

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

March 20, 2025

4:00-5:30 pm

Approved

Attending: Scott Knowles, 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, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: Kelly Goonan, Kevin Stein

Proxies: Emily Dean for Michelle Orihel, Shalina Kesar for R. Alexander Nichols,

Guests: James Sage, Camille Thomas, Jake Johnson, Matt McKenzie, Scott Munro, John Karpel

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:01)
 - 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. Faculty Athletics Representative, Dr. Scott Munro
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
 - a. [March 6th, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

Minutes were approved.

4. Events and Announcements:(4:03)

- 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. Faculty Senate President Elections - Voting Website
 - f. External Access to SUU Spaces and Records by External Law Enforcement
 - i. <https://www.suu.edu/external-access/>
 - g. Native American Student Association [Pow Wow, April 12, 2025](#)
 - i. [Financial Sponsorship Letter](#)
5. Information Item (Scott Knowles) (4:05)
- a. The Great Faculty Bake-Off, March 24th, 3-5pm
 - i. [Flyer](#)
 - ii. [Enter the competition](#) by March 20th at 11:59pm
 - b. Department Senator Elections

- c. Faculty Senate President Elections (Phase 1 closes March 27th at 8am) - [Voting Website](#)
- d. Festival of Excellence (April 1st, 2025)
 - i. [Schedule of events/speakers](#)

6. Action Items: (4:09)

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

Jake Johnson: We got feedback from Brian Koenig and another Psychology Department colleague of his. You can see it integrated there where we've tried to make adjustments based on what they've represented.

There was one comment about not being particularly thrilled that the collective IRB could suspend permanently, but that is an authority given to them under the common rule. It says, "Shall", I think that's as close to a mandate as we're gonna get out of the law. I don't think that it would be wise to have somebody else look at that when the law gives them the authority to do it.

If you go down to section 4 e. 4 a, there was some conversation about protocols that use deception. The common rule does address proposals that include deception, so it's addressed in the common rule and we'd follow what it says there.

I also want to point out a couple of other things, the particular sentence in E.4a says "when appropriate participants will receive all relevant information." Notice that "when appropriate," so it's possible that the IRB would approve a protocol using deception, and it might not be appropriate. I mean, then it would be appropriate to deceive and we also added the language, and consistent with the approved IRB protocol, so IRB might say, Go ahead, use deception, but there might be some expectations in their approval about how you facilitate that deception. Otherwise we accepted all of the other feedback

Maren Hirschi made a motion to approve. Mike Kroff seconded the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

- b. [Faculty Grievance Policy](#) (Kelly Goonan and John Meisner)
 - i. [Faculty Feedback](#)

Rachel Parker: It looks like a couple of the comments from my department have not been addressed. Well, one might have been but I'm not sure what it means. Do we need to wait for Kelly to discuss? I am looking at the Provost exemption. How it was addressed in the email but the suggestion was made that it actually be addressed in the policy as well.

Jake Johnson: Is it that you want the explanation included in the policy?

Rachel Parker: Maybe not word for word from the email but have it be addressed why the Provost is exempt. Something that addresses, "at the pleasure of the President",

Jake Johnson: I think we could suggest that the provost functions as an executive and is an at will employee. Does that suffice?

Rachel Parker: I think so. It came out in the explanation email, but it wasn't addressed in the policy. And so there was confusion. The second question says, when this policy is enacted versus already established protocol within departments and colleges.

Scott Knowles: Is there any other discussion or questions? I will also entertain motions and remind you I can't make them myself.

Ryan Siemers: I'll motion to approve.

Christopher Graves: I'll second.

Grant Shimer: Does this policy have a number, or is this just Faculty Grievances

Scott Knowles: It's just the Faculty Grievance policy until he gets assigned a number and I don't actually know when that happens.

Scott Knowles: The motion carries with 22 voting yes, 1 no, and 2 abstentions.

c. [Athletics Advisors Canvas Access](#) (Scott Munro)

i. [Faculty Feedback](#)

Scott Munro: I will address a couple of things, it was mentioned that it's going to be an extra burden on faculty. The intent here is if there's observer access, I don't know how many of you get those faculty surveys or the surveys about student athletes in your classes. The intent here is that most of those would go away because we would have real time access to grades.

