

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

February 20, 2025

4:00-5:30 pm

Approved

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, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending:

Proxies: Celesta Lyman for Lee Wood

Guests: Mindy Benson, James Sage, Shauna Mendini, Camille Thomas, Jake Johnson, Shalina Kesar, Matt McKenzie, John Karpel.

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
 - 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
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
 - a. [February 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

The minutes were approved with the correction of Maren's name.

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
 - 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).
 - e. Giving Thor's Day - Hammerfest and Thunder Quest 2025
 - f. Research Activities
 - i. [Active Transportation Survey](#)
 - ii. [Muscle Loss Prevention](#) - Nutrition Sciences
 - g. Faculty Senate President Elections - [Nominations Form](#)
 - h. External Access to SUU Spaces and Records by External Law Enforcement
 - i. <https://www.suu.edu/external-access/>
 - i. Native American Student Association [Pow Wow, April 12, 2025](#)
 - i. [Financial Sponsorship Letter](#)
5. Information Item (4:05)
- a. [Policy 6.22 Program Discontinuance](#) added language (Jake Johnson)

Jake: This is the draft that was presented to the PLC, post 21-day review. There is added language that is intended to reflect the state of the law on the issue of program

discontinuance. And so, if you are looking at that, you'll notice that under Section 4A, which is the policy, the beginning of the policy section a.1. We talk about the authority to discontinue programs. That authority is delegated to the President by State statute. It's 53 B, 2 - 106, and you'll notice that in the second one regarding faculty participation, we made a change to provide input if you are looking at the state law and you drop down to subsection 9 of the State Law. It talks about the President's opportunity to request input from faculty in the process that reflects those two changes.

Scott: It's not the ideal situation for what a lot of faculty want to see with an issue like program discontinuance. But it is also truth in advertising. It is better, I think, to have that in the policy, so that we clearly understand our roles at the University versus not having that in the policy, and then finding out that well, the law supersedes what our policy might be. It is a change from what we voted on, but it is a change that is necessary and needed.

6. HB 265 discussion - Summer Pay, Etc. (4:07)

a. [Email to All Academic Leaders on possible Summer Pay Reduction](#)

The summer pay email came out from Provost Mendini last week and that spurred some anxiety. My inbox was quite full for the whole week. I definitely want to hear about your concerns and thoughts. Before we jump into this conversation, I wanted to emphasize just a few very important key points. Number one is that there have been no decisions made with regard to how SUU will handle HB261. The bill has not even passed yet. If it does pass, we still have to wait until March for USHE guidance on exactly how to interpret the data that we must use to make those decisions. We should exercise as much patience as possible as we wait for all the information to come in before SUU can even start making any decisions. I also sent out that survey to a lot of folks, and I have collected 46 responses, which I will share with our administration – no identification identified.

Provost Mendini's email to all academic leaders was a proposal of a possibility to reduce summer pay, meaning again that nothing has been decided. This was an attempt at transparency, and also to allow some agency before registration opened in the summer semester, which was this last Tuesday, so that faculty could have a chance to say I'm not willing to teach for a reduced pay, even though we don't actually know if that is a possibility, or if that will work. I also want to assure you that if that possibility is put into place, in an effort to save faculty positions, that that choice will only be made if we know it's going to be approved through the USHE legislative process. If it's not going to count for the cuts done, or the reinvestments, I should say done in HP. 265. We're not going to do it and we will, of course, make sure to know that before the cuts are made.

Finally, I do want to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak. So if you have feedback to share, please try to summarize that information in about a minute. I also want you to be cognizant of how many times you might be popping up to speak. Try to let others also voice their opinion. If there's a lull, of course you can speak again, but if

we've got people lined up, I would prefer it if everyone got a chance to voice their concerns versus hearing from the same voice over and over again.

