

FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

March 7, 2024

4:00-5:30pm

Approved

Attending: Kelly Goonan, Abigail Larson, Scott Knowles, Daniel Eves, Gary Wallace, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Cody Bremner, Chris Graves, Scott Hansen, David Hatch, Steven Hawkins, Maren Hirschi, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Andrew Misseldine, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Grant Shimer, Ryan Siemers, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: Jon Karpel

Proxies:

Guests: Mindy Benson, Jon Anderson, James Sage, Jake Johnson, Camille Thomas, Katya Konkle, John Lisonbee, Matt McKenzie, Alexis McIff, Donna Handley, Kenzie Jenkins, Brandon Street, Shelly Merrill

1. Call to order (4:02)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:02)
 - a. Shelly Merrill, Benefits Manager
 - b. Brandon Street, Career and Professional Development
 - c. Kenzie Jenkins, Career and Professional Development
 - d. Mike Humes, Enterprise Risk Management
 - e. Lucia Malloy, Legal Affairs
 - f. John Lisonbee, Staff Association President
 - g. Alexis McIff, SUUSA VP of Academics
 - h. Camille Thomas, Asst. Provost of Faculty Engagement
 - i. Jake Johnson, Asst. Provost of Leadership Development and Compliance
 - j. James Sage, Associate Provost
 - k. Jon Anderson, Provost
 - l. Mindy Benson, President
 - m. Donna Handley, Graduate Council
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
 - a. [February 15, 2024 minutes](#) - minutes were approved.
4. Events and Announcements: (4:03)
 - a. CTI Lunch & Learn: Academic Freedom and Free Speech, TBA
 - b. Remaining Senate meetings:
 - i. March 21

- ii. April 4
- iii. April 18 (face-to-face)

5. Information Items:

- a. Benefits Open Enrollment Preview (Shelly Merrill)
Open enrollment is coming soon (late April through May). There is a new vision care option – New Samera Vision Option. Look on the HR Benefits webpage for more information. There is a new EAP enrollment option. HR is moving toward an active enrollment where all employees need to confirm their benefits, even if you're not making changes. All encouraged to do it this year, next year (2025) it will be required. Here are the slides she [shared](#).
- b. Senate Elections
 - i. Faculty Senate President-Elect Nominations
 - 1. Nominations close Friday March 15, 2024
 - 2. Nominate here:
<https://www.suu.edu/facultysenate/nomination.html>
 - ii. Senators with terms ending
 - 1. Retiring Senators are responsible for organizing elections in their departments and notifying the Senate President of the results.
 - 2. New Senators will be installed at the April 18, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting
- c. Faculty Survey Results
Reviewed a summary of the results. A formal report will be sent with the numbers and feedback to the senate, president, and provost.

6. Action Items: (4:24)

- a. Vote on Policy #6.3 - Internships
 - i. [Draft policy language](#)
 - ii. [Summary of feedback](#)

Motion was made to vote on Policy 6.3. (Elise and Maren). The motion was passed unanimously.

7. Discussion Items: (4:26)

- a. Policy #6.33 - Academic Misconduct
 - i. [Draft policy language](#)
 - ii. [Academic Integrity Specialist description \(draft\)](#)

Abi: This has been in the works for a couple of years now – a version of this work is linked above for your review. The Academic Integrity Policy is now called the Academic Misconduct Policy. There is also a link above about the description for the Academic Integrity Specialist, which will be a part time position, which is for a faculty member to assume that role. Half of their workload will be devoted to