Additionally, there was another comment about the process or guidelines. If somebody sees there's an issue, please call me or email me. Somebody did mention that we shouldn't be babysitting athletes. That is one of my grievances or complaints. I don't think that's going to happen in this case. The athletic advisor's interest is trying to help the student athlete in a more proactive manner.

There are concerns about invasion of privacy and athletic advisors looking at things that they shouldn't be looking at. I can't respond to that other than to say that is not the intent at all. I don't have any concern on this, I know these people pretty well and I trust them. To be honest, they don't really have time. As department chair. I have full access to every single course in my department. The dean has access to every single course in the college, and the Provost has access to every single canvas course.

Mike Kroff: If I remember right, when this came up a while back in the Faculty Senate, I thought that one of the conclusions was related to the size of the problem, how much of a problem is this? Are we offering a solution that is maybe too big for the size of the problem? Every person I have talked to is opposed to this. I understand it's informal, Scott, but informal is sometimes worse, because it's great when it's one person who's in charge. When that person moves on and somebody else comes in, then that informality turns into something else. I just can't sell this to my faculty as a good idea. But I totally get it and this is terrible, because I'm not offering another solution.

My faculty said, can't we make it optional?

Scott Munro: My comment might be, it's one of those things where I'm a faculty, too, and it didn't occur to me I had a coach that actually tried to call a faculty, and it wasn't necessarily about grades. It was about scheduling class and allowing the student to miss class and things like that, and that shouldn't be occurring, it's totally being used in the wrong way. The intent of the academic advisors is to help the students. Somebody mentioned in one of the comments that we shouldn't be treating student athletes differently. That's true. But on the flip side they are different. I mean, there's money involved. If they don't meet certain progress requirements as a team, and as a whole we lose money. We lose the ability for the athletes that are doing their job to compete.

I'm perfectly willing to try this for a semester where faculty can opt into this, or volunteer to participate in and get some data and see what it really looks like. That's really what I'd like to see at this point is a semester or two semesters trial.

Chris Younkin: The people I've spoken to in the library who were resistant didn't understand what it actually was, and so I explained it. I wonder if there's a misunderstanding of what an observer in Canvas has access to, or what the intention is.

Rachel Parker: To echo what Mike said, when I presented it to our faculty. There was an idea of opting in and out, and the handful of faculty that I heard back from on it would not opt in. They did not think it was a great idea from their point of view. It might be a great idea in helping the students, but I think they wanted to explore other ways to help student athletes.

Elise Leahy: I don't think there's any confusion about what this is. The faculty in my department is not in favor of this because of the same thing we've said in all three discussions so far, which is that there's got to be another way than to allow athletic advisors to look at Canvas. I don't think anybody would opt in in my department. Maybe the policy needs to be changed to be opt in only, and then we'll vote on it.

John Benedict: My department really didn't like the idea of having to opt out. If we just did an opt in that would probably work for us. So in other words, it's automatic until you opt out would be something that they're not interested in.

Scott Munro: It is my intent for this to be a trial. I will consult the CTI office to perhaps send out an email saying, "You have a student athlete in your class. Can we have Canvas observer access?"

Amanda Roundy: Do other universities do this? And have they found it to be successful and helpful?

Scott Munro: I don't have specific data. But yes, it's becoming the trend. I know there are several schools in the Wac. I think Utah Tech already does this. Off the top of my head I would say more than half of the schools in our current conference are able to get into the learning management system and help track the progress of the athletes.

Scott Knowles: If there's no other discussion, I would entertain motions.

Maren Hirschi: Can I make a motion to reject a policy

Scott Knowles: It is.

Maren Hirschi: I make that motion

Scott Knowles: Okay. It has been moved by Maren that we do not adopt this procedure. It's more of a procedure than a policy.

John Benedict: I second the motion.

Chris Younkin: I want to be clear that this is my position not the library's position, I think that for an institution who wants to help students, I'm not understanding why there's resistance to allowing advisors to help students be more successful.

Scott Knowles: Are there any other comments or discussion?