For President Benson and Provost Mendini. This is a bit more of a moment to listen than it is a moment to answer questions. This is largely because we probably don't have answers to the questions and concerns that might be raised. The bill has not passed. We haven't received the guidance from USHE, so there's a lot of information we simply do not know. But I will say, if there's one thing I've learned about President Benson and Provost Mendini over the last year and a half that I've been privileged to serve as your representative, it's that they listen very well, they will be taking all the information in.

David Hatch: I'll mention that it's been a little troublesome for us. The Speedway program resides in the Interdisciplinary Studies department, and while I recognize that some people have elected not to teach summer courses at the lower rate, it seems counterintuitive for us as an institution to try to encourage people to enroll in the Speedway program, and then not find a way to support those faculty who we depend on to teach those courses. As a consequence, we are struggling to find people to teach those courses.

Jonathan Lee: I have a few points that were brought up from our department. Summer courses in our department are not optional, so one of the proposed revisions of the bill is to facilitate accelerated 3 year degree programs. Our accounting program already offers this, but it can only be done by utilizing our summer course offerings. So cutting support for the classes that make this possible is contrary to one of the bill's aims. We have so many required summer courses that cutting funding to the faculty teaching is detrimental. Additionally, it was pointed out that cutting the summer pay across the board is counter to the reinvestment priorities of the State. Before this decision to cut summer compensation is made, there should be an analysis performed on the impact to each program that offers summer coursework. The Provost could inadvertently cut resources to programs that should be targeted for reinvestment.

Nathan Slaughter: The feedback that I got from my department was actually to be honest, kind of happy, and pleased and in support of it. They'd rather see a slight decrease in the pay for summer, if that helps save some jobs for others on campus.

Derek Hine: Regarding the rumors about incentives for those up for early retirement, and the preemptive address of those budget cuts. And we're still wondering what the status of those discussions are and if sweetened deals are forthcoming.

Mike Kroff: The summer pay is something that's given if our salaries aren't necessarily as competitive as they could be and many of us look at that as almost part of our salary. Cutting this does impact current faculty and what they're expecting, and also in trying to recruit new faculty.

Amanda Roundy: Our department was pretty against this. A couple of years ago our department was pushed to taking 40 students, a class instead of your average 20 to 30. And then the university really pushed us to develop a new program to feed in with

Southwest Tech. And the only way we could allow that program to happen was to run it in the summer because we didn't have the resources, the classroom space, and the lab space to accommodate potentially 80 new students a year. Our department's feeling like you pushed and pushed for us to work all summer. But now, instead of giving us the resources we need to run in the fall, you're going to take our pay away, and still expect us to work all summer.

Chris Younkin: Is there any indication that cuts that have already been made and could be bundled in with the future cuts?

Scott Knowles: The survey was really an interesting and mixed bag of faculty perspectives and opinions on the quantifiable data. Faculty are very concerned about HP. 265 about half of people were rating it as Number 5 as concerned as they could be with very few people, only 2 ranking it as not concerned at all.

In discussions of reducing summer overload pay in general, we had about 40% of folks who were not in favor of reducing summer pay with 25% of folks saying they were in favor of reducing the summer pay. But I will say that that doesn't quite reflect the reality of what folks thought. A lot of folks were adding context in the comment section of the portion where they may have marked that they were opposed to reducing summer pay, but they would also state in the comments that if it did work for Hb. 265, and that if it would count for that, and it would save faculty positions that they'd be more than willing to take that kind of a pay cut.

In general, the qualitative data had a couple of high points. One was a desire for transparency to know how things are going, what they're gonna do, and why they're going to do it. Clarity and process.

There were a lot of thoughts about the bill, not particularly being a very good bill. The legislature is going to do what the legislature is going to do, and I would, of course, encourage everyone to reach out to your legislative representatives, contact them, and let them know what you think about the bill.

There's also a big fear that this is going to target the arts and the humanities explicitly. I am heartened by Amendment 5. That just got added to the bill this morning, which is an amendment specifically laying out a desire to make sure that the core of liberal arts, education or general education is maintained so that we don't necessarily lose things in our core. And it's not really specific and so it allows us to talk about and define what that is, but it does help us to understand that maybe the goal of this is not to gut the arts and humanities which I know a lot of people have that fear. So there is that element going on.

