

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

December 8th, 2022, approved on Jan 19, 2023

4:00 - 5:30 PM

**Attending:** Kelly Goonan, Rheana Gardner, Daniel Eves, Brianne Kramer, Dave Berri, Mark Aldred, Christian Bohnenstengel, Rachel Bolus, Cody Bremner, Rosalyn Eves, Chris Graves, Scott Hansen, Bruce Haslem, Derek Hein, Maren Hirschi, Scott Knowles, Bryan Koenig, Elise Leahy, Celesta Lyman, Michelle Orihel, Greg Powell, (Amanda Roundy), Grant Shimer, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Gary Wallace, Chris Younkin

**Not Attending:** Abigail Larson, Amanda Roundy

**Proxies:** Lee Wood for Celesta Lyman,

**Guests:** Jon Anderson, Daneka Souberbielle, James Sage, Matt Nickerson, Anne Diekema, Emma Turner, Andrew Burroughs, Matt Mckenzie, Jen McKenzie, Wendy Sanders, Bryan Graden, Jen McKenzie, Janelle Brown, John Meisner, Matt Nickerson, John Lisonbee, Heather Jones

1. Call to order (4:02)

2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests

- a. Jon Anderson, Provost
- b. Daneka Souberbielle, Associate Provost
- c. James Sage, Associate Provost
- d. Matt Nickerson (Associate Dean and Department Chair- Library)
- e. Anne Diekema (GE Committee)
- f. Emma Turner (GE Committee)
- g. Andrew Burroughs (University Registrar)
- h. Matt Mckenzie (CTI)
- i. Wendy Sanders (Academic Affairs)
- j. Bryan Graden (Academic Affairs)

3. Approval of [Meeting Minutes 11.10.22](#). Gary Wallace motioned to approve and Joel Vallett seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Information Items (4:05)

- a. Passing of Dr. Kim Craft (Greg Powell)
- b. Important Library Resources [Survey](#) (Matt Nickerson)

Note email sent out about an opportunity to support the academic libraries. Lobbies in SLC to advocate for academic libraries. We have a line item in the legislature that pays for library resources for colleges in UT. We have persuaded them and they've noticed the benefits and efficiencies of large state wide consortia subscriptions. We save money this way. We have a meeting coming up to decide and debate on what major DBs we are going to purchase statewide for everybody. We would like to receive feedback on how we use these. We would like to hear from you. In the survey - choose general public in the first option and then enter your profession when asked later. You will be able to talk about the disciplines you use and need to find in our library. Should take about 10 minutes. Remind faculty and students to

participate.

c. GE Updates (Rosalyn Eves, Anne Diekema, Emma Turner)

New plans for assessment and we wanted to include the Faculty Senate to share ideas. We've been asked to close the assessment loop. We should not only define and assess but also analyze data, and based on that data be able to adjust and improve our GE instruction. That is currently not possible so we've been asked to look at new options.

We are seeking input and volunteers to pilot our assessment. The four GE requirements are laid out in policy R470. During the last several years we have collected data regarding university essential learning outcomes and individual student evaluations. We now propose to collect data from the core knowledge and area learning outcomes and at the course level.

Using the university essential learning outcomes and with these outcomes you can give a 0,1,2,3, or 4 . The lower level classes do not capture information for improvement or any criteria – so it's either a 0 or a 1. The ELO paints a broad brush so it's hard. Students are not asked themselves whether they thought they reached the learning outcome. Some learning outcomes are not covered and the university does not provide any rubrics for any scoring guidance. We feel this new way will allow faculty to use GE data to demonstrate your teaching improvements.

This is for the GE committee and the faculty member, not necessary department chairs and potentially the student, if they want to know the learning outcomes they have reached. In the SUU course catalogue the GE outcomes are listed for each core area students have to demonstrate the listed skills. This is what we will be using for our new GE assessment. They have always been there we just haven't used them. They will be more applicable. What we hope to achieve is an increased alignment with the state-wide GE requirements as specified in the R470 and GE assessment, consistency, useful data, and this will reduce faculty workload concerning the assessment. You will no longer evaluate at student level but rather the course level. In process with a Fall '22 pilot with the math department.

