FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
March 6, 2025
4:00-5:30 pm
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, Matt Mckenzie, Shalina Kesar, John Karpel

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 Athletics, Doug Knuth

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:01)

    a. February 20, 2025 Meeting Minutes

       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. Research Activities

    i. [Active Transportation Survey](#)

    ii. [Muscle Loss Prevention](#) - Nutrition Sciences

f. Faculty Senate President Elections - [Nominations Form](#)

g. External Access to SUU Spaces and Records by External Law Enforcement

    i. https://www.suu.edu/external-access/

h. Native American Student Association [Pow Wow, April 12, 2025](#)

    i. [Financial Sponsorship Letter](#)

5. Information Item (4:05)

a. Athletics Update (Doug Knuth)

Doug Knuth: Dr. Scott Monroe is the faculty athletic rep.and that role is a liaison between the faculty senate president and and the athletics department. It is vital that the athletic director has some accountability or some relationship with the faculty senate.We appreciate all your great support.

There's two different variables that we look at and measure for the Academic Progress Rate and success of a student in the athletic program. The first thing is every one of our student athletes has to have a certain grade point average and progress towards a meaningful degree to be eligible to play. Last semester for the first time ever every one of our close to 370 had a 3.0 GPA or higher. The second is retention and how many of our student athletes finish a semester and enroll and come back the following semester meaning they don't drop out, or fail out. All that goes into a calculation in a perfect APR.

A perfect score across all teams and all student athletes is 1,000 across all the NCAA Division. Last year we set a record and reached 985 out of a thousand.

Finally we're all responsible for the Graduation Success Rate (GSR) with meaningful degrees. It's a 6 year rolling average. Our GSR is going to continue to be strong and solid.

Question: I have a student that is doing well in my class, but never attends class. Should I be worried? Does the student athletes coach want them to attend class? How should I address this situation?

Scott Munro: Absolutely, positively anytime they're here they should be attending class.If they're not, and even if they're doing well, I guess I would leave that up to you, but I would hope to know about it.

        b. Great Faculty Bake-Off, March 24th, 3-5pm

            i. [Flyer](#)

           ii. [Enter the competition](#) by March 20th at 11:59pm

    6. Action Items:(4:17)

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

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

The link that you have is the substitute version of the policy that we're proposing for IRB, it is shorter than the current version you have, we essentially struck through that entire policy, and would prefer that we have this version of it. It is shorter. There are two reasons for being shorter. We are signaling that we are going to follow the common rule, which is a Department of Health and Human Services Federal rule about institutional review boards.

Its definitions are the ones that we're going to follow. So we eliminated a bunch of definitions in there. We also eliminated a bunch of diagrams, and much of that content is shifting over to a set of standard operating procedures that are available on the Institutional Review Board's website.

Jacob Dean: I can motion to accept the new form of policy 6.20.

Bryan Koenig: My department would like to have a chance to look at it. They were involved in creating the earlier version and we just haven't seen this new one yet. Could I make a motion to definitely come back to it? Is that the right term?

Scott Knowles: That would be the correct term. We do have two motions on the table. One was not seconded, however, so we could accept another motion, and then, second, that motion. Is there any discussion about this? Do we feel like we need more time to talk about this policy or make sure the departments have looked at it.

Maren Hershey: I'll second Brian's motion.

Scott Knowles: We have a motion on the table to postpone this definitely. Let's say, until March 20th so that it would come back right away after Spring Break, and then that would give folks time to look at that policy again.

The motion to postpone definitely carried. 23 Yes and 1 No.

      c. [Policy 6.6 Academic Freedom](#) (Kelly Goonan)

          i. [Faculty Feedback](#)

          ii. [Summary of Faculty Feedback with Responses](#)

Kelly Goonan: There is a summary document linked in the agenda. The Academic Affairs Committee worked on this yesterday. We did receive one additional comment after the February 20th meeting, and I would like to publicly thank the English Department for making a suggestion to help us improve the policy. Y

But the summary document outlines chronologically by policy section the feedback that we received and the response from the Academic Affairs Committee, a lot of the feedback that was received was related to section 4a.2 Scholarly or Creative Activity for Pecuniary Return. There are several things that I would like to point out, the first being that the policy language is not new. It is from the November 2000 version of the policy, and I copied and pasted the verbatim language from the November 2000 version of the policy. It is not also arbitrary. It is actually rooted in the AUP's 1940 statement on academic freedom, which is also copied, pasted, and linked there .

