas. Hungerford: This will be a floating assignment in each course, no points, and it’s already published. Allred: It’s 30-60 questions as well. Hungerford: It was also shown in the last Academic Affairs notice.
  + Hungerford: There are helpful questions here, but it seems obtrusive to be placed in Canvas courses. Nielson: Couldn’t they send it via email? Hungerford: It is supposed to be course-specific. Nielson: Data can be helpful, we need clarity on this however, to ensure that it won’t be used in a punitive way.
  + (Hungerford: Let’s celebrate Dianne McAdams-Jones, breaking glass ceilings right and left!) Dianne McAdams-Jones: Why can’t this go through the Institutional Research office? Getting students to complete SRIs or other surveys is a lot already, this is too long and they could at least ask us about this.
  + Wendy Athens: Faculty Senate voted on this previously. Jon Anderson: It was February 12, 2019, based on a review of minutes from that meeting. This action is being interpreted as fully approved. Athens: Alaa Alsarhan presented on this, they were supposed to collect data from all classes in one sweep. It was thought that the vetting was appropriate. Anderson: We need to have another conversation with that office, it’s been long enough that most do not know about this. The minutes said that our comments were passed on, thisdoes not necessarily mean approval.
  + Hungerford: There is concern about how they will be included in our Canvas courses. Nielson: There could be helpful data from a survey data, but my concerns have to do with how data are used. Since it was a few years, we need another conversation. Faculty don’t like how administration may use data. Athens: It’s not OTL, but OEL.
  + David Frame: What are the bumpers for how these data will be used, shared, and destroyed? Hungerford: This had to have been part of the IRB application. Athens: Shared link in the chat with more information: <https://uvu.edu/engaged-curriculum/measurement-assessment/index.html> They are looking for adding High-Impact Practices (HIPs) that helps with our Carnegie designation.
  + Hungerford: There has been an “opt-in” format so far, now they are wanting more. Athens: Yes, they are wanting wide-spread participation for use in the Carnegie designation. Porter: I agree that the survey was likely approved, I don’t know that it was approved to be added in Canvas courses. The concern is that this will be added, that they have the ability to drill down to the section level with this data collection. Hungerford: They are working with Jason Hill, how is this happening and who approved this. Athens: This office had some turnover, I believe that it was under Cheryl that Alaa Alsarhan presented the need for better data collection. I suggest bringing it up to Provost that people are taken by surprise. Hungerford: I didn’t know that someone could create an assignment for every single Canvas course. Athens: It seems like we have done this with other things, but in the past it has been for specific courses with professors opting in.
  + Hungerford: What do we want moving forward? Fedeczko: Can we not automatically add it but make it a request for each class to be added? On a smaller scale in my department, this practice didn’t work because the assignment in question got in the way and got deleted. Nielson: I believe this should be revisited in Faculty Senate and faculty need to be given the opportunity to opt in or not. Data is not being used by administration in ways that are not benign to faculty. 2019 was 3 years ago and I think it needs to be addressed again. Anderson: The reason to get it to the course level makes it easier for them, this creates ease of access. This is an academic freedom issue, the way my students engage with my course. Having an external body put things into my course is not okay, it really should have come back to Faculty Senate for discussion. Skyler Simmons: The ease of access issue, I’m tired of making things easier for administrator as the excuse for changes to be made. What’s easier for them is not always something that should be on us and the timing is not good.
  + Hungerford: I should reach out to Provost and OEL, indicate that it was approved 3 years ago, but we don’t know what exactly was approved, especially the idea of a Canvas assignment. FYI, the survey is supposed to go live 3/21 through 4/1.
  + Anderson: The motion was to pass the comments on, not to approve the use of it. Karen was very good about getting the exact language of the motion. Nielson: I think the motion would need to be specific for this to go ahead. Hungerford: They renewed the IRB and have approval. Thank you for confirming my feeling about how faculty could respond to this. I don’t assume any ill intent. Nielson: I think some faculty assume ill intent and that is the current attitude from many faculty.
* Policy 649 regarding faculty dismissal.
  + Hungerford: It is almost to Stage 2, there was a disconnect about who was supposed to be on this task force. This came in the aftermath of Dr. Shively’s death as a way to do better by our faculty. I have now contacted the original drafting committee and we are addressing it. Apology for the disconnect. Anderson: I recommend adding a comment about this to the Good of the Order for Faculty Senate.
  + Joy Cole: If a person is in their mid-tenure review and it is not approved, but there were extenuating circumstances, are they taken into account? Hungerford: There are appeals procedures, review to see if any steps diverged from policy. Cole: I wonder if there are extensions granted, I have concern about a case in my department. Is it a yes/no or are there extensions granted? Hungerford: Faculty can request extensions. Cole: These have to be done far in advance, makes it less helpful. Porter: By policy you can ask for an extension, but it has to be in advance. There have been cases when people have been close and been granted another year. The appeal process is arduous, there are 3 grounds for it that can be difficult to establish. Cole: Yes, in this case the faculty did not receive exceptional care. Hungerford: I’m in agreement. Cole: We’re losing a great faculty member in this, would like us to consider this. Allred: If we want change, it happens in the policy. Our hands are tied by what we decide should be in policy and administration is supposed to follow that. Ben Moulton: If he doesn’t get tenure, go for the appeal, if he gets the extra year I recommend he get extra support and mentoring in that year. Fedeczko: This is the mid-term tenure review, correct? This seems like a mentoring moment rather than letting them go over a mid-term review. Cole: I don’t know all sides of this, I wanted to know about any possible recourse. McAdams-Jones: I could talk about this with you offline if you’d like. The mid-term goes to the Provost, and policy does not require that they tell you what is happening in a mid-term, but you would think that the RTP committee would have communicated with them along the way.
* The Faculty Recognition Awards luncheon is coming up. If someone else wants to emcee, they are welcome to volunteer.
* Bylaws
  + Hungerford: We need to update the bylaws. Anderson: There were some major changes last year that people wanted to make. The more changes that get made, the more time we need for senate to reflect on it and vote. Since we’re on Teams, we’ve been using impromptu votes. This isn’t in our bylaws, we need to type it in. We need to send the document out ahead of time so senators can start seeing and commenting on them. Considering this over Spring Break could be helpful. By the next ExCo meeting we would want to have a good idea of what we want to do. People can send me changes they want to make to the bylaws by the Friday of Spring Break, then by 3/29 we could have an actual draft and have time to discuss. Will we return to in-person meetings in the fall? Hungerford: Hard to go back to in-person after using Teams.

