**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**Special Session**

March 15, 2022

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

***Present***: Russ Bailey, Alex Yuan, Armen Ilikchyan, Ashley Nadeau, Ben Moulton, Bob Walsh, Brandon Ro, Chris Witt, David Scott, David Frame, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Doug Czajka, Dustin Shipp, Elijah Nielson, Ethan Morse, Evelyn Porter, Gareth Fry, Hilary Hungerford, Jim Price, Jim Sutton, Jim Pettersson, John Jarvis, Jon Anderson, Joshua Hilst, Joy Cole, Justin Schellenberg, Karen Sturtevant, Kathleen Young, Kathren Brown, Kevin Smith, Kyle Kamaiopili, Laura Ricaldi, Lauren Brooks, Laurie Toro, Leo Schlosnagle, Lisa Hall, Lyn Bennett, Matt North, Melissa Heath, Mike Smidt, Natalie Monson, Nicole Gearing, Nizhone Meza, Peter Sproul, Sam Gedeborg, Sandie Waters, Scott Lewis, Sean Crossland, Skyler Simmons, Tammy Parker, Trevor Morris, Waseem Sheikh, Wayne Vaught, Wendy Athens, Wioleta Fedeczko, Young Ham, Zachery Taylor

***Excused or Absent***:

***Guests:*** Linda Makin, Jeff Peterson

Call to order by President Hilary Hungerford– 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – Minutes approved for 3/1/22 (3:01 pm)

**PROVOST**

* Provost: Good news. Student affairs has been working to increase diversity efforts and we are dedicating resources through the creation of diversity fellows. Recruitment, onboarding, etc. will be supported by them to encourage the increase and retention of staff. Thanks to Dianne McAdams-Jones and Erika Johnson for taking on these roles. They will help with developing our long-term strategy for diversity and inclusion.
* There have been many questions and discussion around University College. We have been receiving feedback and are preparing to make recommendations. We are making pivots based on feedback and will make announcements about this soon.
* We are in the midst of RTP now. The volume of folders was 105, a challenge for all of us. 45 or so were tenure folders, about 10% were denials and a very large majority of them aligned with the recommendations of faculty. The president will make recommendations to the Board of Trustees, who will decide and there will be opportunity to appeal if they need to do so. We will work to have another level of review, more assistance for difficult cases. Watermark sends out this message and we have 10 days from the trustees’ decisions to get this out. Faculty Success has the notifications at each level of review.
* Wioleta Fedeczko: Question about summer travel with pandemic situation. Provost: COVID is becoming less of an issue for our decisions about international travel, but Ukraine is becoming more of a concern, may affect travel to certain regions. Kat Brown: Most regions are at level 3 or below, keep your eye on the State Department levels of warning to help guide decision making.

**SENATE PRESIDENT**

* Kelly Flanagan is out today, move to other agenda items.
* Every Spring we look over our bylaws and consider any changes to be made. Read and reflect and send any feedback. Lyn Bennett: There is a quick timeline, so we send feedback to you as President? Hungerford: Yes, and I’ll send it to Faculty Senate ExCo.
* University Planning and Advancement Committee, UVU SWOT Analysis. Linda Makin: UPAC has been around since early 2000s, President Tuminez wants UPAC to do strategic thinking to tie into Vision 2030. This year we conducted a SWOT analysis. Jeff Peterson from the Business school, does this as a practice. Externally, looked at political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental (PESTLE analysis). Then Industry level and Internally what we know about ourselves. This SWOT analysis will lead to a refreshing of the Vision 2030 even as the 3 key principles. Jeff Peterson: President Tuminez wanted us to Rework UPAC to be strategically thinking. In the Industry (Higher Education) we look at competitors, etc. Internally, we look at UVU itself.
  + Strengths: Inclusive environment, Focus on engagement, Options for achievement, Physical campus and location, Affordability and value
  + Weaknesses: Workforce compensation and benefits, Workforce diversity, Digital competitiveness, Articulation of credits and acceptance of competency-based credits, Sustainability initiatives and leadership
  + Opportunities: Capitalize on Utah’s vibrancy, dynamism, and innovation, Adapt faster than traditional institutions, Focus on flexibility and relevance, Promote UVU as an “anchor institution”, Leverage our people (take advantage of our intellectual assets)
  + Threats: Societal changes related to work and education, Other institutions going after students by being flexible and responsive, Intense competition from new entrants and other traditional institutions
* We are welcoming feedback and discussion. Hungerford: The SWOT analysis guides our thinking, I encourage you to consider this and give feedback to UPAC.
* Steve Anderson (University Relations): A legislative update, with the most recent session that ended on March 4. We were able to secure funding, $80 million for a new engineering building, the building is $110 million. There will be about a year of planning and programming before we break ground. Compensation was also addressed, with a 5.75% increase (3.5% for cost of living adjustment, the remaining 2.25% to be determined for merit and performance increases). Engineering and mental health services were funded system-wide, UVU can apply for this. Center for Constitutional Studies and Herbert Institute received funding. About $125 million total of state funds total coming to UVU, the best session I’ve been a part of for funding. Fedeczko: There will be a new parking garage? Anderson: Yes, though not through legislative funding, but legislative approval was given to fund this through bonds. A bill was passed for bonding, for a $12 million parking garage by the Keller business building, to begin when the bond comes through.

**POLICY**

* Policy 532 University Student Groups
  + Skyler Simmons: There is a new draft of this policy, it is lengthy but does not involve faculty as much as UVUSA. You can read over changes. Hungerford: Read, we will add the changes in the homework document.

