

## **FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA**

February 6, 2025

4:00-5:30pm

*Approved*

Attending: Scott Knowles, Kelly Goonan, Chris Monson, John Karpel, Grant Shimer, Chris Graves, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Jacob Dean, Scott Hansen, David Hatch, Derek Hein, Maren Hirschi, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Jon Lee, John Meisner, Elijah Neilson, R. Alexander Nichols, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Kevin Stein, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending:

Proxies:

Guests: Mindy Benson, Shauna Mendini, James Sage, Camille Thomas, Jake Johnson, Shalina Kesar, Matt McKenzie, Robb McCollum, Clint Broadbent, Tessa Anderson

1. Call to order (4:00)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:00)
  - a. President Benson
  - b. Interim Provost Mendini
  - c. Associate Provost James Sage
  - d. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
  - e. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
  - a. Senior Director of CTI and Staff Association President, Matt McKenzie
  - f. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
  - g. Director of American Language and Culture Center, Dr. Robb McCollum
  - h. CTI Faculty Working Group, Dr. Clint Broadbent
  - i. Director of Internal Audit, Tessa Anderson
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
  - a. [January 23, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

The minutes were approved.

#### 4. Events and Announcements: (4:04)

- a. Faculty can submit [Caught Red Handed awards](#) to other faculty, staff, and student employees. Staff Association will deliver these awards monthly (if not more frequently).
- b. Collecting Faculty Stories - Please share these with students and colleagues to help gather unique, personal stories about the impact our faculty have on students every day. No story is too small.
  - i. [Faculty/staff/admin Form](#)
  - ii. [Student Form](#)
- c. QPR Training - 75% Training Goal
  - i. Contact Madison McBride to schedule department level trainings: [madisonmcbride@suu.edu](mailto:madisonmcbride@suu.edu)
  - ii. [Spring Semester QPR Training Dates](#)
    - 1. [RSVP here](#)
- d. This spring (Jan.- Apr.), the Utah Academic Library Consortium's Open Education Resources Committee will hold a monthly lunch & learn series exploring the transformative world of open education. Join fellow educators and professionals for an engaging lunchtime session. Find details at <https://ualc.net/utahoer/> or reach out to Chris Younkin ([chrisyounkin@suu.edu](mailto:chrisyounkin@suu.edu)).
- e. Giving Thor's Day - Hammerfest and Thunder Quest 2025
- f. Student Research - [Active Transportation Survey](#)

#### 5. Information Items: (4:05)

- a. Thunderbird Awards (Scott Knowles)
  - i. [Nomination Form](#)
- b. [SUU's Guiding Principles for Generative Artificial Intelligence](#) (Tessa Anderson)

Tessa Anderson: Julie McCowan and I co-chair the generative AI Committee. We had 30 people at the beginning and got a broad outline for the guiding principles for generative artificial intelligence use on campus. We have continued to meet as a committee several times over the semester along with legal and various other interested parties on campus, to narrow down and refine these ideas, which is the above link

Things that were important to us were whether the policies that SUU has in place are sufficient to protect data, privacy, and security policies already in place. We were very reticent to create another policy specific for the use of artificial intelligence that would then limit our ability to be agile around changes in technology around artificial intelligence.

The guiding principles are posted on the Provost's website. We are interested in surveying both faculty, staff, and students on use.

- c. Faculty Senate President Elections - [Nominations Form](#)
- d. External Access to SUU Spaces and Records (Scott Knowles)
  - i. <https://www.suu.edu/external-access/>

Scott has received a number of requests if ICE approached us on campus/in class. See the link above for guidelines on our responsibilities.

6. Legislative Update Q&A (Interim Provost Mendini and President Benson) - 10 minutes (4:12)

Provost Mendini: SUU gave a presentation and received a very positive response. Provost Mendini was on the Hill and joined President Benson to meet many stakeholders and committee members. The response was solid and supportive, though we won't receive any special treatment. Things are constantly changing. 10% of instructional needs to be cut which creates about 3.17 million that we have to find. If it was institutional, not just instructional, the number would be closer to \$15 million. So things are shifting into a better position in aligning us a little bit better than what it could be. I know that there are legislators who are really supporting us, and one of them is Senator Milner. I am convinced that she has brought things a little closer to the center than they would have been otherwise, and I am very appreciative.