that, and the other half will be devoted to teaching. The scope of the policy is that most of these academic misconduct issues will go to the Academic Integrity Specialist, but faculty will still have the ability to act in the moment as long as there aren't grade altering sanctions that are being imposed. So, for example, if you see a student who might be looking at another student's exam, you can ask that student to move, change locations, and then that can be the end of the incident. It would be your choice whether or not to report that to the Academic Integrity Specialist. If, however, you note academic misconduct, and you believe sanctions should be imposed, then we have outlined a specific set of procedures for you to follow, including timeline, for how soon after the event occurs, and what the steps and processes are that need to happen. We are working on making templates for faculty to use as well so they know how to contact students, and they know what kind of language they should include in that initial contact before they set up a meeting time to discuss potential sanctions. We want to make sure there is due process for students. So the alleged academic misconduct claim should have some evidence that it occurred to be well vetted. Then, after it's decided that academic misconduct, more likely than not did occur, sanctions will be imposed. You will need to send that information to the Academic Integrity Specialist and depending on what the sanctions are, or how egregious the misconduct may be, the Academic Integrity Specialist will review the case and potentially, there'll be another option for the student to appeal, if they desire. And then it's got another level after that for appeal. If the student is likely to be suspended or removed from a program or something that would be significant in that nature. So we've got several layers of due process and appeal. So students have the ability to have a fair process. This should streamline the process for faculty and make it easier and less ambiguous as to what faculty should do in the case of academic misconduct, and if they do have questions, there is now going to be a liaison in place, the Academic Integrity Specialist, who can help faculty and students through that process.

James Sage: Congratulations to Abi and Jake for getting this first version to the Senate – this policy helps to solve some problems with faculty feeling like they are not in control. I hope you feel that faculty are now driving this and this leans heavily on faculty judgment and ownership of what's happening with academic integrity in the classroom. Our Dean of Students office and Student Affairs are there to help support the student and make sure a due process occurs according to the structure but it doesn't leave the hands of Academic Affairs. With the new position of a specialist, this faculty member will be in a position to provide faculty with guidance and resources, development opportunities, best practices from somebody the faculty trusts.

Alexis: Will Student Affairs be involved in the process?

Abi: Heather Odgen, Dean of Students, will only be involved if the case of academic misconduct goes all the way through the appeals process to the panel hearing, and she will be chair of that panel hearing so at that point she would have a vote as to whether or not the sanctions being suggested for that incident of academic misconduct are fair and just. If a student appeals the sanctions that are being imposed upon them, in the event that it would cause them to be suspended from the university or if they would be removed from a program, then that could go all the way to the panel, in which case Heather would serve as the chair of that panel. But there would also be a member from SUUSA and one other person on that panel for a total of three people. The Academic Integrity Specialist would serve as prosecutor, and then the student, of course, would be there in their defense.

Alexis: Is there any support for the student before it reaches the appeals?

Abi: The Academic Integrity person is there for support and provide resources to students and faculty.

Alexis: We want to make sure that the resources will definitely be made available for students. Is there a way to do that?

Abi: The Academic Honesty website will have to be changed as soon as this policy is approved. Then at that point we can start putting in those resource details. But the student always has access to the academic misconduct policy that's in place at this time, so they can always look to that for reference. Student Affairs can be a resource, regardless of whether or not Heather is currently involved.

James: We want to prevent this from happening at all – we're not setting a trap. We want students to embrace the idea of academic integrity and own their work. But we realize we need to be there to inform and provide support when something does occur.

Abi: Yes, I'm envisioning the Academic Integrity Specialist communicating with students through Student Affairs about what the expectations are and how to walk through the policy, if something unfortunate does occur.

Bryan: Are we supposed to go back to our department to get feedback?

Abi: Yes – I would like to vote on this at our next meeting. Next steps are to get this through to the Cabinet, and then to our 21 day review, and then over to the President Leadership Council, and then on the Board of Trustees agenda potentially before the end of April. I would like to see this person in place soon rather than at the beginning of fall semester.

Kelly: This was already approved by the Dean's Council. Please share with your departments.

Jon: I want to make a pitch to consider this position. It will be a wonderful opportunity to serve the campus as a whole, and to be engaged with students. And we really do need someone to fill this role. We have a few roles like this, like the IRB Director, that are little less known but tremendously helpful.