**NON-POLICY**

* Part-time shared governance
  + Open to comments and feedback on this prior to a vote. If our results say that we need adjunct representation, this will guide thinking with bylaws and compensation. John Jarvis: Requesting clarification, that representation meaning having adjuncts on the senate, not just senators representing their adjuncts. Fedeczko: Yes, and the votes are set up with options like these, including voting rights question. You may choose to abstain if needed. Jim Price: Without an adjunct organization, is there a way for them to connect and communicate? Hungerford: Important question, and perhaps an adjunct mailing list as separate may serve this purpose. Kyle Kamaiopili: These questions are about the principle about including them, not specifics. Hungerford: Clarify that these questions are to see what we need, how to make this happen.
  + **MOTION**: Sandie Waters to vote, John Jarvis seconded. Lyn Bennett called the question. Time given for voting. (Results: Nays have the majority for representation, voting rights, these will be posted to Voting files in Teams)
  + Price: Adjuncts can still be welcome to attend and speak in Senate. They don’t have a way to acquire a collective voice. Hungerford: How to make their participation meaningful is a key point.
  + Bob Walsh: We have more faculty than adjuncts. What is their level of preparation compared to faculty? Hungerford: They vary, some are Ph.D.’s, some are from industry, some are advisers, it’s a wide range of folks. If they do so much for the university but do not have a voice, the worry is that this is exploitation. I acknowledge the results of the vote.
* Curriculum procedures.
  + Evelyn Porter: Procedures will be approved by Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs Council. We are asking for feedback and comments on these changes, we are sending them out now and will discuss more next time. Price: Are the department curriculum chairs already aware of these changes? Porter: At the college level, these representatives have been in the meeting and are aware. I’m unaware at the department level.
* Peer observation and teaching excellence model
  + Hungerford: Discussion in the university about evaluating teaching. Questions at yesterday’s Town Hall about SRIs as limited tools for this. There are new tools being piloted, the Teaching Excellence Model and the Teaching Observation Form. We would like these tools to be formally recognized as tools for evaluation, a way to be forward-thinking about evaluating teaching.
    1. Bob Walsh: Question about online evaluation tools, the use of SRI for this in ways that don’t relate to online teaching. Has there been thought about a tool for evaluating online teaching? Hungerford: I have not seen this. Fedeczko: There needs to be an evaluation tool for online classes, these are different from face-to-face or hybrid.
    2. David Scott: Concern about making a policy about a vague measuring system, the SRI as a poor measure with Likert scales. I would like to see a student evaluation form that we can agree on based on research before we vote on whether or not it is used for evaluation. This measure is worse than the tool at other institutions. Walsh: If any of us used the SRI in our research, we would be laughed out of the academic community. Hungerford: We can open discussion, if we want to review and revise SRIs. This would be a next-year project with preparations beginning in the summer. A stop-gap measure would be to endorse these other two tools. Bryan Sansom: I agree with what David said and emphasize that students mark me down when the technology goes down, even though I don’t have control over that. Elijah Nielson: Cherry-picking occurs with the qualitative data, focusing on negative comments, this is an issue with administration use of the measure.
    3. Joy Cole: We are not voting on SRIs today, but are voting on this well-researched teaching excellence model. We are not asking about using it as an SRI tool, but to endorse the tool as a good basis for future SRI development. Hungerford: With this we can say as a faculty that this model is good and represents what we hope for.
    4. Matt North: Could we get a presentation of the outcomes of the pilot studies of these tools? We could invite them to come in and show what they have learned. Hungerford: Joy Cole and Wendy Athens are here, we can address lessons learned, outcomes of the pilot, at an upcoming meeting. This is a chance to study the tools before we vote to endorse. This is a way to say not just we don’t like the SRIs but here’s what we do like.
    5. Leo Schlosnagle: There is a solid body of peer-reviewed research on SRIs, reliability and validity and relation to teaching effectiveness. Before faculty make a dramatic move, I would encourage them to review that peer-reviewed research on SRIs. Hungerford: Absolutely. The Teaching Excellence model is grounded in research.
    6. Skyler Simmons: The methods used now have serious issues. If we switch over to a new system, some of us could have the problem of being measured on one system then on a second system.
    7. Sandie Waters: Most of us are willing to put in the work to make a comparison between two documents if it would be helpful. I would be willing to put in work to level the playing field to have tools to use that we can rely on. Having to work with an instrument that is intrinsically biased is making more work for us. Hungerford: With experience on how qualitative data are used, you can pay attention to how many comments are “outliers” compared to most comments.
    8. Hungerford: We will look forward to a discussion of the tools. If we’re serious about looking at SRIs then we could start taking this on in the Fall.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

* Armen Ilikchyan: We have about 11 students from Ukraine who may need our help and support right now. If there are ideas, maybe we can get together and discuss what to do, including perhaps collecting donations. If you’re interested in an informal group, contact me and we can move forward from there.
* Ethan Morse: Lexie Soto will be the new UVUSA president. Jaden Muir will take my position.
* Provost Vaught: Follow up on conversation about SRIs. Academic Affairs is fully supportive of the efforts of faculty to improve the SRIs. If there is funding needed to support this for people working over the summer, we support this work being done. We want to effectively evaluate our teachers and we want improved tools. Hungerford: A great opportunity to address this, we will look at putting a task force together. We have two more meetings this semester and we can add this to our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 pm.