Emma:

What we want to do is have faculty report on how well learning outcomes were covered and then ask students the same.

We're hoping when faculty have more frequent exposure to the core learning outcomes that they will self-correct as they review the responses from students and the reflection they've taken themselves. The GE committee can use faculty responses and discrepancies between faculty & student responses to provide support and encouragement and also use the data to look at breadth and knowledge areas as a whole in terms of learning outcomes.

Please send feedback.

Grant: Curious how we will get students to do the surveys. Is there a standardized incentive?

Emma: No, aside from faculty encouragement.

Chris: Currently the ELOs are put into a rubric and then get shuffled somewhere. Will that continue to happen?

Emma: Yes, we are working with CTI on this. James and Bill will be coming to most of our assessment meetings.

Rheana: How would you like to receive volunteers?

Anne: Emma Turner (GE Committee Co-Chair) [emmaturner@suu.edu](mailto:emmaturner@suu.edu) Rosalyn Eves (Faculty Senate GE Committee representative) [rosalyneves@suu.edu](mailto:rosalyneves@suu.edu) Anne Diekema (GE Committee Assessment Team Chair) [annediekema@suu.edu](mailto:annediekema@suu.edu)

Rosalyn: Here's the full GE catalog if you want to see it: <https://catalog.suu.edu/content.php?catoid=24&navoid=4292>. The current system also means that, when instructors select ELOs, subject experts may not be the only ones assessing a given outcome.

d. January 5 Learning & Development sessions (Matt Mckenzie)

This afternoon you should have received an email about the Jan 5 Learning and Development sessions. They are held in the afternoon – faculty has asked us to hold these sessions. There will be a Banner 9 training (Banner 8 is going away). If you do any purchasing or finance you will feel the impact. We will be streaming this Zoom event. We are also having a certifying CPR training with the Red Cross on Dec 5<sup>th</sup>. We need people to RSVP soon. There will be a Lunch and Learn continuing the conversation on the Summit on Belonging. Lunch ideas welcome. At 1pm we will breakout for Banner 9, Active Shooter Training, Risk Management, Embed Study Skills into courses, Evaluation Kit to look at long term statistics of your courses – using data over time and use the info to craft your effect. Academic Integrity module will be imbedded into your courses with some ability to avoid plagiarism, etc. It will; be editable by you to fit your needs. There will also be a training on the IRB changes and HR will talk about job descriptions. These will be recorded for you to watch them later.

Bryan: One of things that is coming in January – they will get rid of the exempt application form [for IRB]. The long form will still be available – it doesn't change the kind of approvals you can get, just the short form will no longer be available. Session to explain all this will be Jan 5<sup>th</sup> @ 3pm as a part of the Learning and Development

Sessions.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qE9bVWPTK-tD7LI7kcsWD39-ywJyRS6nxMJMTLlrkGk/edit?usp=sharing>

- e. SUMA Event Dec. 9, 6 - 8 pm [Mystery at the Museum](#)
- f. Funshine Childcare & Learning Center (SUU) – Update  
Last year faculty senate pushed hard for an employee childcare – recently representatives from all the stakeholders (SUU, State Bank and the Leavitt Group) met to discuss the procedural roll out. There will be an email about the facility, mission, enrollment, entrance procedures and possible subsidizing on Jan 1<sup>st</sup>. All of the stake holders are a part of this conversation. State Bank and the Leavitt Group will be subsidizing a small percentage of the childcare costs, so SUU could follow suit. There will be an interest form that closes on Feb 15th. The director of Funshine will hold meet and greets on campus, date TBD. SUU has 55 spots for staff and faculty and will use the employee interest form to prioritize need. Enrollment process will open on March 1<sup>st</sup> with the actual opening date on May 1<sup>st</sup>. Reach out to Rheana for more information.

#### 5. Action items (4:34)

- a. Vote on approval or suggest changes to [Emergency policy 5.68 Religious Accommodations](#)

In response to the requirement in State Statutes and prompted by USHE. Legal Affairs drafted the policy and was reviewed by president Benson and Presidents Cabinet. Deans Council has approved.