Mike Kroff: I just wanna be clear that this is not that my faculty do not want to support students or support student athletes. I think this is just a threshold that they do not want to cross. And it's just a different level and that's the issue. It is not that we're saying we don't support student athletes, that's not really fair. I don't think you can make those two things equivalent because they're currently tracking students. They're asking us for information and it's debatable whether or not this is better. I think that's just not true that a vote against this would be that we're saying we don't support students.

Maren Hirschi: I wholeheartedly agree with that. I really care about supporting students. As an educator in Higher Ed, I think an important piece of that is helping them grow into responsible, accountable adults and I want to see them a lot more responsible for this process. Additionally, I'm just not just not comfortable with the privacy issue.

Scott Munro: Thank you, Maren. We'll have the last comment by Scott, and then we'll go ahead and have the vote on this motion. Go ahead, Scott

Scott Munro: The surveys we send out are only if you have an athlete in your class, and we get about a 50% response. It used to be about 20% or 25%. So this process is incomplete. This new proposal is another tool to help us to try and help them become accountable and more responsible, not as a crutch.

Scott Knowles: There is a comment from Elijah Nielsen in the chat. It sounds like there isn't a lot of resistance to having the default be that advisors don't have access, but faculty can opt in if they want. Is there opposition to this idea?

We do have a motion on the table that we have to vote for. If that motion doesn't pass, we could have another motion. There are also rules about competing motions that can come forward but I'm not as familiar with those. This is the moment where we all look to James Sage and say, what would happen if somebody made another motion right now?

Ryan Siemers: Well, I'm curious, Scott, I mean just curious for Grant, we've had a motion made and seconded. Doesn't that end the discussion period? Shouldn't we move to vote?

Scott Knowles: Technically, it actually goes the opposite direction. We just don't usually follow that rule very well in the faculty senate. Normally, you make the motion, and then you have discussion on the motion, and then you vote on the motion. Because a lot of people have opinions, I thought I'd open up more discussion just to make sure voices could be heard. So normally we do it a little bit backwards than what we're supposed to.

But we do have a motion on the table.

Grant Shimer: Yeah, the benefit of that, Ryan, is that it helps us clarify what the motion actually will be by having a short discussion ahead of time or at least sometimes does.

Scott Knowles: Okay, the motion does pass with 15 in favor, 4 no's, and 6 abstentions.

James has turned on his camera, so I'm hoping he could give us some lessons on parliamentary procedure.

James Sage: Normally, it's only one motion at a time. So now that the motion has been made, seconded, discussed, and voted on, another motion can be entertained. If the body so chooses, you just don't want multiple motions, being active at the same time.

Scott Knowles: Yes, and you could also make an amendment. Is there a way to make an amendment to a motion?

James Sage: Only before the vote. If there was a vote, and there's an amendment, then the person who moved originally would have to either accept it or reject the amendment as a friendly amendment or an unacceptable substantive amendment. It's basically so that everybody has a chance to participate and that we are only talking about one topic at a time or one motion at a time. That's really the goal.

Scott Knowles: What this means, Elijah specifically is, if you wanted to make a separate motion, for example, that maybe we should accept the policy with the idea that it is only an opt in. We could also vote on that motion and see where faculty are standing. Someone would need to make the motion, and then, second that motion.

Elijah Neilson: I think more people probably would have abstained if there was more interest in that idea. But I'm open to it. If someone wants to second it I will motion.

Chris Younkin: I'll second it.

Maren Hirschi: Scott Munro mentioned a few minutes ago that they get about 50% response rate. When emailed requests for updates are sent out. I have had questions on and off about FERPA, and whether or not I'm allowed to share that information with whoever it's coming from.

Scott Munro: It's actually gotten more complex because they use Teamworks, which is kind of a communication thing that a lot of universities use for their student athletes. And now you have to get a one time password code. They look at all the FERPA stuff beforehand and it's all within a secure realm. If they are on scholarship, they sign a waiver, saying that the department can look at their grades because there's money associated with it, because they have a contract to be a student.

Maren Hirschi: It would be helpful for faculty to know that ahead of time, I'm thinking back to my very first semester here, six years ago, and it was so much simpler when my student athletes just brought a paper around for me to sign.