President Benson: Met with 40-50 legislators. We were well received but they are going forward with the legislation. It was reported that Senator Milner has heard from more of our faculty and staff than any other. We are involved in the process and were commended.

Provost Mendini: The bill hasn't been voted on yet. Still going through changes. No decisions have been made. We are looking at 6 criteria. The important one is the size of the program and graduates. The provost is meeting with the deans and looking at all the nuances. Student demand and resources are examined to look at the balance.

Rachel Parker: At both the committee meeting last week and the floor vote in the house yesterday, Representative Peterson said that cuts don't just have to come from academics and student support. Has that been communicated to you at all?

Provost: Asking for vice presidents to look at their programs and see where they need to cut. Perhaps student support programs and facilities as well.

President: We need to look at efficiencies across campus. However, there seems to be an emphasis on underperforming programs. In meetings with legislators this past week. It was very clear that they want us to follow this, the letter of the law, and that means cuts within programs that are underperforming, not an across-the-board budget cut to try to absorb this. So we're trying to figure out how to thread that needle with what we're hearing from legislators and from USHE.

Grant Shimer: Regarding the enrollments, it could vary quite a bit. The average enrollment in a major or in a program, for instance, in geology, some of our courses will have 60. Some of them are 24, and then we might have a special 4000 level course of like 5, and that changes the median. So what number should we be thinking about as representative of a program?

Shauna: Enrollment of majors is what we're looking at for the last five years and what the trends are.

Chris: Are there enough underperforming programs to meet the 10%?

Shauna: IT doesn't have to all be 10% in programs. As we're looking at things, we can make some cuts in different areas and have enough low programs that need to shift to minors. I will be emailing faculty about the possibility of dropping stipends for summer semesters. \$1800 grad classes per ICH, undergrad classes at \$1500 ICH. This could save us \$600,000.

John: Grant's question made me wonder how the majors are calculated for secondary education. The secondary education majors declare at different times compared to what we calculate for elementary ed. Is this being considered? Is there anything we should be doing to make sure those students have declared their major earlier than they typically would?

Shauna: Separated by CIP code. We have to keep track and look at secondary education and understand the nuances of the education degrees aligned with their major. When they enroll it's total during the 3rd week.

Maren: Please clarify the summer stipend.

Shauna: Summer courses taught.

Elise: Counting double majors for data accuracy. Also, I think efficiency is very important, and I know you both said we were the most efficient of universities. Of course, we're also thinking about education right and being a university and wanting to keep the breadth of programs.

Shauna: Exactly excellent. To your 1st question, Christian has gone back and created the double majors for all 5 years. We are making sure that we have every bit of data. We've counted those in terms of our completions. Your second question – the efficiencies are incredibly important, but we are first and foremost a university. We need to make sure that if we can downsize a program and broaden its experience to more students and redefine how we use that faculty we can have a lot of options. It doesn't have to be cut the program. I'm seeing already, with some of the curriculum coming through departments are looking at how can they have a broader institutional impact. There can be an opportunity where we don't have these 4/5 or 6/7 majors that are taking a lot of resources at the 4000 level, but that we broaden the 2000 and the 3000 level courses with more of a major in general ed.

Scott Knowles: We have two questions coming from a Q&A, and they are related. Are summer administrative stipends also being considered for cuts in conjunction with summer teaching compensation?

And then along those same lines, are we going to know whether there will be cuts to summer compensation by the time registration starts next Tuesday so that faculty can make an informed decision?

Shauna: Department chairs are on a 10month contract and receive \$6000 stipend. We will not cut chair stipends – we are underfunding them and overworking them. Second, the decision for summer stipend reductions hasn't been made but I am emailing to let faculty know that we may reduce the summer stipend for teaching classes. Be aware.