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**

* Ethan Morse: We just had our elections. Maybe in a few weeks, my successor can come and participate. Is there anyone who supports the scheduling of assignments during Spring Break? We’re asking students to record if there’s anything due from instructors. If we hear about it, should we talk to our teacher about it? How should we handle the data we collect? What should we recommend to students? Anderson: This happened during Fall Break too. The issue is that there isn’t policy about it, so it’s only a talking point currently. The best route would be to communicate with President and decide how best we can help this. Any penalties would have to go through the Chair and Dean, but senate could pass a resolution to say this is inappropriate. Hungerford: I’m planning to send an email to faculty and including a comment about this. Fedeczko: Could we research about how other universities do this? Who could do this? Discussion on academic calendar committee how other universities have “dead week” when faculty are not allowed to assign things because students are preparing for finals. We need to think about how we ensure that students get their break, which is essential to mental health for students as well as faculty. How can we make this more official so students have power to address this? We need a more official manner to address this. Morse: The plan is to collect data from both fall and spring breaks and present on this. I hope this continues to be conveyed to faculty. Hungerford: I will include this. If others have items for me to include in the all-faculty email, please let me know.
* Anderson: I was disappointed to know that Friday is now part of the finals week. I don’t know if faculty are aware that they are losing a day. Fedeczko: Yes, that is correct and this will continue to be a trend because of how they are scheduling commencement. Anderson: We need to advertise this, so faculty know about it. Fedeczko: I agree. Anderson: Teachers are needing to prepare and I haven’t seen any communication about this change, curious about whether students know about it. Fedeczko: I will address getting this communicated, hadn’t realized since I joined the committee that it’s a new change this semester. Thank you for bringing this up, it needed to be communicated.