There was a lot of focus on people, purpose and place and whether an approach to this kind of strategic reinvestment plan can make sure that we're reinforcing that mission as much as possible.

and then some discussion about whether or not cuts are being considered an administrative and student success areas, and how that works. And again, a lot of those

questions simply cannot be answered right at this particular moment. We kind of have to wait and see.

Are there any other thoughts that folks would like to share?

Elise Leahy: The impression that I'm getting is it might be a little late for the legislature to add an amendment about arts and letters, because now it seems to be in USHE's hands, and I don't know whether they're paying attention to the letter of the law. I'm also hearing that plans are made even though the bill isn't signed so I don't know if USHE is listening to every little amendment. I hope that's true.

Scott Knowles: I hope that it is true as well. I don't think it's too late for amendments to be added again. The bill has not passed. I am sure that USHE has been working on the guidance because why wouldn't you? Especially considering the timeline that we're under? These plans have to be turned around, basically in the next 4 to 5 months. So we do need to move fairly quickly. I'm sure USHE is working on that and I do have some faith that they would integrate that into our guidance. And if it's not there I would imagine our administration could ask about that and then hopefully, additional guidance would be added, but I don't think it's hopeless in that regard.

Bryan Koenig: Were there any other amendments I haven't been able to keep up.

Scott Knowles: There were some proposed amendments. At one point there was an amendment to try to make sure that university presidents specifically had input on the guidance that USHE was creating. I'm actually not sure if this one got included in the version of the bill that they're currently considering. If someone knows, please feel free to chime in. Nor do I know if it'll end up in the final version or not. Again, an emphasis on the bill has not passed yet. Amendments can still happen. They might still continue to happen.

If you watched the Higher Ed Committee at 8 am on Wednesday (I watched it last night after the fact) I was heartened by Senator Johnson specifically. I'm not sure he'll support the bill in its current form, so he is looking for additional amendments that will help protect general education, and what it means to be a university. He wants to make sure that we do not become trade schools or akin to trade schools, and I think that's where Amendment 5 came from. But I don't know if additional amendments are forthcoming.

Shauna Mendini: We have not made decisions. These are simply proposals, and I appreciate the ability to put that out. I know that we had a timeline relative to registration, and even if I was to consider a move like this, I wanted the level of transparency, so people could understand and make decisions based on that before the committed. We don't know for sure whether this will be utilized or be considered if it doesn't have to be. I am committed to making sure that graduate and undergraduate are the same amount. If we can bring them all up at a higher level to the full 2,000 we're willing to do that, and would want to do that. We just need to know what levers we're going to push. And we need to be able to have as many options available as possible. As we start going down this road.

Mindy Benson: I will try to talk through a few of them, and I want to start with our provost is deathly ill with the flu right now, and, much to my chagrin, came in and moved all of her meetings to Zoom, and came into her office, and is still pushing through like a trooper, because we are dealing with all of these issues, and she's very concerned about all of campus.

A couple of questions that came up. We did push for at least the last year of changes to be counted toward this bill. The sponsor of the bill suggested that she would put it in, and it has not made the bill. I don't believe that it is going to make the bill, but if any of you listened to my presentation to higher ed appropriations 3 weeks ago, I specifically talked about how SUU has changed, discontinued, or moved 23 different programs in the last 5 years, and that we have been doing this. And we are not just doing this now because it is legislated.