Kelly: Concerned with bill timeline. Universities should submit plans by July 1st. If the Board of Higher Ed is taking June-Sept at proposals what does that mean for jobs that could be lost? If a position is discontinued and someone loses their job they would miss the opportunity to apply for jobs.

Shauna: This is one of the biggest concerns. I am trying to look at a lever of 600,000. The first step is we have to put in 30% of the cut. And then it provides us the ability to teach people out of a program.

And then the second step is we have to come up with 70%. If we could come up with a good amount of funding that isn't attached to a personnel issue or a faculty line. Then that faculty line can continue to be hired next year to teach that group out and prepare for new opportunities. I don't want to have to let anyone go this year. If there are individuals who want an early retirement or a retirement, I really want to work with the president of human resources to have some incentives.

Mindy: This is something that we talked about with Cabinet last week, and I tasked Mary and her team in Budget to take a look at it. What kind of funding do we have available for incentives and incentivizing an early retirement? Or I know Weber is doing a mutual separation kind of agreement, and they're incentivizing

that. We're trying to explore all of our options. We're also asking that question, do these have to be done right now? What do we do with people in the 3 months until we know if we get that funding back? Do we have funding to keep them for those 3 months until we get a definite yay or nay. It's important to say that we have not made any final decisions.

Scott: University presidents said they wanted a shorter timeline.

Mindy: Each university president is handling it differently and want to do cuts sooner/faster. Our budget is lean and efficient enough that it will be difficult to find 3.1 million of it at once. So we have decided not to be that aggressive. But I know some Presidents are being that aggressive.

Shalini: Graduate directors have an ongoing decision about whether their a 10-month contract or not depending on the former provost formula. But when we are considering these budgets, can we anticipate that the working round will also be considered? Not a budget cut or not a priority like the chairs. Just wanted to get an idea so we also know where we are going.

Shauna Mendini: In order to get the 10 months you've also completed two of the criteria – do you have over a hundred students? So chances are at our institution we're not going to cut a graduate program with 100 students, and that workload on those directors monitoring and taking care of those 100 students is high enough that I don't think we will drop down into that level where that would be a major consideration. I can't say that's never going to happen though.

This is 3.17 million dollars. There was a cut made a year ago that the legislators backfilled for us for 1.5 million. We've already made those cuts as an institution. I've taken a major cut in academic affairs and most faculty haven't even felt that you've gone about your work without even knowing that took place. Now your Deans know, because I've said no a lot and that's been a difficult process. But we've already made major cuts in this process and are working our way through now that we have this next level. But we were able to overcome that last level of challenges and we're going to get through this. I'm not going to say we're going to be stronger. I don't know if we are. We may see some programs go. But we're definitely going to do our best to take care of our people and be there for our people.

7. Action Items: (4:49)

a. WAFSEC Committee Member (Scott Knowles)

i. Prosenjit Chatterjee (Computer Science)

The motion was given and seconded. This was approved.

- b. [Repeal Policy 6.32 Faculty Resignations](#) (Jake Johnson)

Motion was made and seconded. Motion carried.

- c. [Student Course Feedback Survey Revision](#) - CTI Faculty Working Group Proposal (Robb McCollum and Clint Broadbent)

The point is to elicit student feedback and not an evaluation of teaching only as an instructors tool for improvement.

Ryan: Received feedback from the department. The easiest one is one faculty member felt three text boxes were redundant. If you have a text box that asks for people to talk more, they're gonna make positive and negative comments. And so my faculty didn't like the idea of additional text boxes after that.

See feedback about the first question regarding engagement. My professor's instruction was engaging and interesting. There's some concern that many of our students have various forms of attention deficit disorder and anxiety, and so forth, probably as a result of growing up with social media on their smartphones. So there is interest in massaging that language a little bit something like: the course provided many opportunities for me to engage meaningfully with the course content, or something along those lines. Something that is less directed at whether or not the professor is competing with whatever they have going on their phones, etc.

Clint Broadbent: We did make some changes due to the feedback and that engagement question was one of them. Something to the extent of: my professor made attempts to engage me. Highlighting the idea of attempting the work with that, because, again, I do agree.