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

* Curriculum: Evelyn Porter: We are waiting for programs that were on institutional prioritization to be approved by provost. Our timeline is compressed. We start registration in April and we can’t push back the curriculum update because of this, which is due in November. I’m trying to get this expedited. Why can’t we push the registration back two weeks? Because of a manual transfer of curriculum from Courseleaf to Banner, this takes significant time from November to April. The registrar’s office opposes pushing back the registration, as we won’t have enough registered in time and supposedly we lose funding from the legislature. How would pushing it back affect students? Morse: Clarify that we are discussing continuing students. I’m wanting to register as soon as possible, get my first choices. Porter: Moving it from first week of April to third week of April for priority registration. Morse: The end of the semester would be the latest you would want to do it, other considerations for students are planning with on- or off-campus work. Porter: I’m pushing this in Curriculum, possibly moving registration back. It’s a vicious cycle with too many manual processes involved. That’s what happens during the November-April period. Fedeczko: If it gets pushed back, some students might still be registering during summer interval, is that the case? Porter: That is the concern, and it depends on how large the registration windows are. Fedeczko: I’m concerned about equity issues with students completing finals and needing to jump into a summer job, we might be privileging students who don’t have to do this. Every student should have the opportunity to register before the semester ends. Hungerford: I agree. And I think we should focus on adjustments in the November-April window. Porter: That is outside of my purview, but I agree, this is the longest period of the process while Curriculum itself is actually the shortest part. I will give the feedback as described, delay but not so much as to not allow students to register during the semester.
* Advancement of Teaching: Cole: We will take up a repository of syllabi. We are getting awards together for faculty recognition. We will address the SRI data gathered as a study, Jessi Hill has gathered this. We also need to bring up faculty excellence awards.
* RTP&A: Allred: We are addressing policies that affect RTP&A. We’re focused on any policies that affect this. Hungerford: Provost was looking at portfolios this last week. Fedeczko: I have met with Kat Brown, they have reviewed 105 portfolios. Let people know that they will be getting back to evaluating department criteria as their next order of business.
* Service & Elections: Sandie Waters excused.
* Special Assignments & Investigations: Neilson: We need to check with Dr. Cole about what we’re doing regarding SRIs. Regarding service of the deans and HR, we need an update. We plan to have this go out before the end of the semester. The anti-racist statement has been approved. Anderson: Passed with about 62% approval.

**SENATE AGENDA discussion**

* Hungerford: Provost may have things to address post Town Hall. The University Planning and Advancement Committee will be important, want to present about the university with a SWOT analysis. I invited Kelley Flanagan as well to talk about technology and things we would like to see, automating processes. We have a read-and-comment policy, not as much policy discussion this time.
* Simmons: Policy 532, University Student Groups, will be on the agenda. I expect 5-10 minutes. Anderson: We only have 3 more senate meetings, consider that we have limited time to address new policy without special sessions in the summer, which is not desirable.
* We will vote about whether to have adjunct representation in senate. Fedeczko: What do we want that vote to look like? What should the questions look like? If the question starts with “should adjuncts be allowed to vote in senate” I think it would be a no. Hungerford: Yes, which question comes first? Fedeczko: For departments with a lot of adjuncts, there will be differences and many may not want adjuncts to vote. Porter: We have procedure-related items, may address these along with bylaws. We are recommending updates to the curriculum procedures. They have to be voted on. We can introduce it as a read-and-comment item next time. Fedeczko: Citing Joy’s comment, question about whether and how adjunct representation would be included. Cole: If we don’t have adjuncts, senators would need to do a really good job of representing their interests. Hungerford: Wioleta, you and I will meet and address this.
* Hungerford: Ann updated me about the past senate discussion on Sego survey. This was a vote in 2019 to accept the comments, they were going to do it in 1 semester, Fall 2019. They came in February 2019 to ask for the next fall. There is a misunderstanding about what was approved. The comment was that they wanted it in Canvas “like SRI”, but this is not currently done. Anderson: SRI is in Banner or myuvu, I am comfortable with this as an alternative. Students don’t do them because of this. If we can’t get SRIs in Canvas, this shouldn’t be either. McAdams-Jones: Unlikely that students will complete this. I offer points to students just to do SRI for me, I don’t think students will do this. Hungerford: Would you like to be cc’ed on the email I’m sending to the Provost and Provost for Engaged Learning? Fedeczko: It makes no sense to present this survey mid-semester, it won’t represent the course accurately. Hungerford: Does it threaten our Carnegie designation? Athens: Yes, work with Tammy to make a workable approach. I don’t think these details were considered back in 2019. Hungerford: I will address this and let you know.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**:

* Fedeczko: Question about health insurance. I’m getting several problems with health insurance denials, I am not sure about how decisions are made about insurance carriers. When does that come up? Are other faculty experiencing this? Hungerford: I am on the benefits committee, discussing them. Lots of Intermountain doctors are no longer taking our insurance. We renew in April/May and I can bring that to them. This year people have not delayed procedures as much as in a pandemic year. There may be more telehealth options coming. Cole: My medication that allows me to live was denied, I have to take pills every few hours now. I’m not happy with how this was handled. The teaching excellence model and peer evaluation tool, do we want to vote on whether to use those as recommended items? Hungerford: Read and comment this time, then vote next time. McAdams-Jones: Who denied the claim? Cole: Magellan. McAdams-Jones: We have had some bad insurance carriers and the way these companies operate is killing people.

Closed session at 4:51 pm.