Motion to Approve: Gary Wallace  
2nd Motion: Kyle Thompson  
Unanimously approved.

#### 6. Discussion Items (4:35)

- a. Policy 6.1: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (Wendy Sanders, Bryan Graden)  
You will find links to the guiding document for revisions to Policy 6.1 and Highlights of the modifications. This is NOT the policy, but rather an outline to assist. Feedback on the directions the committee is moving.
  - i. [Highlights](#)
  - ii. [Modification Outline](#)

Wendy: We have had a great work working on this policy revision. We have a wide representation. We also have representation from multiple colleges. Over the last couple of months we have consulted with the Deans counsel, legal counsel, faculty members, department chairs, executive faculty senate council, etc. We started collecting feedback about the policy last year and finished up this semester. We have synthesized the feedback into several key points, which are based on the most

frequently repeated topics. We have worked to address these in the highlighted document. A quick recap on the issues of concern:

- Separation of the FEC plan and report. We propose to eliminate the plan. We would like to replace it with what we are calling an Expectations and Documentation Meeting between faculty and department chair before end of spring term.
- Mentors should not be the evaluator and should recuse themselves. Mentors used for first 3 years or longer depending on whether faculty would like to continue.
- We are reinstating that the department committee is the first to evaluate and then the chair. We have clarified the procedures.
- We want to make it simple, clear and streamlined.

Bryan: The document you received is not written in policy language as we are trying to articulate these ideas of what the tenure and rank advancement process would look like. Critical to the process is that every department has a current document that weighs out the criteria for rank advancement and tenure as applicable. So that's the foundation to make sure that all junior faculty whether TT or NTT know what the expectations and criteria are in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service. Every department will be tasked as this moves forward with making sure that their document is up to date to eliminate confusion and understand where the benchmark is. We tried to address different faculty profiles for criteria that addresses TT, NTT, and tenured faculty.

Bruce: Please don't make mentor recuse themselves as my department has four tenured faculty that could serve on committee. In finance there is only one, and so serves every other faculty in finance as well as management and economics. Somebody has to be on the college committee or department committee and if the one finance member has to recuse himself then no one from finance would be giving feedback on any committee which means no representation from anyone who actually knows the finance field. It is burdensome to say that I have to mentor all these folks but I can't serve on any committee and give feedback at these evaluative levels. I think it's a real weakness. I've sent an email suggesting that we pool the mentors all together, but if that can't happen I hope we can have more flexibility to have a true evaluative committee when it comes to the faculty.

Cody: We may want more discussion – as I understand it, at the department level the evaluation committee would consist of tenured and non-tenure track individuals. This would result in non-tenure track individuals evaluating tenure track individuals and basically making the first decision on whether they should get tenure or not. In my experience we've avoided this and might warrant some further discussion or clarification.

Bri: Another issue I have is a question about the mentors being replaced by department chairs to work on plans. I am a little concerned about the power dynamic that may be a

little compromising for the new/junior faculty in a vulnerable position. With a mentor there seems to be a little more equal footing and taking advice from a fellow faculty member rather than a chair. It could be an issue for some.

Rosalyn: Interviewing with the department chair presents some logistical issues as English is a large department that typically is without an assistant department chair and so the department chair has to meet with 20 faculty in a 2-3 week period. This could be difficult. A lot of the faculty work under the writing program administrator rather than the department chair. Can we write language that makes some accommodation as the department chair may not feasibly meet with every one they would need to?

Chris: Expectations meeting – there seem to be some checks against things being unfair or unbalanced. The language just says expectation it doesn't address faculty goals or what the faculty wants to do. As it is represented in the document, it sounds like you will sit down and be told what to do but this doesn't seem to take into consideration what the faculty wants to do. Another concern is that having the policy updated is a little like a student finishing their degree, which is based on how things are when they started. So, if a new faculty comes in and then a policy changes, are the expectations changing across their experience of the tenure process? If there is a big change is that throwing them off or are there going to be requirements that come up that someone in the 5<sup>th</sup> year hasn't met yet and then there is going to be a scramble? How do you balance the changes to the expectations and what they were when they started with how things could be changing?