We did receive feedback, and we are exploring the possibility of asking: what was your enthusiasm level or what was your desire level to take the course to to better help with that and give more context to that same situation of having an attitude of being forced to take a GE course that the student doesn't want to take.

**Updated document was sent to Scott.**

Ryan Siemers: There was a similar concern about the last question about whether the professor cared about my success.

Clint Broadbent: We also received a lot of a lot of feedback on this one. We wanted to tie it in with the mission of the SUU being people-centric and we tossed around the idea of investment: my professor seemed

invested in my success. But again falls into that subjective idea. We would appreciate any feedback on ways of approaching this one.

Ryan Siemers: The feedback that I received was that the word care might raise expectations along the lines of the professor being in a parental role which isn't what we're doing. So maybe something like: I was adequately supported in the class to achieve the course goals or something along those lines. I would move away from asking the student to try to get inside their instructor's heads and sort of figure out what their intentions or emotional state is.

Scott Knowles: I don't think the Faculty Senate will be able to vote on this because we have not seen the revised language. So let's go ahead and continue this conversation for a few minutes longer, and then I'll get that information from Rob and send it out to all faculty senators and we can collect feedback again, and then we'll bring you back for another meeting.

Bryan Koenig: I am in the department that produced the last set of these student evaluation questions. The folks who were on that committee said they weren't asked to provide any input into the current process, and they would be happy to be involved. They did a literature review to identify empirically based teaching that impacts student success and that's how they came up with their list. They tried to be really careful with the language so it wasn't subjective. One of the goals of the last system was to get away from a single number. It seems like there's this big push to get back to a single number. That's just an observation. I know a lot of departments use a single number for evaluating faculty, and even for tenure qualifications. You have to get above a certain number but the various faculty members in my department suggested making sure that you can. You only ask questions that the students would know the answer to. They appreciated the idea of making it shorter and more concise. So I think everybody agrees that it's a little bit too long.

But a trade-off there, of course, is you end up missing important things. It's really important that you pick the most important things that people care about. Generally, they suggested choosing objective, evidence-based topics.

Previously, when they set it up, it was intended to be a kind of feedback to help professors improve their teaching. It was not designed for an evaluation for tenure or anything like that. It's formative rather than summative. Moving forward with this new effort, it would be nice if CTI could do some training.

Shalini: I agree about this not being a tool for evaluating teaching effectiveness, but rather that it is feedback for the instructor to improve their teaching when they connect with their mentor and their chair.



In our department, student feedback has been used as an effective teaching evaluation tool. So the question I have is, if I go back to the faculty, would it be advisable that we go back and look at our deck and put this comment, that this is just a reflection and improvement, and not an evaluation. And if I could have the chair in our department or the committee who's involved with the deck reach out to you because this changes the whole dynamics of what you're saying. The second question I had was since it's been used as an effective evaluation tool we were told it had to be 65% response rate or more to be effective and to be valid as a tool. How does that change the dynamics of how we view this?

Kelly Goonan: Policy 6.1, the Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation policy explicitly states that the DEC shall include a variety of measures of teaching effectiveness outside of student feedback.

It doesn't say that student feedback surveys cannot be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness, but it does say that it cannot be the sole piece of evidence used to evaluate a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The DEC are supposed to be developed by the faculty in the department and reflect the disciplines in that department. So if the faculty have agreed that they want to include feedback as a measure that's absolutely within their rights to do so. It just cannot be the only measure of teaching effectiveness.

Shalini Kesar (Dr. K)

Shalini Kesar: Thank you, Kelly, that helps. I'm just thinking as a faculty senator to go back and say, let's revisit it. If it's not a tool designed for teaching effectiveness why are we using it?

Scott: I would entertain a motion to postpone definitely until our next meeting when we can make sure that we have the right document in front of us with the updated questions before we take it to a vote.

The motion was carried.