I shared that specifically so people would know that we have been doing this, and I hope that we can count some of that but it has not gained any traction. But we did speak with the bill sponsor directly, and she said, Oh, I would be interested in counting the past year but I don't think that it will make it into this. But we have tried going down that path and I'm hoping that we will get some clarification on the discussions with USHE and the ability to maybe use some of that. We'll see what kind of leeway comes our way

Regarding the discussion about the new amendment. USHE put it in. They have to as it's a state statute. So whatever the amended bill comes out to be is what we will execute on our campus and we, as Shawna mentioned, have not made any decisions. We are exploring every possibility, including the early retirement incentive in that scenario. The budget team is working on what that would look like, and how much that would cost, and how many people are eligible, and what that would mean. We also have to be really careful that we are not saying you should retire because we cannot discriminate, based on age, and we cannot be the ones suggesting retirement. So yes, we can put forward some incentives, but then it has to be a personal decision. So we are walking a fine line with that as well.

I appreciate your feedback and sharing these unintended consequences or thoughts with us. You know that we are always open to that. I have shared in my emails that each member of Cabinet, each Vice President has been tasked to go to their area and start working with the basic foundation of this bill that we know is likely going to pass to work through each of their areas in deans and department chairs. Every Vice President is looking at efficiencies within their areas. So, yes, we are looking at administrative cuts and reallocations. We're looking at any inefficiency on campus or any efficiency that we can gain from this. We don't know where that will be counted but we are looking for those, and each Vice President is going out and going through this exercise right now. So it is not just the Provost, and on the instructional lines. We all want to help, and we all want to be part of the solution. We've got to find out what will count as well. I want to reassure you that we will do the very best we can to maintain our campus and to maintain the personalized sense of who we are, and how we take care of our campus

and each other. That is important to me and the strategic plan reflects that and this will continue to reflect that as we go through this process.

I have to go back to the Legislature one more time next week, but after that each Vice President and I will go to their departments and have these discussions. It's interesting to me how some vice presidents and some department chairs and deans are being very specific and talking programs and having very honest conversations, and some have never even had a discussion about this. We want to be transparent, and we want to continue those discussions and that starts with the top so we will continue to push for those discussions, and continue to ensure that campus is part of these discussions but in the end nobody is going to vote for a position or their position or their colleague to be eliminated. We will lay out the data and the case when we have it. Ultimately, we've got to make the decisions, and we know that we may not agree on those, but we will try to bring people along and communicate often.

Scott Knowles: Thank you so much, President Benson. Bree Kramer mentioned that the other amendment I was talking about didn't get added in, and Amendment 5 will still have to be voted on so it may or may not end up in the final bill.

7. Action Items: (4:34)

a. [Program Director Job Description](#) (Shalini Kesar)

Shalini Kesar: First of all, thank you for your patience. I know we've been a little bit behind in catching up. If you remember, policy 6.2. There was a section that the Graduate Council added on the Program Directors description, which was approved at the Graduate Council. But then we worked with HR. especially Meagan Beesley, and expanded that. I will share a little history and say the program description has been expanded from the section in 6.2. So it's aligned and approved by the Graduate Council, and Meagan and HR used a template to expand it and provide more details. We did get some guidance from Jake Johnson, and in the beginning with Dean Hall also, and we were very careful and conscientious of the wording.

Scott Knowles: This is part of that batch of job descriptions that we approved earlier and now we're looking at the Program Director job description. If there is no discussion I will entertain a motion to approve.

Rachel Parker moved to approve and Maren Hirshci seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

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

i. [Information](#)

Scott Knowles: Our next action item is to try to find a Senator who would like to serve on the Attainment Gap subcommittee that's being chaired by Bree Kramer.

Please look at the link for additional information about what is going on in the attainment gaps initiative. Bree is looking for a faculty senator to join a subcommittee that is focused on the second bullet point – to develop and support targeted interventions to close attainment gaps and support student success.

I reached out to Bree to find out what that workload might look like, and it is going to be meeting about twice a month through the end of this academic year to cultivate and gather information about what we're currently offering and what we might be lacking so that they can move on to actions in the next year. Do we have any volunteers that would like to serve on this committee as a faculty senator, and then we will have you come back and report on that committee's progress.

Maren Hirschi: I am willing to do it. If someone else has a burning desire, I'm also happy to step aside.

Shalini Kesar motioned to appoint Maren Hirschi. The motion was seconded by Christ Graves. The motion has passed.