Michelle: Clarification on expectations and outcomes – would faculty be penalized? The plan would be formal but the goals would be discussed with their chairs. Some academics are overly ambitious and some scholarly work and that path to publication can be an uncertain process.

Bryan: I want to clarify that we need to be more precise about what an expectation meeting actually is – my understanding of that meeting with the department chairs is that it is meant to be a conversation where specific knowledge about the needs of the department are discussed. There would be no dictating of the type of research/scholarly work you would be involved in. In terms of achieving tenure and goals, the faculty would need to refer to their mentors and the department level criteria to determine what they need to do to achieve tenure.

Wendy: We want this to be a conversation between faculty and department chairs to prepare and support rather than dictate. We want to be set up for success.

Kelly: Faculty job descriptions. If job descriptions are slated to be added to the policy – we would like them to be accessible to faculty. I haven't seen mine since I was initially hired, nor could I find it. Just because a faculty member is hired to develop or teach specific classes, it shouldn't limit them to expectations only within those classes. Also,

uncomfortable with “expectations” language, perhaps word like “goals.”

Bryan Koenig: It would make more sense to do the report in May at the end of the year and the expectations meeting before fall semester, when you’ve had time to think about the upcoming classes. Concerns about intentional time to come up with what we want to do, so now perhaps it will be more like a brainstorming session. Also, top down concerns. Also, a concern about whether the mentor would keep them from having an evaluative role – mentor discusses plans with mentee, but keeps their concerns confidential (not share with Chair or committee) then say they approved the plan so there is documentation of approval or have something like a check box that says that the mentor has concerns, but they wouldn’t say specifically what the concerns are. A lot of people might prefer this so there are more sources of evidence when tenure approaches, not just the chair but other faculty members in your department thought you were doing the kind of things your department values. Preferred two faculty mentors over one for more distributed feedback. One goal with prior system was to reduce the concern about whether or not they would get tenure by having records of two people/faculty mentors every year saying that, yes this person is on track and doing what we value. We desire supported documentation to make a supported case for tenure but now all is concentrated with the chair and less predictable. One person wondered – so we still have a mentor for first three years but not on the committee, could they however be an advocate to influence the committee?

Maren: Power differential – having a mentor who is not a department chair seems very helpful for faculty pursuing tenure. Having a mentor who is not the evaluator. The power differential minimizes or eliminates the supportive nature of this process.

Wendy: One of the goals was to take the mystery out of how you get tenure. Put the emphases on the department criteria so there is no question on expectations in moving through rank. We believe that the mentor process is the conversation the faculty member is having before they go in to the department chair to make sure all aligns with department criteria and needs. Clarity with job descriptions. Some explanation on the shift to spring in terms of the amount of labor that it would take at the end of the semester to hold these meetings, it was considered too late in the fall to respond and make adjustments.

Bryan: University is on a trend to have less tenured faculty, which makes representation an interesting struggle. Power deferential is definitely a concern that we want to mitigate. These entities are meant to be supportive rather than punitive or critical. Having the P&T committee first, before meeting with department chair, would provide a second voice.

Lee: I appreciate that we’re trying to refine a policy that isn’t perfect. Maybe we’re trying too hard to come up with the perfect answer. Perhaps we need to look at this as a document that is in process and may not be perfect but will still make progress.

Jen: Do mentors have to be tenured? Can we say that folks can be mentors once they have passed their midpoint review?

James: In response to Kelly's comments (esp. about defining faculty expectations and job descriptions): our Legal Office has asked for some revisions to six different policies, including 6.0 (Definition of Faculty). Those requested revisions should help with the notion of clarifying expectations and job descriptions for faculty. However, admittedly, those clarifications are still at the more general level and would not address the expectations linked to specific courses and other responsibilities within the hiring department.