Andrew: Many faculty feel extremely awkward about dealing with these academic dishonesty cases. We are usually the ones who discover the evidence of potential dishonesty. Often we are the prosecutor as well. The policy has the faculty set as the one who makes the eventual decision based upon the preponderance of evidence. Whatever decisions/conclusions are made on these cases, we are still the student's instructor and mentor and should be on their side. I feel like it's this awkward almost conflict of interest. I want what's best for the students but I also want to protect the integrity of the university as well. I'm wondering with the potential creation of this specialist, would this specialist be able to help alleviate some of this conflict that I'm describing?

Abi: The faculty would need to take the first steps in writing the notification but then if you want the professional to take over from there we can look at putting something in the policy about this.

Jake: We have talked about this – the faculty member deferring to the specialist.

Bryan: I went through one of these experiences and I got the Chair involved right away, and we worked through it together and it kind of diffused that responsibility a little bit, and I felt supported by somebody with more experience. I thought it was really helpful for me and I hope this policy would allow this.

David: I've unfortunately had experience with this – the better trained we are the more we can use appropriate language to approach the uncomfortable elements of this. So we hope this person could be a resource.

Cody: In my experience most students accept responsibility during an initial meeting – that said, it might be nice to have a referral option to involve the Academic Integrity Specialist when a student disagrees in the initial meeting that anything happened.

Michelle: AI is mentioned in the revised policy. Is there going to be an attempt to address this and help us know how to deal with AI and approach students who we suspect are abusing this?

Abi: There is an AI committee who are looking over the nuances of using AI in the realm of pedagogy and what approaches are allowable and what is not. Different professors have varying levels of acceptable AI usage, so I don't think we can put anything specific in this policy. You should use your syllabus to outline your expectations on this. How we enforce AI infractions is a different question – how do you provide evidence of someone who has used this – this will be the most challenging part and what the Academic Integrity Specialist is going to have to explore and be trained on.

Jon: The committee generated a set of guiding principles specifically for generative AI, which is what most of the students may be using. And we also have a document from the Legal Office talking about AI use for note taking, minutes, and those kinds of things. Both of those documents will be reviewed by the Cabinet next week and then they'll be shared widely for feedback after that. So we're making some progress out of the work of that committee.

Abi: Hopefully, that will dovetail in with the Academic Integrity Specialist and what's under their purview.

b. Adjunct Faculty Compensation

Kelly: This has come up a couple of times over the years. We discussed this briefly before Spring Break. Adjunct faculty compensation (not talking about overloads for faculty) at SUU has not increased in a number of years (7-8 years ago) and that was \$800 to \$900 at the undergrad level and \$1000.00 at the grad level. We are the second lowest in the USHE system for adjunct pay. The only one lower than us is Utah Tech. I would like to change this. The best way for us to do that is to have the Faculty Senate come out with a resolution advocating for an increase in adjunct compensation. That resolution would go directly to the President, and then the Cabinet would deliberate on it. I want to be clear that this would be for people who are teaching as adjuncts. At this moment it would not affect faculty overload pay. How adjunct faculty are compensated and treated has come up in multiple conversations as well as in the recent faculty survey. I feel strongly at this moment about focusing on adjunct faculty compensation, and decoupling it from faculty overload compensation.

Joshua: Do we have an idea of what the proposed compensation per credit hour is?

Kelly: I don't have one yet. I will be asking the Provost to share his data and Scott and I both have reached out to other USHE institutions for their adjunct compensation rates and we have not gotten a great response. Snow College pays

\$1000 per credit. Weber State varies based on the kind of course/department/college but their average is about \$1369 per credit. When I was a PhD student at USU, I got \$1500 per credit to teach a class. I'd like to take a look at the data we do have from the other USHE schools and hear from those of you who have thought about a particular dollar amount to see what might be comparable or appropriate. Not comfortable with making proposals on a per credit hour rate until we know what it looks like across the system.

Ryan: I'm strongly in support and would be willing to help with language for the resolution.

Kelly: Not sure what a resolution would look like and what the language would be as I haven't seen one from the Faculty Senate before.