Scott Munro: Good point.

Scott Knowles: I do have a clarifying question from Elise who wants to know what the motion is. The motion is that we adopt the procedure that we might allow athletic advisors access to Canvas, but only if a faculty member opts into that process. If a faculty member says, No, then it would not happen in your class. It would only happen if a faculty member agreed to it.

Scott Munro: To comment on that I would say that what we would do is send out something because we're talking about at risk student athletes here. So 30, 40, 50 at most a semester. At the beginning of the semester, we could set that up to get an email through canvas to verify that you're opting in or out.

Scott Knowles: Is there any other discussion about the motion before Grant posts it, and we vote?

Scott Munro: My understanding is that as part of their scholarship acceptance is the fact that athletics can oversee their progress because they have to make certain grades they have to make certain progress, and we have to actually submit an audit every semester to the NCA.

James Sage: Thanks, Scott. I guess I should have said so student athletes on scholarship have consented to allowing appropriate athletics personnel to review their academic progress.

Scott Munro: I'm not sure about walk-ons. That may be a coach by coach thing. Some of the coaches are very proactive and actually dedicate a lot of time to helping ensure their students are making progress.

James Sage: That's helpful, because I think that alleviates at least a question I had as to whether or not students were aware this was going to happen. Clearly, students know if they're on scholarship, there are people who are monitoring their academic progress. So that's not the concern. I think the concern is more focused here about whether faculty are allowing this to happen in their Canvas shell.

Scott Munro: Right.

James Sage: Which is a more immediate, timely kind of oversight. I mean they already have consented to oversight. It's a question of whether or not to consider options for the speed or the timing.

Scott Munro: That's the big advantage, I see. I've had students that have basically bailed on their classes and just not doing their job is a small percentage, but I think they should not be traveling or practicing until they learn to be students first.

Scott Knowles: Okay, Mike, I'm gonna let you have the last comment. And then we're gonna vote

Mike Kroff: Since this is a second motion, I'm wrapping my mind around this. We rejected this and now we're saying we're accepting it in a different format?

Scott Knowles: That is what this motion is. I don't fully know exactly what happens if this motion passes. If this motion doesn't pass, then we would stick with our original motion to reject the proposal, and off we go. If this motion passes, then I'm not 100% sure how we would withdraw the previous motion. If that's what we want to do, or exactly what would happen.

Mike Kroff: Before we get to that procedure, this is a step towards something different. We're saying, this is okay on a trial basis and does that lead to something more permanent? Is that what we're saying we're okay with?

Scott Knowles: All we are very specifically saying is that we are okay if a faculty member consents to an athletic advisor monitoring a student athlete in their Canvas shell.

Mike Kroff: So we would be voting and saying that on behalf of our department we think that's okay.

Scott Knowles: Yes. We're gonna go ahead and vote. We don't actually have unlimited time on this today we do have a few more things to get through whenever you're ready, Grant. Matt McKenzie could answer perhaps better than anybody else

Matt McKenzie: In the Canvas observer role you are assigned to a student or students. For example, if you have kids in Iron County School District, you are put into an observer role. You can only see your children, you can't see all the other students in the class.

Scott Knowles: Okay the motion does not pass. We had 7 yes, 10 no, and 6 abstentions on this one. So the motion to have it be an option for faculty fails, which means we would continue with our previous vote that we would reject this.

Scott Munro: I appreciate the time I appreciate the thoughts and comments and conversation I've got to step off and and check in on an exam. If anybody wants to have any further discussions feel free to contact me

James Sage: This means that the Faculty Senate removed the option to opt in for any faculty, right?

Scott Knowles: We don't really have that power if we're being frank. What we have is the recommendation that this not be allowed. So we are recommending that this not be allowed.

James Sage: All right. I just wanted to clarify whether this body was actually prohibiting faculty from doing certain things. That's ostensibly what the motions appears to be, that this shall not be an option for faculty – for the 400 plus, 600 plus faculty, 400 full time and many part time.

Scott Knowles: The specific thing we rejected was the proposal as brought to us by Scott Monroe, the athletic faculty representative.