- b. [Strategic Plan 1.2 Draft](#) and updates; [Strategic Plan 1.3](#); and more updates! [Plan 1.4 as of 12/7/22](#) (Provost Anderson, Chris Younkin, Gary Wallace)

Jon: The committee has been working on this for 2.5 years with a 1-year hiatus in the middle during the presidential search. It's important for the strategic plan to reflect the intents and hopes of the president. We took guidance from her inaugural address and incorporated that with the work of the committee and months of refining and now have the document to share with campus -- finished the plan late yesterday afternoon. Built on a focus of people, purpose and place for the next 5-years. There are 18 actions under 5 broad categories. We feel this is a solid plan to help us to elevate the academic culture on campus and students to get the support they need to be successful. At this point we are sharing with the senate, staff association and the student association and asking for their endorsement. You will have a chance to vet it and give ideas back. We will take any edits and then work it up to the Board of Trustees in March.

Chris Y: during the refining process this represents a lot of the feedback we were receiving – it is student centered and also accounts for the rest of campus and what it does. The language is general – we hope it is well received.

Jon: The Strategic Plan 1.3 link is the correct version (1.4 link is the old plan).

Gary: A plan like this is a methodology to carry us forward. Having four pages we have the methodology of what captures what SUU is and where we want to go. I think it's a great document.

Chris: As we're moving this forward and getting feedback – is this meeting our only chance to talk about this?

Rheana: We can talk about it in the spring as well – Jan/Feb.

Jon: Our committee has finished – we will not be reconvening. It will go straight from



here up to the leadership channels to the president and leaderships counsels then to the cabinet and then the board of trustees.

Grant: Make the figure (pie chart) bigger, hard to see.

Jon: Marketing team is working on it to make it much more legible.

- c. Policy 6.49: Graduation Requirements [Tracked](#) [Clean](#) (Andrew Burroughs)  
Deans council has approved changes.

Andrew: The biggest change is the opportunity for students to add a second degree. Now they can only double major on one diploma. This is an opportunity for students to earn two distinct diplomas during their undergraduate career without having to stop and come back. This is the biggest change. This is a student-led initiative about why they can't earn two degrees without having to stop and come back

Rheana: This is the first reading -- we can take another look at this in Jan.

Cody: Does this help students with financial aid for the second degree?

Andrew: Once you finish the requirements you're still not eligible. But this brings them closer as they approach the end.

Koenig: Explain the requirements.

Andrew: 60 credits have to be unshared in. It's not a big difference, but the only difference between a student with a double major vs. a double degree is that right now with a double major a student can technically earn a BS in French. So, if a student is an engineering major and a French major, we have to put that under one. So, a student could technically have a BS in Engineering and a BS in French, which we don't offer. This then becomes an issue when it comes to the academic record.

- d. Interest in performing a similar survey or adopting recommendations? (tabled)  
[Report finds UNM faculty members affected by ongoing pandemic stress and work obstacles](#) (Chris Graves) Tabled for January meeting

## 7. Standing committee updates (5:24)

- a. Academic Affairs (Rheana Gardner)
- b. Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (Kelly Goonan)  
Onboarding meeting at end of November – Lindsay gave committee updates and their charge and priorities. Will reconvene next semester to work on those

initiatives.

- c. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)
- d. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)
- e. Staff Association Liaison (Daniel Eves)
- d. Faculty Awards Committees - [webpage](#)
  - i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer/Grace A Tanner Committee (Chris Graves)
  - ii. Inclusion Diversity Awards (Abigail Larson)
  - iii. Outstanding & Distinguished Educator Award (Bryan Koenig)
  - iv. Distinguished Scholarly/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
  - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award (Derek Hein)
  - vi. Distinguished Faculty Global Engagement Award (Kurt Harris)
- e. General Education Committee (Roselyn Eves)
- f. University Equity and Inclusion Committee (Bri Kramer)
- h. University Curriculum Committee (Scott Knowles)
- j. Student Association Liaison (Joel Vallet)
- l. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
- m. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)
- n. Past President's Report - (Rheana Gardner) Funshine Childcare Center
- o. President Elect's Report - (Kelly Goonan)
- p. President's Report – (Abigail Larson) President's Council & Dean's Council & Strategic Planning & Athletic Director Search

8. Call for Executive Session

9. Adjourn (5:29)