## 8. Discussion Items: (5:07)

### a. Attainment Gaps Initiatives Sub-Committee Member (Scott Knowles)

#### i. [Information](#)

The Attainment Gaps Initiative subcommittee approached me looking for a Faculty Senate representative to join that committee. You'll note there that the email from Bree Kramer is included, so that you have some additional information on what that is. Go ahead and take a look at that. We do want this representative to be a current faculty senator. If it's of interest to you

email me and put your name in the hat for that position, and then we'll discuss it further.

b. [Policy 6.6 Revision](#) (Kelly Goonan)

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1H\\_F2DshK9x-RqAJWomWNO1YbAXFbJxHa/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=113879619033367281283&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1H_F2DshK9x-RqAJWomWNO1YbAXFbJxHa/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=113879619033367281283&rtpof=true&sd=true)

At the December 5th meeting, the Senate voted to postpone definitely the revision to policy 6.6 academic freedom. The two main concerns that were raised by the Faculty Senate were (1) that the policy addressed research, and folks did not feel that that adequately captured artistic or creative work that faculty are involved in. The next point (2) that was raised was a concern about protecting intramural speech. The Academic Affairs Committee took that feedback and has proposed the current version here. You'll notice a few specific areas where that have been updated to include references to shared governance and freedom of artistic expression. We also added some definitions. Previously we just had a definition of academic freedom, but we also pulled definitions from policy 6.1 to define scholarly and creative activities, shared governance, and teaching effectiveness. The policy has also been reorganized to make it a little more clear and easy to understand.

Some specific additions that I would like to draw folks attention to in section IV a4 in shared governance that was added to explicitly state that faculty who are working on a committee or serving in an elected or appointed role are protected by academic freedom.

There was a vigorous discussion. 25 emails to be exact, about intramural speech, and whether this provision was strong enough for faculty to feel like they were adequately protected. You will notice that there is a comment that it has been approved by the majority of the Academic Affairs Committee. But this was an addition that we have suggested, kind of based on that feedback to protect faculty speech when they are speaking within their faculty role at the institution. So department meetings, town halls, campus events, etc.

The limitations on Academic Freedom section has been reorganized. But again we felt that this helped it be more clear and easy to understand. So the Academic Affairs Committee would like to propose this version, with the addition of that comment there in institutional functions which would be added as Roman numeral for a 5.

Kelly (chat): from 6.1: Scholarly/Creative Activities: Purposeful and intentional activities that seek to provide new knowledge or understanding to a particular field of study. These activities are skillfully interpreted and

deployed and are deeply informed by current knowledge in a Faculty member's field of study and expertise. Scholarly and Creative Activities are of equal value and importance to the University and may lead to innovative curriculum, and/or integrate thoughts and ideas from diverse disciplines or areas of inquiry.

Scott: I do have a question, and perhaps Jake can help us understand this. This is currently a temporary policy. It was put in place and then needed to be revised, presumably because of new legislation laws or resolutions. What was the original reason that we had to do that? Why did we put it in as a temporary policy?

Jake Johnson: This initial draft, the December 5th draft that you saw, was put in by our former general counsel, Maureen Rediker, she felt based off of USHEs statements about protecting academic freedom and institutional neutrality that this policy should be updated.

And so that's why it went through with that temporary revision. She wanted it to be consistent with both 6.28 but also 5.1, which had substantial changes as a result of those resolutions.

Scott Knowles: One of the things I notice is that we no longer mention institutional neutrality in the policy. Is that okay? We're not worried about that?

Jake Johnson: I don't necessarily know that institutional neutrality wasn't supposed to impact teaching or research. That's why I think it isn't as important for a reference in this. At least, that's my read on it.

Grant Shimer: Regarding the language style, particularly in the definitions in 3c for the scholarly creative activities, some of the adjectives. I was a little curious about how those came to be and how important they are, or if some of those could be struck just because they offer wiggle room for people to essentially get evaluated by other faculty in a way that could be discriminatory. Specifically "purposeful and intentional activities. I mean, if you're doing something, it's generally purposeful or intentional, and then "skillfully interpreted and deployed". I feel like it adds weaknesses in the armor of protection.

Jake Johnson: That's just a verbatim copy from 6.1.