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

i. [Faculty Feedback Document](#)

Kelly Goonan: We did suggest that addition that you see there in the comment as being a fifth point, so it would not replace shared governance. And the Academic Affairs Committee unanimously voted to suggest that we actually change that to other institutional functions so that it would cover both the shared governance formally but when faculty are working within other areas. The faculty feedback document, most of the comments were added within the last day or so. I did not see the TDAA comments until the meeting started, and there seems to be concern about scholarly and creative activity for pecuniary gain. So I might ask Jake if he would be able to comment on that. That was not an area that we spent a lot of time discussing, and it was not something that was brought up in discussion until the comments were added to this feedback document.

Jake Johnson: That's a carryover from the original policy and that is the way its defined. If you look at the policy from November 10th of 2000, you'll see that sentence in the description of research. So the policy has always had a reference to 552. The only thing that changed was we substituted the word scholarly creative activity for the word research.

Rachel Parker: I can speak to the concerns for my department about that. Mostly it's not necessarily the pecuniary. We had to look it up to see what that meant, but the consent as well, gaining approval. We have professionals in the field teaching during the year, and doing their scholarly and creative activity out in the world during the summer. Having to get approval in advance and how much is shared? How much is not? What can count for P&T things, etc. I received a lot of feedback on this.

Scott Knowles: I will say that the statement in there also doesn't seem to match with the policy that is referenced. The policy that is referenced doesn't actually speak to who one would get consent from? It actually states the opposite, that the university will take no interest in any kind of money that somebody makes in consulting. It might also just be a phrase especially seen now that it was from the very old policy that no longer actually makes sense with the new policy. And I'm not sure when the new intellectual property policy was last updated. But it seems like it doesn't actually jive with that policy anymore.

Kelly Goonan: The intellectual property policy was updated January of 2000 so it predates the original version, or the most recent version of the academic freedom policy by about 10 months.

Scott Knowles: I don't know who was doing this in 2000, but it seems very strange, because there's no reference to the process that it's laying out in the academic freedom policy that's actually in policy, 5.5 2. I don't know what we want to do about that.

Rachel Parker: I can also address some of the other areas of concern if that would be helpful. The main one was in 4b.5. regarding student opinion and how it can be problematic and has been problematic in our department in the past when older research is used. The example that we have was student using old research, talking about how Blackface is beneficial to the black community, and a professor tried to make that student rewrite that paper, using more current and thoughtful research, and was reprimanded and told that they could not make that student rewrite it because the student was saying that it was the professor's opinion that they were grading on. So this is stuff that we have faced in this department in the past, just 3 years ago. That's of great concern that we cannot grade based on something that students say is their own opinion. It's like a science professor receiving a research paper on using flat Earth research.

Kelly Goonan: I guess I'm sorry to hear that a faculty member was reprimanded, because to me that is covered in the legitimate pedagogical concern that you're using outdated research to support an argument. And that's one of the things that we as faculty do, which is teach our students how the knowledge in our field has evolved over time and how to do that research. This is Kelly's opinion: that was actually inappropriate and that the faculty member did not infringe on the students academic freedom.

Rachel Parker: I will add that this could open a wider conversation to the training of chairs or deans, or however far up we need to go about areas of research. Or when the teachers are on the ground and they are the experts in that field.

It would be beneficial to have some of these things addressed, and not just from TDAA, there's some other things in this feedback thing that should be addressed as well. I know it's frustrating to come to a meeting, thinking that there's going to be a vote and continually getting it pushed aside.

Kelly Goonan: It seems like the biggest concern was the pecuniary return, because that was also mentioned by education.

I appreciate the feedback from the library. I'm not certain how to address the first one. Unless they're suggesting that academic freedom should not be assumed to extend a speech outside the institution or one's discipline should explicitly be added to the policy.

I'll take it back to the Academic Affairs Committee, if that's what the Senate votes.