James Sage: Good way to put it.

7. Discussion Items: (4:56)

a. P&T Submissions (Jake Johnson)

i. [Faculty Feedback](#)

Jake Johnson: I'm inclined to let it ride as it stands at this point, because it doesn't really seem like we have consensus for a better option. We'll provide some training about how to use the single .pdf more effectively. Another thing I will add is that the Provost office will encourage those departments that have really long submissions to look at ways in which they could manage that workflow a little differently.

Chris Younkin: I mentioned this to Jake through email, we do have an institutional repository here at SUU if people want a place to house their scholarship or their creative works. We have limited space and limited size of files, so we can't put video or audio in

there, but you can have a place to link to. I'll be talking about this possibly in May at the CTI training.

Ryan Siemers: I put the feedback in the document, but my department's pretty unified on wanting to keep a single .pdf.

Scott Knowles: Yeah, absolutely other comments or feedback that we want to say or discuss.

In my view, we probably don't need to bring this back as an action item. If no one feels super strong about it, we'll just continue with what we have been doing with the single .pdf and the Provost's office will continue to refine that for us, and hopefully we'll get closer to getting people acclimated to making it happen.

b. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

8. Standing Committee Updates: (4:59)

a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)

b. Sick and Medical Leave for Faculty Committee

c. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

d. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)

e. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

Camille Thomas: We're working our way through some procedure stuff. We're going to start asking for nominations for individuals to serve on the area breadth working groups at the USHE level. So you may see your dean or department chair reaching out regarding nominations probably early next week.

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

Katie Engler sent out an email. She's currently looking for faculty across campus who are willing to guest teach in the honors program in one of the honors seminar classes next semester. If that's appealing to you, reach out to Katie.

g. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)

h. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

i. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

j. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

If you attended one of the HP. 265 meetings last Monday, you may have heard an update on our process for health insurance and the rfp that we had hoped to send out.

The State has asked that we wait for another additional year, as they work through, whether they want shared services across the State or not, which means we are going to be with UMR for an additional year before we even consider sending out an rfp to get a different health insurance provider.

k. 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 our winners, so they'll be coming out during the awards ceremony.

- iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)

We have also concluded our voting, and I'm just finishing up the write-ups about each candidate. We should be done by tomorrow.

- v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)

We are done with our work and we have already submitted our paperwork.

l. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

I was hoping to have some information on our faculty senate scholarship, but I haven't been able to get a hold of anybody in the Scholarship office. I think the applications were already due, so I'll keep hounding them to try to get a list of students that have applied, and so we can try to get this taken care of before we run out of meeting times.

- m. Past President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee
- n. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC); Ad Hoc committee on policy outside of 6.0

Chris Monson: UCFSL met on March 7th. Hb265 had just passed and everyone was very excited to share their university's perspective on it. The University of Utah is saying they're really excited to refinance a bond, and that's how they're going to be more efficient.

WaFSEC hasn't met. Scott is going to update people on the Ad Hoc committee. results of the comments. So that's my report

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

Scott Knowles: The conflict of interest policy 5.7, Chris and I ended up having a meeting with Lucia Malloy, the general counsel for the University, as well as John Fonseca, who has been working on the revision to conflict of interest policy 5.7. Many thanks to Chris and the ad hoc committee for getting feedback together and helping faculty understand what was happening with that policy so that more folks could submit comments in the 21 day review period. I want to outline what has been changed based on the conversation that Chris and I had with Lucia and John yesterday. They're going to be updating the definition to make it more clear that work that you undertake as part of your responsibilities for SUU doesn't count. So a way to think about this is that anything that you're going to put on your FEC Report is not going to be counted as a conflict of interest because you are doing it for SUU. It is part of your job and responsibilities. However, there are some caveats to that which will impact some departments more than other departments. So if you are paid for whatever it is that you did, and that payment is over \$100, then you are going to need to submit a conflict of interest, disclosure or a potential conflict of interest. Then at that point they're probably in almost all cases going to say, this conflict does not need to be managed. But you've reported it, we've got a record of it, and this is good.