We have changed the policy language to state that faculty are responsible for understanding how academic freedom protections under this policy may be affected

when undertaking scholarly and creative activities for pecuniary benefit, and we reference policies 5.7 and 5.52 in that section. We hope that that language is more clear. We hope that folks understand why that language is in there, and then we point people to the conflict of interest and intellectual property policies in that section.

There was also some feedback on the definition of shared governance. But then also section A.4. We recommended at the last meeting that we add a 5 to distinguish between academic freedom in shared governance and academic freedom under other institutional functions; those sections were specifically added to address concerns raised by the Senate related to intramural speech. And so the Academic Affairs Committee would like to keep both, so that it's very clear when academic freedom applies, and that there are no questions.

There are additional comments related to the limitations on academic freedom which have been addressed there. In some cases we felt that the current policy language adequately communicates what those limitations are. I highlighted the exact text in that document with our response under competence, we added following procedures outlined in policy, 6.1 or policy 6.28 to direct faculty to the policies where those procedures are actually housed.

Another comment came up about, what do pedagogical concerns mean and regarding student opinion? We changed that language to be verbatim from policy 6.2 8. It doesn't really change the nature of the language under fairness, but the language is now verbatim consistent with policy. 6.28.

There were a couple comments related to the difference between academic freedom and freedom of speech. And again we felt that that was already adequately stated in the definition of academic freedom in the policy. We tried to clarify that this policy applies to university employees and students. We added a point D or section D breach of academic freedom. If a faculty member feels their academic freedom has been infringed or diminished, they can follow the procedures outlined in the new faculty grievance policy.

So we hope that that addresses all of the concerns that were brought forward by the Senate and from the faculty feedback that was collected in the current version of the policy, The new language is included in purple text.

Nathan Slaughter: I'm motioning to approve.

Elise Leahy: I'll second.

The motion carried with 26 voting YES.

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

David Hatch: I want to thank Michelle,Christian and Elise for their help on this, and remind folks that you know our goal here was to offer some additional opportunities for

online teaching, for adjunct teaching, graduate education and general education, and to recognize those people on the teaching they're doing.

Rachel Parker: One of the points of clarification regarding online teaching was on the parameters of that. Is it for somebody that teaches online only? Is it a certain amount of online classes? Is it anybody that has taught an online class?

David Hatch: I'm not sure I have a great answer for that. We didn't really think of the subtleties there. My initial reaction is that anyone who teaches an online class should be available, not someone who teaches exclusively. But I don't know how the other committee members feel or what the faculty wants to do.

Rachel Parker: Knowing that this is a proposal, I think that's something that would be addressed as you do the criteria.The second question was regarding the phrase, time commitment in that proposal of the online one. Does that mean that the time commitment It's different? Does that mean it's more or less than face to face? There was a suggestion that when you say it's a different skill set, just leave it at that. Don't say different time commitments. The last one was the note at the end that seems to imply these would be second tier awards, comparative to outstanding and distinguished, and if that is the case, just making sure that it would not preclude someone from winning the other ones. These are the suggestions from my faculty.

David Hatch: I think those are excellent suggestions. I'm not sure that language needs to be there. If it adds needless complications without making things more clear then maybe we need to strike that language.

Bryan Koenig:I talked to my department about this. They also wanted clarification about the fully online versus mostly online. It sounds like we're thinking one online class is probably enough and that the award would be for the online classes that the person teaches. Somebody said that most of the adjuncts that we have teach online. So it seems like there's a large overlap in that group of folks. I'm not sure how that would matter for the awards. But that was something somebody mentioned. And also, for us, Summer courses tend to be taught online. One of my faculty mentioned that SUU has more faculty now than we used to when we came up with the four awards we have now, and so the idea of having additional awards would make up for the increase in the number of faculty.

Who would be nominating? It could be a little bit tricky, especially for adjuncts, because students often don't know who's an adjunct. I'm not sure if the faculty know all the adjuncts, except for chairs.

And we were wondering who would process the nominations and identify the winner. Will it be the same committee that does the outstanding and distinguished educator awards?

Overall, my department was supportive.

David Hatch: I'm pleased to hear that people are interested in these awards. I do think there's some. I agree that adjuncts often go unrecognized, despite the fact that they do some of the best teaching, and carry a pretty heavy load for not a ton of compensation at times. We want to be mindful of our colleagues, who are adjuncts, and certainly it behooves chairs and deans to recognize and have a more global view of who's teaching.