It helps us, if we have specific feedback on not only the section and the concern, but how that concern might be remedied. If folks have thoughts on a better way of saying something, or if there's something missing that should be included, or if something should be removed.

I hear the concerns about policy 5.52, and I don't see anything specifically stating that should be removed or that policy. 5.5 2 needs to be updated to define an accurate process.

So from the perspective of the Academic Affairs Committee, any specific suggestions or feedback that we can get will help us get a version of the policy that faculty feel comfortable with, and get us out of the revise and resubmit cycle. We appreciate the feedback, it's just that that will help us.

Chris Younkin: I had the same issue, this is the only feedback I got from anyone in the library. So if you want clarification, I can have this faculty member reach out to you. But I think what it's saying is to be careful not to include anything that is covered by freedom of speech beyond your role as a teacher. That's how I interpret it.

Rachel Parker: I would move to postpone and send it back to the committee. I can give a lot more specifics in regards to what and where, and how.

Kelly Goonan: That would be helpful. You're welcome to email those directly to me, Rachel, if you would prefer to do it that way.

Scott Knowles: Excellent. Do I have a second for Rachel's motion?

Elise Leahy: I can second.

The motion passes with 22 yays and 2 nays.

d. Sick and Medical Leave for Faculty Committee (Scott Knowles)

Our final action item today is trying to form a committee to explore sick and medical leave for faculty. We are looking for folks who are willing to take on this work. Is there anyone that's willing to chair such a committee to investigate this possibility?

I know that Kelly had expressed interest in the past. But I did want to open it up. Kelly does a lot of work.

Maren Hirschi: How long do you expect this to extend beyond this academic year?

Scott Knowles: That's probably pretty likely. When Kelly started this process with the Parental Leave Committee it took, I think, a year and a half, maybe a little longer. Is that right, Kelly?

Kelly Goonan: We started in fall of 2019 and the Staff Association was already working on the 9 point parental leave policy, and they actually had done a lot of the initial data gathering and legwork. We completed the draft of the policy in spring of 2020, and I believe it went into effect August of 2020. It was not a horribly lengthy process, but it did take essentially the full academic year, and then was approved at the June Board of Trustees meeting, and went into effect in August of 2020. If I remember those dates correctly.

Maren Hirschi: Thank you, Kelly. At the risk of overloading myself, I'm willing to serve on this committee. However, my time as faculty senator draws to a close.

Scott Knowles: I don't think there's any reason that this committee has to be limited to faculty senators. Perhaps we can create a motion to say we want this committee and send senators off to look for volunteers amongst their departments of folks who might be interested in investigating this issue.

Maren Hirschi moved for a motion and Christopher Graves seconded it. The motion carried.

8. Discussion Items:(5:00)

a. [Policy 6.2 Revision](#) (Shalini Kesar)

Shalini: This is a condensed version of the description we just approved.

Scott: Please go ahead and take that back to your faculty and get their feedback on anything for policy 6.2, and that will be an action item on our next agenda on March 6th up.

b. [Policy 6.20 Institutional Review Board Revision](#) (Jake Johson)

Jake Johnson: This is a fairly significant revision. You'll remember that we had proposed some limited changes based off of 2.61 from December last year, and I had indicated that we are really considering much more extensive revisions to policy 6.20 and so what you see here is very much a reduction in the amount of content on IRB in policy.

If you go to the IRB webpage, you'll notice that they are starting to place much more of the content about how they review IRB submissions in a set of standard operating procedures, so the policy itself will shrink some, and essentially reflect that our practice is to follow the common rule.

There are some specific things in terms of if we have concerns about deviations from protocols about how those will be handled by the IRB and some additional clarification about things in the policy about how IRB membership is constituted here. But for the most part it pairs the policy down a great deal.