Kelly Goonan: We would have to revise, revise 6.1 to make changes to the definition. I'm not saying we can't. Do it next year when Scott is chairing the Academic Affairs Committee.

Scott Knowles: I do have another question. I like the new language that applies to all faculty with concern to intramural speech, and I don't really care if we call it intramural speech or shared governance, or anything else.

But my question is, is there a demonstrable difference in the protection that's being offered in the new language compared to the protection that's being offered in the shared governance section? Or is there a demonstrable difference in the place where communication would take place? For example, it seems to me that the new language suggested would cover everyone. Then why do we need the shared governance section for people who are specifically elected, appointed, or volunteered for a specific role on a committee? I just don't think we need both, do we? Unless there is a demonstrable difference in the language, and when we look at the language, the protective words are reasonably right, reasonably rely on academic freedom to protect them from discipline when expressing things in specific roles, and then the new languages reasonably rely on academic freedom to protect them from discipline in a variety of situations.

Kelly Goonan: My understanding that the Executive Committee felt that IV a4 shared governance was too narrow a protection of intramural speech, and when you read the definition of shared governance, which is also taken from policy 6.1, that states that faculty who are serving in an elected role. So you all as senators, or maybe on a department committee, or something similar in an appointed role. If your dean or your chair asks you to serve somewhere or in a volunteer role, when you volunteer for a committee you are protected from sharing opinions or critiques or questioning university policies or actions.

Folks felt that did not include asking questions in a department meeting or in a college meeting, or what if I'm venting to my colleague in the hallway and my chair walks by and happens to hear me talking about how I don't like having to do a parent syllabus.

So after much discussion, this language was suggested by a member of the Executive Committee, and I took it and adjusted it slightly in an attempt to clarify that academic freedom protects us when we are acting within our professional role as faculty members. It doesn't protect us everywhere. If I'm at the July jamboree complaining about parent syllabi and a City Council member hears me tell somebody maybe that's not as appropriate or you can say it's appropriate or not appropriate. But academic freedom wouldn't apply. But my first amendment rights would because I'm speaking in a public gathering, not as a representative of the University, not in my official role as a faculty member.

I would recommend keeping both, and that seemed to be the consensus among the Academic Affairs Committee because it clearly states that faculty participating in shared governance as well as in their institutional function. It adds a few lines to the policy. I think we would essentially have to say the same words, or many of the same words in one point to capture

the full intent of that. I would rather be more inclusive, if you will, than brief in this case.

Scott: To be clear, I'm not suggesting for brevity's sake. I'm suggesting it because I don't know why we'd say the same thing twice and I think it is largely the same thing. I don't see how institutional functions don't apply to my role currently as faculty center president, for example. And if it doesn't, then why keep both. The added concern that I have is that I know we were told that it's possible that people up the line, Dean's Council/Presidents Cabinet, would not be amenable to an inclusion that tells us that we can have intramural speech if we include both. It's very simple to cut out the one they don't like, and leave the one that restricts intramural speech to only those who are elected, appointed, or volunteered for a specific committee role. And that's a concern to me so I'm voicing it. We don't need to continue to discuss it.

Chris Younkin: My question was partially answered. I've always thought of academic freedom in the sense of we're protected while we're teaching, and we're protected when we're doing research. Outside of that it seems academic freedom isn't really applicable. So I'm wondering if the shared governance piece isn't in here, then where would it fit, or are there protections elsewhere? Or does this just bundle service into the teaching and scholarship?

Kelly Goonan: So that was the main my understanding and that was the main point behind the Senate raising the concern about intramural speech in the previous draft about shared governance that was not included, and folks felt that academic freedom ought to apply to faculty when they are functioning within their role as a faculty member at the university, beyond their teaching and their scholarly and creative activities.

Scott Knowles: Chris, I can send you some resources. Intramural speech is often discussed as a portion of academic speech and intramural speech being that speech which a faculty member engages in to critique or criticize, or give an opinion about the operation of the university, whether via policies or on a department department level. It is essentially a faculty member's right to tell the department chair that they think they're mishandling the budget and then that would be protected under academic freedom.