Sometimes we are employed or doing things that aren't compensated, but will still also need to be reported. So in the policy it lists other types of conflicts. For example, a conflict of ethics which can include a time commitment issue. So you can think about this if I took a second job. Does that second job still allow me enough time to complete my obligation, time wise and commitment wise to Southern Utah University and we should probably submit a conflict of interest to make sure that it is in fact true. There apparently have been instances on campuses, especially with Covid happening, where people will take a full time position as an online instructor at a different university and maintain a full time position as an instructor at their university.

SUU would like that to not happen because they have a belief, and I actually do think it's a reasonable belief that you can't actually perform appropriately in two full-time faculty jobs at the same moment at two different institutions. So there are other conflicts that we might need to report, but those are there. We did get everyone to remove the language of loyalty and allegiance that existed in the former policy. So now the term is obligation and it's made more clear what we're talking about there. It's more you're hired to do a specific job, and we are obligated to fulfill the responsibilities of that job. Not that we need to be loyal and show allegiance to Southern Utah University, which I think is good.

The language around the grading a family member got changed to the recommended language that the ad hoc Committee put forward. So it is no longer just the chair assigning a faculty member, or they themselves grading a family member that might be in your class. Instead, a plan will be put together to figure out what the best way to assess that student will be. Sometimes it might be a different faculty member, but that doesn't work in all instances, and so other plans can be put in place.

I also wanted to make sure you were aware that the guidelines that are linked in the policy are still very much in flux. We talked a lot about what was said in those guidelines, and those are going to change dramatically, and will continue to change as we roll out this policy and work through it with faculty. So if you ever have questions about things that are listed in those guidelines, we should really be communicative about that, so that we can get them changed. It's not hard and fast. We can change those things and make it communicate better. For example, the information about political activity, and whether we needed to report that as a conflict of interest, we got a lot of clarity on that from Lucia. What they're really looking for there is are you running for a political office? Then you probably need to disclose a conflict of interest. Are you a campaign manager for a political candidate? Then you probably need to disclose that as a conflict of interest. If you are simply volunteering for a political candidate or campaign. That actually is not what they're interested in. They don't want us to disclose that in any context, and that's going to be made more clear as they update those guidelines.

This new policy is coming from law changes to the Utah Public Officers and Employee Ethics Act, which actually has some steep requirements which SUU is trying to negotiate to make our lives as faculty easier if we did not do this policy and create this conflict of interest process, many of us, or all of us actually would have to submit potential conflicts of interest to a number of different state agencies, have those documents notarized every year, and it would be quite onerous on us. So part of this policy is actually making an agreement with the state to manage this process for us so that it can be a simpler process. The other thing to note here is that the penalties for the conflict of interest breaking that state law are actually fairly steep, including a class B felony, if it involves a thousand dollars or more, if it has not been disclosed and managed appropriately. So part of this is also to try to help faculty maintain our own selves, and not get into trouble.

With all that said, I do think we can continue to contribute and discuss the policy and how it's going to operate and how it can operate better. Both Lucia and John were very in favor of hearing from faculty voices, especially as we roll this out about how to make the policy stronger, about how to make the procedures not onerous and about how to make it protective of faculty.

The policy is going forward to the Board of Trustees next week for approval when we have our meeting. It will change our processes because if you make over a hundred dollars on anything you're doing that's not with SUU, you're going to need to disclose that and we are working on processes that will hopefully make that as simple and as less onerous. But this is going to happen.

Chris Monson: The one other thing they said is, even if you work at another state agency, even as a volunteer, you also have to disclose that.

Scott Knowles: I think we can all agree that it is probably going to create some workload issues for everybody. We're hoping to make it as less onerous as possible. And we're working with Lucia and John to make that happen, and they will want more feedback as we move along. Are there any questions or concerns about that?

Derek had a question, what if you were on Sabbatical leave at another UT institution, and getting paid to teach there. Yes, I believe you would have to disclose that. I mean, you're disclosing it because it's probably part of your sabbatical information you submitted.

Maren Hirschi: I have read the policy, though I haven't read the updates. Does SUU or the state have the right to tell us that we can't do some things? I mean, it makes sense. We can't have two full time teaching jobs, but if it's unrelated they can't tell us we can't do it, can they?