The IRB has reviewed this version and approved it.

c. [Teaching Awards Proposal](#) (David Hatch)

David Hatch: We were tasked with coming up with some potential teaching awards that might recognize the subtleties with different instructional modalities of people on our campus. So we have four: an online teaching award, an adjunct teaching award, a graduate education teaching award, and a general education teaching award. Each one has a short justification and talks about these being a subset of the outstanding educator or distinguished educator awards one and three of each respectively, but that the selection criteria would be by nomination some sort of a short justification then committee review. Now, these don't have to come as a unit. There are some of them that faculty may value more than others, or may want to amend.

We're looking for feedback. There are some opportunities to recognize people for some of their exceptional teaching who may not otherwise receive the kind of consideration that they might deserve.

Bryan Koenig: Just to clarify, did you say that these are separate from the outstanding and distinguished educator awards, or they're overlapping? How are they related in that way?

David Hatch: No. The significance of the other awards are greater because of the audience. Let me get the titles right, the outstanding educator. There's only one. So that would be one person throughout our University. There are three distinguished educators. These are subcategories or additions.

Bryan Koenig: There'd be 8 awards instead of 4.

David Hatch: Yes

Scott Knowles: Please take these award proposals back to your faculty. Gather that feedback, and we will have this as an action item on March 6th. Ryan Seamers, if you could make sure that this gets to the General Education Curriculum Committee that you are on that was specifically interested in this, if you could take this to them and collect their feedback and report back on that, that would be great.

Ryan Siemers: Will do.

d. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

9. Standing Committee Updates: (5:08)

a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)

Mike Kroff: We did meet within the last couple of weeks under the advice of Jake Johnson. The committee has never had to meet for or had an actual faculty hearing in the last 4-5 years and that could very well change over the next year given what's happening in the Legislature. We went over 6.2 2 and it talks about the procedures for what happens with faculty, a faculty hearing, and the role of the Faculty Review Board

and given that information what's in other policies. We are going to start meeting every other week till the end of the semester, under the astute leadership of Jake Johnson, to help us understand better what our responsibilities are as a Review Board.

b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

Qian Zhang: We actually had two meetings last month, and we only received a total 18 parking ticket appeals, and we almost accepted all of them.

c. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)

Amanda Roundy: The Smead Company is going out of business, and so if anybody needs office supplies, such as dry erase markers, pens, pencils, etc. they will be open from 7 to 3 tomorrow, and if you just go show your faculty ID they will give you free office supplies.

d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

Ryan: I don't have much to report. We are doing a little bit of house cleaning working on getting rid of some courses that haven't been offered in a long time, and fixing some cross-listing, that kind of thing.

e. Honors Council (Maren Hirschi): <https://www.suu.edu/honors/>

f. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)

Nothing except I want to give a big shout out to all the program directors. We worked on three policies. Otherwise, I'm looking forward to the action item at the next meeting.

g. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

h. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

Benefits committee. We're still in a holding pattern. The State has not decided whether they're going to move to a unified system or not a unified system. We're just waiting.

Once that decision is made, depending on what that decision is, we'll either go to an RFP to either re-up with UMR or replace them. But we have to wait for the state to make a choice there.

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)

We've got the nominees and our chair is organizing the plan, and that's where we are for the outstanding and distinguished educator award.

- iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
- v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)

k. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

The student scholarship applications are due March 1st, so I imagine that we'll start getting some information about our scholarship, and share that with the senate when it comes out.

Scott Knowles: Thank you so much for that. We should probably try and plan an email to get faculty to talk to their students who would be eligible for such a scholarship to make sure we get a good, robust applicant pool.

l. Past President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee. We're very close to bringing a new faculty grievance policy recommendation to the senate. I'm hoping that we'll finish that up next week, and then have that to present at our next meeting.

We are also looking at policy 6.15 Faculty Leaves to clarify some of the language there.

We'll be back again with an Academic Freedom policy at some point.

We also have on our agenda, working with the provost's office to provide some guidelines for when to implement program discontinuance procedures under policy 6.2, 2. For example, does an emphasis or a minor that doesn't have any faculty attached to it, or substantial student enrollment, need to go through the full process? Or are there

different levels at which we can kind of guide program discontinuance through that process? Those are the things that we're working on?