Please go ahead and send this policy off to all of your faculty. Colleagues, gather feedback, and we will return to this on February 20th as an action item.

- c. Ad Hoc Committee on Policies outside of 6.0 - Comments (Chris Monson)
  - i. [5.26, 5.32, 8.5.1, 9.11, 11.1](#)

The committee is trying to give our feedback to Faculty Senate before we return it to the policy originators. There's a policy 5.2 6 Residency. There were a few parts that we suggested they could clarify by rewriting 5.32. Somebody had a question about part-time faculty. I didn't know the answer to that but if there are, then this policy might apply to them, but otherwise it wouldn't. 8.5 dealt with overtime, and there were comments about whether we wish we had overtime. Policy 911 is a voting policy that says that you can arrange with your supervisor to have time off to vote. The question was, Does this apply to all faculty? Or does this apply to all employees? Does faculty have a class canceled to go vote? We don't know the answer to that. We suggested that should be cleared up one way or the other. There was the SUUSA Constitution, which we had no concerns about. We are open for comments if anyone has additional concerns.

d. Faculty Senate President Criteria (Scott Knowles)

There is no path for protection for NTT faculty to serve as faculty senate president. Furthermore, Provost Mendini really felt that serving as faculty Senate President was outside the scope of a lecturer or non-tenure track faculty member's job, which is mostly focused on teaching and at a higher workload than tenure track faculty members. All of this is to say that the Provost office does not support having non-tenure track faculty members being eligible as Faculty Senate President. Are there questions or comments?

my recommendation would be that we move forward and not try to make that happen.

e. Sick and Medical Leave for Faculty (Scott Knowles)

I asked you guys to go back to your departments/colleagues and see what people thought about perhaps working on a policy that would start covering sick and medical leave beyond what is required by law, which is the Six Week Family Medical Leave Act. What feedback did you receive?

John Benedict: Indifferent. Department current does not have any sick or leave.

Maren Hirschi: Multiple faculty in my department are supportive of a sick leave policy. It's not a big deal for faculty generally to manage something like a stomach bug where we're out for a day or two, but when bigger things come up that require long-term treatments, such as cancer, that is a lot harder to manage and faculty should not have to choose between getting cancer treatment or keeping their job.

Jon Karpel: Yeah, a few of my faculty members pointed out that a lot of other institutions have something like this. Maybe we could look around and see what kind of examples other universities are using.

Scott Knowles: There are some complexities that go along with that like we don't accrue sick leave and doing that changes some other things around. A lot of other universities also do that. But it's a very good suggestion that we look at what other institutions are doing for sick and medical leave, and see if we can mirror a policy on that.

Does anybody else have comments or feedback on that idea?

Ryan Siemers: My faculty were generally supportive of this idea.

Scott Knowles: I'm going to take this back to the Executive Committee and work on forming a committee that will try to put together a proposal for that. Thank you all for getting that feedback.

f. P&T Documents in a single PDF (Scott Knowles)

Nathan Slaughter: This is the only thing I got feedback on, and the feedback was that they are in much more support of allowing the Google drive in the folder instead of the single .pdf that essentially the pros and cons from both an evaluative standpoint and from a submitter standpoint is while we understand the why it came up the single .pdf for people adding other documents that concern didn't outweigh the hassle from the router standpoint and from the preparation standpoint, and all those things. So let's go back and allow the Google Doc/Google form folder concept.

John Benedict: My faculty are more in favor of the single .pdf editions. They they did mention that the single .pdf gets very long and tedious, so multiple .pdfs are much more preferred in my department.

Derek Hein: Interestingly enough, my department wanted to know if there's a way when you know a certain level asks an applicant for additional documents. If those can be merged into an even longer single Pdf document.

Scott Knowles: The only way to do that based on my technical expertise would be to download the .pdf that is there. Attach the new documents to that and re-upload it. Which opens up the possibility for other things to be changed. I don't think anybody would nefariously do that. But I'm not sure how how desirable that would be across campus, but we could certainly explore it.