Scott Knowles: They can only tell us we can't if it is an actual and legitimate conflict of interest that has to be managed, and that management has to be agreed upon by both parties. In most cases for faculty it is not going to be an actual, real conflict of interest.

Shalini Kesar: Two questions. One is, what if a faculty has a consultancy of their own which I know we have to disclose anyway, to the chair and the dean, etc. So based on that consultancy, and if you're doing volunteer work, I'm guessing it encompasses that disclosure.

Scott Knowles: So the consulting policy is still in effect, and you have to comply with the consulting policy and this conflict of interest policy. So you will still disclose your consultancy business, whatever that happens to be with this consultancy form. This conflict of interest form that will come out, you also still have to abide by the consultancy policy.

Shalini Kesar: For example, there's a comptia certificate. Comptia is an institution and I am a part of the Advisory Board for them. So that is outside SUU. So that is also what you're saying that has to be disclosed.

Scott Knowles: Yes.

Shalini Kesar: Fun. I just wonder if a person like me who has several volunteer positions might get demotivated and do less because it's too much paperwork.

Scott Knowles: Yeah, Chris, and I did talk to Lucy about that and we tried to make it clear just how many small things faculty really do that are outside the institution quite regularly. And this is what spurred them to think maybe we need a pre vetting, very simple form for conflicts of interest that a chair can go through and check very quickly, and won't be nearly as onerous to fill out. And then, when we see one in there that really actually needs the full form we mark that and send people the full form. And then we can kind of get what we need done without necessarily overburdening everybody. But that process hasn't been developed yet.

Shalini Kesar: Okay, that's a really good idea because obviously as a faculty, I don't want to be in trouble. So I'm just going to be extra cautious. But I like that idea that maybe having a quick vetting over and then having a detailed one, if need be. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Scott Knowles: Absolutely. Are there any other questions about this?

I just have a few other things I want to update you on. Last week we discovered there might be a glitch with the grading in the dashboard. You can now look at grade histories in the dashboard, but the grades were not necessarily matching up for some people. I reached out to Christian Reiner, and we discovered why and it's because of the way he set up the form. It was supposed to eliminate classes that were under 5 people because the data is not really great, but when he did that it also eliminated the grades like a grading category that had under 5 people. He has adjusted that, and so the grades should be now accurate with what you might see in your canvas, and what grades you actually assigned.

I did want to update people on CTI's professional development slots for the end of the semester. Those slots are starting to actually fill up. We're getting to the point of competition to get those slots. So just know that everyone might not be able to present, which isn't really a bad thing. It means that faculty are really engaged, and that's going well. But I wanted to make you aware that the Dean's Council approved policy 6.6 on academic freedom, and it will go out for a 21 day review soon.

We've also got an update on the SUU Emergency Operations plan that was just completed, and is live on the website.

Administration did receive the guidance from USHE on HP. 265 and what sort of decisions need to be made and not made. The guidance, from what I've heard is actually much more, here's the form and all the data we want you to provide when you give us our plan, and it's quite substantial. It's going to be a pretty significant amount of work to get that done. We're working on it. I'm sure we'll hear more about the process of HP. 265, as we continue along.

Tuition is increasing in case you weren't at the earlier meetings this week or yesterday's truth and tuition, hearing it is going to be probably about the second lowest increase in the state. We're not increasing as much as other schools are. I just want to remind people of the three really great reasons that we have to increase tuition. Currently, (1) is the mandated costs from the state, (2) is to increase labor wages for our students, and (3) is to pay for tenure and promotion pay increases for faculty. So that is why we are increasing the tuition in the way that we did. Lastly, I just wanted to reiterate, I've said this a number of times, administration and I am concerned about faculty and staff morale and I am still compiling ideas and thoughts about how to best address the impact of Hb. 265 and the general morale of faculty at SUU. One of those ways is sending out that survey. So please let us know your thoughts in that survey that will be coming out on Monday. But if you have other ideas or thoughts. Please email me. We will compile those thoughts and give them to administration, so that hopefully, we can have action on some of those. And that is my full report.

9. Call for Executive Session (5:20)

10. Adjourn