Andrew: I agree that adjuncts are under compensated but I would have to oppose it on a few issues. But the realistic problem is if we raise their pay, what are we giving up instead by moving those funds. I disagree with decoupling overload from adjunct pay because those teaching overloads are effectively adjuncts for these extra classes. If we're going to hire someone to teach an extra class, we should have a full time faculty who knows SUU better than an adjunct. The other issue is about paying someone more to do the same job.

Kelly: To explain my thinking a little more. Faculty at a minimum get regular cost of living adjustments and can count on some increase. Adjunct pay however does not receive these 1-2% raises and have stayed flat for years.

Grant: When we get overloads do we also get additional benefits?

Kelly: I believe we don't – it's separate. It's a non-benefited assignment.

Josh: I think we need to pay adjuncts more. I think it creates a negative consequence for Chairs who might be more willing to ask a faculty member to teach an overload because it's cheaper than getting an adjunct to do so. I think it's a really important distinction to think about. It might create a perverse incentive to actually put more workload upon our faculty because it could save our department or save some money in doing so.

Kelly: Hopefully departments are putting workload and overload guidelines into place, which is overloads are optional. Faculty are not required to teach overloads and no one should feel forced. This would not financially hurt the departments because it's the university budgets that would pay this.

Chris: Would it be possible to use a service model – based on the length of time they are here and if we want to retain them can we have the option of offering them a raise?

Cody: I support this – I'd like to know where the \$\$ is coming from. In my experience, overloads do increase the amount into your retirement.

Kelly: My understanding is that it's a percentage of your base salary that affects this – I'll look into it.

Scott: For example, I get overload pay to run the symposium during the summer, and we calculate benefits into that number for our budget process. So I know for some kinds of overloads in the university that are being taken into account. I don't know if that happens for overloads and classes.

Kelly Goonan: That's a good point. So distinguishing between instructional and non-instructional.

Jon: When full time faculty teach an overload they also get the 14.2% retirement contribution.

Ryan: I'm fine either way with the couple/uncoupling – I know WaFSEC is recommending a system for regular raises for tenure track faculty. So that's kind of coloring my support here as well. It's not going to be one or the other. We're going to advocate for more pay for everyone, essentially. But I'm curious if we could get some sense of how much support is there in the senate for keeping these things together versus uncoupling them.

Elise: I don't have a definite answer – there is a compelling argument for giving a raise to adjuncts. This is a hard question.

Chris: Would this be in competition with full time faculty getting raises?

Kelly: I would hope it wouldn't be in competition – but we are asking the President for this. I think we can ask for more than one thing.

Elise: Let's ask for both then, raising adjunct pay and overload pay.

Matt: From Shelly Merrill: But that is correct, it's whatever your paycheck salary is what the 14.2% so if you teach an overload you will get more retirement

Kelly: I'll work with Ryan, and anybody else who is interested we'll draft something and share it with the Senate. So you are all aware. I'm not gonna ask you to vote on something that you haven't had an opportunity to review or consider. We'll draft something for the next meeting to propose to the group and see if it carries the support of the majority.

8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:15)

- a. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)
- b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)
- c. Staff Association (John Lisonbee)

Adjunct faculty conversation – I'll be happy to reach out to Staff Association's statewide constituents to see if they have any information. We are looking at doing Finish Strong stations a week before finals. We'll get a sign up sheet out, if you'd like to participate in this. We are working with the CTI office to bring a guest speaker. An April walking group will be forming and we'll get info out about this. I have a question about what academic freedom protections there are for a staff who teaches.

Jon: In the classroom, we have academic freedom within the context of the learning outcomes for the class. It applies to anyone who is teaching in their role as soon as they become the instructor of record they have the academic freedom to teach within their discipline. Academic freedom extends to teaching assistants as well if they are supporting the learning outcomes of the class and are under the direction of a professor.