Maren Hirschi: I move to approve the teaching awards proposal.

Rachel Parker: I'll second.

Elise Leahy: Does that mean that we need to address the question of who would be making the selection because one of the questions asked was, would the same committee that chooses the outstanding educator and distinguished educator be also making these selections?

Scott Knowles: Faculty Senate doesn't get to decide to add an award. What will happen here is that we will vote to make a recommendation, and that recommendation will go to the group that runs the Thunderbird Awards, and they will say yay or nay. The most likely thing to happen would be that this would get lumped in with the committee that works on our other education awards or the teaching awards.

So this proposal is: Faculty Senate thinks we should have some more teaching awards, and they should be in these categories. Then we send it on to the next group who has purview over those Thunderbird Awards. And we'll move from there.

The motion has passed unanimously.

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

            i. Maren Hirschi, Christopher Graves, Ben Sowards

Scott: We asked that you consult your departments for nominations of people who were potentially interested in being on a sick and medical leave faculty committee to explore the possibility of creating a sick and medical leave policy similar to our parental caregiving policy.Three people volunteered: Maren Hershey, Christopher Graves, and Ben Sewards. I'm curious if there is anyone else that other departments heard from, or any other faculty senators who would be interested in joining that work. Kelly Goonan also volunteered.

    7. Discussion Items: (5:08)

      a. [Faculty Grievance Policy](#) (Kelly Goonan)

The Academic Affairs Committee has been working on this. It started when we were working on revamping and reorganizing policy 6.22, which currently is Faculty Due Process but we are changing it to be the bona fide program Discontinuance

Procedures. Policy 6.2 8, which currently is Faculty Professional Responsibility is moving forward and will incorporate the due process.

In moving due process out of 6.22 into 6.28, we left a little bit of a gap with faculty grievances. If you read the current version of policy 6.22

in section 4b it says that the policy applies to all disputes involving or regarding faculty at Southern Utah University, except those alleging sexual harassment or harassment, discrimination or retaliation based on a person's protected status.

And so in our discussions with the committee, when we were working through policy 6.22 and policy 6.28. It was stated pretty strongly that we needed to have something that would kind of take what was left over from that reorganization and give it a new policy. So essentially what this new faculty grievance policy does is it fills a gap that currently is being filled by policy 6.22 but once those final versions of the policies take effect, we would be missing that. The purpose is to provide an avenue for faculty, to resolve grievances that warrant being resolved. But maybe don't rise to the level of a policy violation under another policy.

So that's the rationale for the policy. If you have any questions I'm happy to answer or I'm happy to provide more information.

Scott: We will discuss this again at our March 20th meeting. Make sure that you take this policy to your faculty members and collect feedback. If you do want me to set up a feedback form, now would be the time to let me know, so that we have plenty of time to put feedback on such a form.

Maren Hirschi: I think having such a form is useful.

Scott Knowles: Okay.

Rachel Parker: I second that.

Scott Knowles: I will create a form for you all to gather feedback.

Kelly Goonan: I'd like to ask a question of the Senators. I typed up some notes for the Executive Committee, related to points that I thought folks would have questions about, because they were points that we discussed quite a bit in the Academic Affairs Committee. Would it be helpful to the Senators if I sent those points out to you all so that you could read them over and share them, and it may address some questions that you may have coming in.

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

Scott Munro: We talked about this about a month ago. It's fortuitous that Doug came on and talked about academics and athletics, and the three numbers they track. One thing

Doug didn't tell you is that there's academic money from the NCAA that gets distributed to schools that meet these criteria. So there's extra special interest there. That's not the only reason that we would do something like this. We do have a vested interest in getting these students to graduate; they are students first. The athletic department has Dr. Cedric Brown who handles compliance and academics and oversees the academic staff. They have two academic advisors as well who support athletes when they register, there are all sorts of NCAA regulations. If students aren't doing well in a class, there could be multiple reasons for that. And the academic staff monitors the grades through Success Hub, but that still leaves some gaps. If a student's not doing well in a class, this could be for multiple reasons. The problem we have is there's a timeline involved. If they look at Success Hub and see that a student's struggling in this class, the only indication they really have is a grade. They try to meet with the student but if it's during the season that can potentially get hard because the student athlete is traveling. Time is of the essence so we lose time in trying to understand why that student has that grade in the class. What we're trying to do with Canvas access is to speed up this response time. It's not going to solve every problem. If we can go into canvas why this student is struggling we have more information when we meet with the students and urge them to seek additional help/resources, i.e. getting a tutor, etc. Perhaps then I may need to take action and say you're not traveling this week because you haven't turned in all your assignments. Let me be extremely clear, this is not for anybody in athletics to go into Canvas and look and talk to faculty. This access is specifically for at most 4 people, Cedric or Dr. Brown and then the two academic advisors.

