

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

April 3rd, 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, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Lee Wood, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

**Not Attending:** Kevin Stein,

**Proxies:** Julie McCown for Ryan Seimers, Dan Swanson for Jeanne Subjack, Shalina Kesar for R. Alexander Nichols

**Guests:** James Sage, Camille Thomas, Jake Johnson, Matt McKenzie, John Karpel, Cody Bremner, Clint Broadbent, Robb McCollum

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:01)
  - a. Associate Provost James Sage
  - b. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
  - c. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
  - a. Senior Director of CTI and Staff Association President, Matt McKenzie
  - d. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
  - e. CTI Faculty Fellow, Dr. Robb McCollum
  - f. CTI Faculty Working Group, Dr. Clint Broadbent
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
  - a. [March 20th, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

The 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. QPR Training - 75% Training Goal
    - i. Contact Madison McBride to schedule department level trainings: [madisonmcbride@suu.edu](mailto:madisonmcbride@suu.edu)
    - ii. [Spring Semester QPR Training Dates](#)
      - 1. [RSVP here](#)
  - c. This spring (Jan.- Apr.), the Utah Academic Library Consortium's Open Education Resources Committee will hold a monthly lunch & learn series exploring the transformative world of open education. Join fellow educators and professionals for an engaging lunchtime session. Find details at <https://ualc.net/utahoer/> or reach out to Chris Younkin ([chrisyounkin@suu.edu](mailto:chrisyounkin@suu.edu)).
  - d. Native American Student Association [Pow Wow, April 12, 2025](#)
    - i. [Financial Sponsorship Letter](#)
  - e. Gerald R. Sherratt Library Director Open Forums: SUU will be hosting two candidates for the Director of the Gerald R. Sherratt Library position on campus next week. Both candidates will present at an open campus forum and be available to answer questions from the campus community. The first forum will be held on Monday April 7 at 11:00am, and the second will be held on Wednesday April 9 at 9:00am. Both will be in the Church Auditorium in the Sharwan Smith Student Center and [streamed via Zoom](#).
5. Information Item (4:04)
- a. Benefits Update (Cody Bremer)

Cody: We did have our first meeting today. It's been a while since we had a meeting, which is why I've provided no updates.

I have an update. You may recall in the fall we had to pause our Rfp request for a proposal for our medical benefits. The state had indicated that they're looking at potentially combining our medical benefits across all institutions and have been in a three year review. We are still waiting on the state.

The second update is about raises and the potential increase in premiums for the benefits being provided. The good news is that the institutional leadership is working really hard not to pass that cost on to the employees, and it's looking promising but no final report on that yet.

Another thing to pass along to your faculty is the Teladoc feature that we've had with our health insurance and has been free the last few years is now going away because the Federal subsidies (Covid-19) are no longer available. Teladoc will still be an option but we will have to pay for it. Whatever you pay will go towards your deductible and your out of pocket maximum, so it would be very similar to when you go to a doctor face to face. You can start to use the Teladoc feature for your annual assessments and they'll send you a blood pressure cuff in the mail. They're also going to be offering mental health services, counseling and access to a psychiatrist will also be available through this feature. It will be an enhanced Teladoc.

More updates are regarding the dependent child care subsidy. For the past couple of years, the SUU provided, if you qualified, \$75 a month for childcare. Unfortunately, due to the various changing landscapes of the institution, they are no longer going to be able to provide that. You can still use your FSA to take out money tax free to pay for that childcare, so that option is still available to you.

This May all SUU employees will need to enroll/re enroll in our benefits. Beginning May 1st there will be an announcement on your MySUU portal about open enrollment and then you will be guided via links/tabs on how to do this. You can review your current options and what you're currently signed up for and then you can complete your choices and enrollment. This change is happening because HR has reported a lot of instances where faculty or staff have thought they are signed up for benefits which they were not and found out too late. Or another example is discovering belatedly that ex spouses are still listed as their beneficiary. These are some reasons why they want to move away from the passive system, which will protect us as we become more aware of the benefits we actually have.

We currently have AFLAC as an option for additional insurance, for severe health concerns or accidents. The university doesn't pay anything towards that. They have however negotiated a better price. So it is available to opt into. Apparently only about 21 people at the university use this supplemental insurance and they are looking at potentially changing to a different company called Chubb. The primary reason is that it will cover more things like critical illness or cancer as well as long term care. The university still wouldn't pay anything toward this coverage but they would negotiate a better price than AFLAC.

HR is thinking about partnering with a company that would help educate us on what our health insurance coverage options are. If this rolls out, we will have an option to fill out an optional six question survey, and then an individual would meet with you, and walk you through all the various options and help you understand, financially, when it's better to go with Medicare or other forms of coverage.

Scott Knowles: Are there any questions for Cody?

Shalini: Can you prepare a couple of bullet points that we can share with our faculty and if they have questions they can come back to your office to find out.