Would anybody be willing to work on a resolution to ask the Provost office that we move towards a single Google drive situation instead of a single .pdf?

Kelly Goonan: I'll volunteer if nobody else does, because I hate the single .pdf.

Scott Knowles: I will also help you, Kelly. We can do it together if you'd like.

Christopher Graves: I can help with that, too. And I'm an expert with .pdfs and I think it's stupid.

Chris Monson: I'd be interested.

Scott Knowles: It sounds like the Executive Committee is definitely on board to help create this resolution.

Shalini Kesar: I can also help you, Kelly, and you know what you can reach out to Parker Grimes and I think he will give you solutions, and then take those solutions to the Provost office.

Scott Knowles: Excellent. Thank you, Shalini, so we'll work on that, and it'll come back in another Faculty Senate meeting.

Scott Knowles: Yeah. So we're skipping that currently Scott Monroe hadn't received feedback yet from the athletic advisors on his proposal. So he wanted to push that back. I thought I deleted it off the agenda, so that there would be no confusion. But clearly I deleted it not on that agenda, somehow. And so here we are, confused. But that will be returning, probably at our next faculty. Senate meeting.

Elise Leahy: I just I just wanted to say, my faculty are unanimously and very strongly against the idea of the athletic advisors having access to canvas.

Scott Knowles: I don't disagree. He's already got the proposal done. He's just waiting for any notes from the athletic advisors, and then we'll bring it back, and we can share all the feedback that you all have gathered on that topic.

- g. Call for New Business / Faculty Input
- 9. Standing Committee Updates: (5:34)
  - a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)
  - b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)



- c. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)
- d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)
- e. Honors Council (Maren Hirschi): <https://www.suu.edu/honors/>

Yes, there is an honor student who is looking for recruits to help with the study she's doing for her honors project. I sent a a photo Jpeg, I think, to the Faculty Senate email, will you? I couldn't upload it into the chat. Would you please send that out to everyone?

- f. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)

We don't have any updates. But the good news is the section for policy. 6.2 has been approved by the general. The Graduate Council Committee. We are working on the section on the HR so that it's consistent. Hopefully we'll bring it to the table on the 20th but I'll reach out to you.

- g. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- h. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)
- i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
- j. Faculty Awards Committees:
  - i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
  - ii. Employee Commitment for Access and Belonging (Kelly Goonan)
  - iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)
  - iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
  - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)
- k. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)
- l. Past President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee is working on a new faculty grievance policy that we think will actually address several of the concerns that have come up in our discussions about 6.28 and 6.6. We worked on that this week, and hopefully, we'll be able to get that to the Senate at our next

meeting for their review. It would be a new policy. So it doesn't have a number associated with it yet.

The other two tasks that we have is we're going to be proposing some minor updates to policy 6.15 The Faculty Leaves policy to make the sabbatical eligibility timeline more clear, and also to address administrative appointments for parental caregiving with modified duties portion of that leave. The second task that we're going to be working on the updated policy 6.22, the Bona Fide program discontinuance procedures. It referenced educational and academic considerations that would be developed by the Academic Affairs Committee. We're going to start working on some initial considerations that would support that policy. So we'll be working on that over the next few weeks.

- m. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC); Ad Hc committee on policy outside of 6.0

UCFSL did not meet this past week. We'll meet on Friday, so I'll have updates for next time.

WaFSEC the COLA stuff is way more complicated than we thought. So we're figuring out how to adapt it. We're gonna start working on workload as well. And that's it.

- n. President's Report (Scott Knowles) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

Dean's council, President's council, as well as Board of Trustees, have not met since we last had our January 23rd meeting, so I don't actually have anything to report on that front. I did sign up for Faculty Senate for a Thor's hammer team, but I desperately need two other team members to join me in being woefully embarrassed at how long I can hold a hammer. I will hold it just not very long I'll do my my best. But if you would like to join me again, please shoot me an email, and we'll try to try to get a good team together and see if we can win some money for students. I think we can beat staff so let's at least try to do that right. And that's all I have. Is there a call for an executive session?

10. Call for Executive Session (5:40)

11. Adjourn