What we're trying to do is simply use this as a tool to help us respond faster, and to be honest in my role, hold them accountable. Coaches are not to mess with academics, they come to me. The hope is that we get Canvas observer access for that particular student, not the entire class.

Cedric: Thank you for allowing us to have this time. We are not trying to make extra work for our colleagues. I'm an adjunct faculty. I've been a full time faculty member at other institutions. What we're trying to do is be good campus partners with you all as we try to find a way to help you help the student athlete be successful in your classes. If at any time you have an issue with a student athlete, please send me an email. I will be more than willing to make an appointment with that student to figure out how I can help before they drop classes. All 369 student athletes have to come see me before they can drop a class. I just appreciate it. We're only talking about just over about 10%-15% of the student athletes who have academic challenges right now. Each semester is somewhere between like 35 to 50 that we would be asking to have access to monitor.

No one but Scott Monroe will ever get in contact with a faculty member. If a faculty member gets in contact with me, I will respond.

Elise: Concerned because we consider our students adults. Have you looked into FERPA considerations? Could the students who are in jeopardy sit down with you and show you their Canvas?

Scott Munro: This could be perceived as hand holding but we are not going to be checking all the time on each assignment. It's when the students begin to slip and we need to understand better what is going on. It's similar to services we provide at risk students. We would like to help facilitate better support.

Chris: At previous university all athletes had monitors. It's not an uncommon practice and it's actually unique that we don't do it.

Maren: Primary concern is that I require a lot of personal reflection and if others have access to this and students not having given informed consent.

Scott: I will create a document for departments to respond.

       c.   P&T Submissions (Jake Johnson)

Scott Knowles: Faculty Senate was hopeful that we might be able to find a way forward to not do a single pdf submission for our tenure and promotion submissions. I reached out to Jake Johnson and explained this desire. Jake talked with the provost office about it, and they came back with some reason as to why they don't want to do or do away with the single pdf and perhaps a proposal to go in a different direction. Jake, do you want to outline that for us?

Jake Johnson: I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this. And I think we want to explore an option that works for most. Part of the reason we ended up in a single pdf version was there were original concerns about the security of files if they were shared in a different format and a pdf locks that information in place, and if that pdf is only available on the dashboard, it's behind a protected password. You have to log in to see it, and only certain people end up with access in the dashboard, and that access is controlled tightly by Parker Grimes and his staff.

It's my understanding that many faculty feel like if we permitted folks to link to files outside of a single pdf, that it would be a preferable solution, which is kind of a hybrid. The provost office, Aimee Uchman, was responsible for trying to manage a whole host of Google drives and access to those Google drives for all of the faculty going through the process. That's a challenging role to fulfill.

We're trying to strike the right balance between having a single pdf and not having to manage a whole bunch of Google drives to make sure that all of the people that need access to the Google drive, have it in a timely fashion. We're curious if there's the potential to have multiple uploads in the dashboard, if that might be a reasonable middle ground for us. Parker has written the code to make that possible in the dashboard.

One of the things we've thought about is that there would be the FEC Report, that three page summary. Or if you're submitting an application for promotion or for tenure, you'd have the allotted page numbers in the application, and then you could submit additional pdf files for your evidence that supports the material that you reference in your application.

Could that be a reasonable middle way for us to address P&T submissions.

Maren Hirschi: Yes, Jake, could you please just restate the proposal.

Jake Johnson: So I think we have three options to think about. One is to keep a single pdf version and people are getting better at that, as they've become more accustomed to it, though some could be improved. If we do stick with it, we can provide additional training to make the single pdf a little bit more manageable for faculty.

Another option, though we don't love this idea, is having links to the Google drive in your application materials.

The last option is to open up the dashboard to accept multiple uploads rather than one so faculty could provide multiple files of evidence that support their application.