- d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)
Meeting soon – nothing yet.
- e. Graduate Council (Donna Handley)
We have a faculty grad director compensation – 8 of 15 of our directors that do not receive summer compensation. We are making a recommendation to go through the Dean's Council to make a petition to consider summer compensation for directors.
- f. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- g. Student Association (Alexis McIff)
We all had a great spring break, and are excited to be back. A report on some legislation that we've passed in the Senate: (1) We funded 500 midterm wellness kits and handed those all out the week before spring break. (2) We also passed a resolution to encourage more scholarships for non-traditional students. (3) The Center for Hope ran out of money, and they still had people coming and asking for help. So we just would encourage administration to look further into that. (4) We also passed a bill to help fund the NASA Club with their showcase and then also (5) The Women in Business Club is going to a conference, and so we

allocated some money for them. (6) We also passed a bill to give the DRC some funding to help them assist students to take the test that's required for them to get DRC accommodations. And then (7) a resolution to encourage administration to look into more funding for the DRC for that purpose. (8) The last one was a resolution urging the library administration to stay open later on Fridays, during the month of April, as they shorten their hours, but we feel like April is a great time to be at the library till midnight on a Friday. A couple of members of the Senate went to the Capitol and met with Senator Vickers and Lieutenant Governor, Representative Albrech, and then Becki and John from SUU. That was a really great opportunity to see how the SUUSA Senate is modeled after the actual Senate. So that was pretty great. Also something to be aware of: SUUSA elections are coming up in the next couple of weeks so be aware that candidates may ask you if they could reach out to your students or stop by your class, encouraging people to vote. If you could encourage people to vote, that would be greatly appreciated. We also have a lot of clubs and other activities coming up in the next few weeks. Several of the colleges are doing college weeks, so STEAM week is next week. So science, technology, engineering, aviation and math. Business Week is the first week of April, and then HSS is planning a wellness event for right at the end of the semester. If you could stop by any of the club events, I know that students really appreciate when faculty/staff/administration pop in and say, Hi. Other than that we have a Town Hall today to give an update on the State of SUUSA. So you're welcome to come to that, if you'd like, but that's all that I have. Thank you.

h. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

Reach out to Shelly or Patti with any questions.

i. Faculty Awards Committees:

- i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
- ii. Employee Commitment for Access & Belonging Award Committee (Kelly Goonan)
- iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)

We had 60-70 nominations and 15 finalists. We're getting their materials and meeting Tuesday to talk and hopefully identify the winners. I also wanted to mention that I'm trying to get the committee to discuss their thoughts on having the distinguished educator awards include one for a general education professor, one for an adjunct, and one for a graduate instructor course. David Hatch mentioned this at our last meeting. Our committee chair, Jen Mackenzie, asked for certain language to be on the form where people could submit nominations, but they didn't put that on there. So all of our information isn't fitting the rubric that we asked for. I don't know if it's possible in the future to have a dialogue with whoever

finalizes that language or creates those web pages so that we could adjust it. So it's a little more useful for the committee.

Kelly: Yeah, I can reach out to Bailey about that. Thanks, Brian.

- iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
- v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Andrew Misseldine)
This award received over a dozen nominations. We narrowed it down to five finalists and we have requested more information.

j. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)

k. Past President's Report (Abigail Larson) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee

We are wrapping up Policy 5.52 on intellectual property which will be an information item. The Policy 6.1 subcommittee are making final changes and we're trying to allow departments more leeway in who they can assign to the P&T committees, since we know that was a huge struggle this fall, not having enough faculty to serve on the departmental P&T as well as the college P&T. I'll have specific language for you, probably at the next meeting.

l. President Elect's Report (Scott Knowles) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)

m. President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

There was a Board of Trustees meeting right before this one and I had to leave before they finished – they did approve a 3% increase in tuition for next year. Students seem to be in favor of small incremental increases rather than large ones. Good discussion on this. No change in online tuition. President Benson did mention compensation as part of this increase. Another meeting next week. Dean's Council approved Policy 6.33 this week. A lot of discussion on certificates and a lot of R401's have come through with certificates of completion or proficiency. So there was a good conversation about the certificates and the place of certificates. Camille did mention that if there are any requests or needs for mentor training as part of the P&T process to please reach out to your Dean. Deans work with their faculty representative in the CTI working group to leverage the CTI resources to put that training on.

9. Call for Executive Session

10. Adjourn (5:33)