I would ask in support of coming back with policy 6.6, if folks can send me any specific suggestions or feedback that they have from their faculty, or add it to the document that Scott shared last time. If I can get that feedback by the end of next week, February 28th.

I'm not going to put that on the Academic Affairs Committee's agenda for next week, because we're close with faculty grievances. I also want faculty at large to feel like they've had enough time to review 6.6. So if that feedback can get to us by the 28th That will give us time for our meeting the week before Spring Break to go back and look at policy 6.6, so that we're not pushing it too far out. But I'm also not rearranging the other items that we have to get too much. I would appreciate that.

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

UCFSL met last Friday and it was very interesting. As you might imagine, faculty senate presidents throughout the state are concerned about HP. 265 but the concern was at very different levels. Both the University of Utah and Salt Lake Community College actually said we're hoping that we just make cuts to administration and physical plant and things like that. And it doesn't do anything for teaching lines. Whereas Utah Tech, UVU, and Weber State were more concerned that it was targeted and there were going to be cuts to faculty. I have no idea if this is the faculty senate presidents, not the university presidents, who are the ones who are making the actual decisions. So I have no idea how that actually is going to play out at those universities but that was something that I was surprised about.

WaFSEC has started talking about faculty workloads. There's hopefully going to be a survey going around about workloads and following the policies. We got an update on the proposal that we have made to have a flat rate plus a percentage. However there could be legislation in the works that could prevent this.

The Ad Hoc Committee on policies outside of 6, we just got some new policies. So we're working on those. One of which is the conflict of interest policy, which definitely has a lot of faculty involvement there. So if you have any feedback you would like us to include please let us know.

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

- i. [Summer Enrollment Summary Report by James Sage](#)

Scott Knowles: The Dean's Council has not met. The President's Leadership Council has met. PLC is moving forward a number of policies to the Board of Trustees, all of which we have already voted on, including 6.1 6.4 student locations, 6.2 2 bona fide

program discontinuance, 6.2 8 faculty, professional responsibilities and 6.3 8 faculty hiring. All are going before the Board of Trustees at their March meeting.

You'll notice there's a link here to a summer participation memo from Associate Provost James Sage. I just wanted to share this with all of you, because it's great to have this data. I've had a number of faculty ask me over the last two years whether our summer program is actually doing what it's supposed to do. Is it successful? People wonder and as it turns out, yes, it is, we've actually increased enrollments in the summer semester by over 100%. And there's a lot more details in that document.

I would just encourage you to share that with your faculty and bring it back to your departments. So they can also have that detail and that data. And I'd like to thank associate Provost James Sage for putting that together for us.

I really wanted to cover one of the other concerns that came through the survey, and that is morale on campus. Given HP265, as well as faculty, mental health. I would love to try to get a group together to start working on that issue. What measures could we implement to assist and help and support impacted faculty, staff, and students that might be impacted by HP 265, which, of course, hasn't happened yet. But when it does, I would love it if we could support them in some measurable and impactful way, as well as recommending general strategies for maintaining morale during the reinvestment process, which we're going to be going through through the rest of the semester. If any of you or any of your department colleagues would be interested in working on such an initiative, please send me an email with names. This will probably be a discussion item at our next faculty senate meeting so we can talk about it a little bit further and hopefully form a group to start working on this issue. I have ideas, but of course I want more ideas from everyone else.

The last thing I kind of wanted to tease as far as an announcement is that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is planning a dessert contest for March. A little bit of a social event for us, to get us out of the doldrums, eat something sweet, and also perhaps win some bragging rights. So there's going to be some more details coming out about that. I will point out that Elise Leahy is going to win this contest. I don't know if any of you have had any of Elise Leahy's fabulous desserts. But she will destroy you all. I'm pretty sure of that. Details are forthcoming. So keep that on your radar.

John Benedict: I'll make a motion for executive session.

10. Call for Executive Session (5:23)

11. Adjourn