Chris Younkin: We've had discussions about this in the library, and it seems like the consensus is we want to be able to link out. One of the problems with that is if you don't get the right permissions in Google drive it will limit how people can access it. Also, if you have a document you're using for evidence in your P&T and it's Google Sheet or a Google document it can be changed. I would say if the goal is to have something that's stable and unchangeable, having multiple submissions within the faculty dashboard would be the best option. Some parameters on how many files you can actually upload sounds like a pretty reasonable middle ground.

Shalini Kesar: What do you mean by multiple? How many files? Because if somebody has different articles or showcases, a slight concern would be the volume of multiple files. When it goes to the P&T college departmental committee it's easier to overlook a file which is in multiple files than perhaps in one file.

Jake Johnson: As we discussed that in the Provost office we thought something like this might work. You would have your application or your FEC report as one file and then you would have an additional upload for your teaching effectiveness evidence as an additional file upload for your service and leadership evidence and an additional file for your scholar and creative activity uploads. If you're a non track faculty member, then you really only have teaching effectiveness, service, and leadership.

Bryan Koenig: I'm just wondering if we had multiple file uploads if Parker could transform them all into pdfs behind the scene and then merge them into a single pdf for folks to download if people wanted that as an option, it seems like that the technology probably exists for that kind of thing, that's all.

Jake Johnson: That's something for us to consider. I want to be really respectful of Parker's workload. This is a fairly significant project for Parker, he has to manage all of the access from committee members across seven colleges and multiple committees, and I hope we will take that into consideration, as we think about the system that we adopt.

Maren Hirschi: This may be unpopular, and maybe I'm forgetting some previous discussions we've had. I'm really having a hard time wrapping my mind around why it is an issue for us to submit in a single document when we can hyperlink to other places. Let's not unfairly burden Parker.

Jake Johnson: You are speaking the language of the Provost office. I think we're a little bit reluctant to change, but we wanted to entertain a conversation about this. We're very much in the same mind you are on this. But we wanted to hear from others.

Scott Knowles: The concerns about the single pdf had to do with the construction of the pdf. The ability of faculty to really manageably create that large document, i.e. the various kinds of things that have to be created in it, the size and scope. On the other hand, for example, one of the downsides to breaking it into four pdfs, which might be more manageable in the creation, is that there would be no hyperlinks between those pdfs. You can't hyperlink to a pdf that is outside the pdf you are currently in, which might also make it more difficult for evaluative entities to actually navigate that package if it wasn't in a single pdf or we didn't go to the the Google drive model where they can click it, and it takes them to a different location.

Ryan Siemers: I agree with Maren. Aso, Shalini's point about the possibilities that evaluative bodies might miss something, and I understand that creating better on balance.

Scott Knowles: I know that a lot of folks had concerns the last time we talked about this, and you wanted me to approach Jake. We have not really heard from any of those voices. Does anyone want to raise those concerns? Does multiple pdfs answer that question for you?

Kelly Goonan: I think I'll share the concern that I heard from my college. We had one faculty member in our department whose FEC Report was over 700 pages long. That's not a tenure application. That's not a 3 year review. That's one year because our DEC asks for all of the abstracts from all of the conferences, full copies of publications, and this happens to be a faculty member who does a lot of undergraduate research as well as graduate mentoring. it took countless hours for that faculty member to put that pdf together, which is a huge amount of time and at the department level, reviewing it, even though you can link having to navigate back up, you get lost in that many pages.

My FEC report, I will admit, was probably not even complete, because I didn't get every single little thing in there, and I think mine was 300 pages long. It's very unwieldy for the people who are serving on the department and college curriculum committees. I've looked at single pdf ones on the college committee and they're really hard to navigate, and not every faculty member has the skill to set them up well. So the evaluative entities can literally be scrolling through hundreds of pages of material to try and find what they're looking for, whereas if there is a way to either upload multiple pdfs or to link to a drive outside, you can have your narrative or your application. What I've seen work really well is faculty will have a table of contents that enables you to click and see those examples of what they've done.

The concern from my college is faculty time and putting all of those things together in a single document. Then it's the ability of the evaluative entities to find what they're looking for and to efficiently navigate that document, especially when they're going through potentially dozens of these every year, depending on what level of committee they're serving on. Those are the concerns that have come up in my college from faculty and also from the department and college committee levels.

Scott Knowles: I do want to be mindful of time, so maybe we want another feedback document on these three ideas, I will outline them and we can collect departmental feedback on all three.

Shalini Kesar: I want to explore what is called a Pdf portfolio, which is multiple files put into one file, and it automatically creates a table of contents. We should perhaps think about having training about how to use this for these reports

Rachel Parker: In my experience of nonprofit arts grant writing in that world a lot of these large, unwieldy grants are now switching over to forms where they have certain fields where everything is plugged in, and places where you can attach pdfs. So I know that would put a lot on Parker to create. It's similar to what Dr. K. is talking about but it would front load a lot of that work, and be easier for evaluative and navigate.

      d. [Non-6 Policy Feedback](#) (Chris Monson)

            i. Policy 5.7 Conflicts of Interest

Chris Monson: There were two policies that came out for review. One was licensing and use of the university name and trademarks and second is there are some departments who wish there was a way to work with marketing and get a marketing approved trademark that they can use for their logo. So that was put in there as a suggestion.

There was some conflict of interest feedback or conflict of interest policy where there were significant problems that we saw with it. This is outlined in the document, but they boil down to an administrator, and it has to be approved at the associate or at the vice president level, so it would have to be the provost or someone in the provost's office who could say, I don't like the fact that you give private lessons or something like that, and you can't do that if you want to stay a faculty at SUU.

There was also a concern about family members in classes where it said the department chair had degraded that, and it really wasn't a workable solution. There were also problems with annual conflict of interest reports needing to be updated whenever there is some activity that would include something like the way it's written, e.g. reviewing a textbook where they send you 20 bucks, which would require you to update your document and get approval from the department chair and the dean.

Scott: You all have the ability to comment on policy. 5.7. Conflict of interest, or 5.43 until March 11th or 12th.

            ii. Policy 5.43 Licensing and use of University Name and Trademarks

Wanted to work with marketing and get an approved logo.

   e. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:19)

   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/

Seniors will be disseminating their honors capstones in the coming weeks, and your students would love your support if you are aware of it happening.

   f. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)

   g. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

   h. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

   i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

Still waiting on the state to determine whether they will put all universities on a shared system.

   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)

Actively working on nominations right now.

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

Reviewing all the candidates files.

      v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)

We are making great progress toward selecting a recipient. We narrowed it down to 5 finalists, got some feedback from the chairs. We're waiting for clarification about one question from Kenton Pope, but after that the deliberations are going to begin, and we'll select a winner easily by the March 21st deadline.

        k.   Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

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

The Academic Affairs Committee will be working on the revisions to Policy 6.15 Faculty Leaves, and then also working with the Provost's office on guidelines for implementing policy, 6.22, and we passed the Academic Freedom policy.

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

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

Dean's Council this last week was actually a training session for the epic grant that SUU has received working on the built model which stands for business and industry leadership team.

The process is actually quite interesting. Some faculty get their hackles up a little bit when they hear we're going to try to collaborate with industry. But after going through the training, I say keep an open mind. It really did seem like a very valuable process of working with folks in industry that might be able to help us make our programs better. And I think it could actually apply across all kinds of programs and engineering, business, and even the arts. I had several ideas for my own department in theater that could deploy the exact same model. So you're going to be hearing about that from your deans and department chairs soon, and I would encourage you to let your faculty know that this might be a really great opportunity. We should consider it because the process I think would be illuminating to a lot of different things within what we do in higher education.

The main piece of the compensation model that WaFSEChas put forward has the approval from the President's Cabinet, which is really exciting. We're going to get some more specifics from President Benson in the coming weeks on that including exactly what the numbers are going to look like. It is a really exciting win for our WaFSECCommittee, which has done tremendous work as well as working with the University Employee Compensation Committee to combine what WaFSECand the Staff Association was doing together to put forward a proposal that the President's Cabinet has looked upon favorably, and approved. Our main ask was that a percentage of the COLA allocated by the legislature would go to everyone as well as a flat rate amount. You are going to see some updates in the coming weeks from President Benson about exactly what those numbers are so if you see Dr. Gretchen Ellison or Dr. Lynn White,

who also worked on this the year previously, thank them for all their work with the WaFSEC Committee and any other members of the WaFSEC Committee as well. They've done tremendous work.

Finally, I want to make you aware that there is going to be a Truth and Tuition Town Hall on March 19th at 3pm on Zoom so watch for that announcement.

9. Call for Executive Session (5:25)

Move was made by Ryan Seimers. David Hatch 2nd.

Scott: President Benson and Provost Mendini is going to join us in the executive session to talk a little bit about HB 265. And our current place in that process. So join me backstage.

10. Adjourn