Cody Bremner: I'd be happy to do that. I'll just send it to Scott.

b. Department Senator Elections (Scott Knowles)

If you are a department and are rotating off the faculty senate, you need to get your election done in the next week or so, so that you can bring those new senators to our final meeting, which will be in person on April 17th in the Charles Hunter room. We will have an option for people to Zoom in but, as many folks will tell you, zooming in often doesn't work super well, there is a technological barrier as far as following the conversation or keeping up.

c. Faculty Senate President Elections - [Phase 2 Elections with Ranked Choice Voting](#) open from April 1st to April 8th at 8am.

We have our faculty senate elections for president elect. We did have the really unique circumstance in which we had three people that needed to move on to phase two so Jill Whitaker kindly devised for us a ranked choice voting system. Please encourage everyone you know to vote. It will close on April 8th at 8am. I will send a reminder on Monday morning at 8am. The candidates are Brandon Wiggins, Melinda Ford, and Steve Barney. There are descriptions and bios on the voting website.

d. Syllabus Database Update (Camille Thomas)

i. [USHE Guidelines](#)

ii. [Sample Syllabus](#)

Camille: This is something we have to do with HB261, which was passed last year. We've now had a fall and a spring, and USHE has done an audit around mid-February of our repository. They selected a random number of classes and looked at them and we've received a "generally conforms", which means that 70 to 99% of our classes conform with what the legislator expected to see in our syllabi, so we still have some work to do.

We've also received some new and updated guidelines because of that audit that have been linked in with the agenda today. So you can take a look at those, which are straight from USHE. USHE provided an example of the syllabi they are looking for as far as what should be in these external facing or these published syllabi.

Now what's going to happen for summer? In the guidelines we will be required to submit syllabus in the repository 14 days before the semester starts. So for those that are teaching this summer, you'll need to have that syllabi submitted and then published by April 28th

This is our new culture for how we're going to do this and will continue into fall where the syllabi will be due 14 days before the semester starts, August 13th. Two days before

your contract starts on August 15th.

USHE has asked that all syllabi outline more clearly the process on how grades are going to be assigned in the course. They're looking for clear breakdowns on how assignments will be evaluated, for example 20% writing assignment might be 30% of the final grade. In essence, they would like to see more information regarding how grades are actually assigned.

Finally they want us to put out a syllabus for every semester, update it for every semester, and it should be linked for that semester. It should be very specific for those who are teaching summer, they would want you to do a syllabus published for what you're actually going to teach in the summer. That means we're going to lose language saying it will vary depending on who teaches it. Those who teach different sections for this summer, if they're consistent in how the course is taught across different sections, we can keep it as one syllabus. However, if there's going to be differences in how one section is taught versus the other, we'll need to add those sections into the management system.

I'm working with department chairs and they're going to let me know what needs to be added. I'm asking department chairs for the classes, the mandatory courses that are taught just this summer and we're going to focus on updating those classes.

Brian Koenig: We need to give the actual syllabus for every class, is that right?

Camille: No changes for summer. The change is coming in the fall where we will be posting syllabi for every class (grad and undergrad). We're looking to create software in order to have a centralized syllabus builder that can publish it, submit it to Canvas or save it as a pdf or word document. The goal is to do it all in one place. It can be tailored for external facing publishing and will only pull required elements from the builder and Banner per the guidelines, ie. it won't include any personal information. It will work the same internally for Canvas purposes and include only the needed information. More information will come through department chairs as Parker develops this further. All syllabi will now be centrally archived for easy reference.

Nathan Slaughter: We do need the flexibility of accessing our syllabi for a multitude of purposes, eg, P&T, and in all forms, pdf, word, etc.

Camille: Yes all these forms will be available for all purposes and accessible in a centralized location. Departments will no longer need to collect and store syllabi, we are taking care of that and it will be accessible to faculty, staff, and students.

Chris Monson: Who will be in charge of enforcing this? Department chairs? The provost's office to make sure these are all submitted the correct way?

Camille: We will lean on the department chairs to change the culture and promote this as part of the process of being a faculty member or adjunct to use the builder and publish internally and externally rather than previous practices. The system will be able

to tell us who has submitted and who has not, and that will be shared from the provost's office to department chairs and deans.

Scott Knowles: Camille is an excellent resource so send any questions you may have her way.

Camille: I have already emailed department chairs that I would be happy to visit and explain the new process to their departments. We have an August 13th deadline that we hope to meet to have this syllabi builder ready for fall. We hope to make it! Parker is working hard. You can always submit earlier, once the builder is up and running, it will accept your syllabi whenever you're ready, as long as it's 14 days before the semester begins. That being said, if you're in the middle of the semester and you need to change something on your syllabi because it pedagogically needs to happen, you can do that.

Nathan Slaughter: Will contracts be adjusted accordingly for the earlier work required?

Camille: We have not discussed changing the contract dates. There is an expectation, a hope, that some of you might do this at the end of spring semester, before you leave on May 15th. I can happily bring that up to the Provost for a discussion, if you would like.

Scott Knowles: I have a concern for adjuncts who are required to do this earlier than expected for a class that may be cancelled and they've put in labor that goes unpaid. That is not ok in my book. If we could address paying adjuncts some compensation for the work they do on their syllabi, that would be fair.

Camille: I'll brainstorm with the provost's office on that. I want to treat adjuncts fairly. As a former department chair, I also know that sometimes we're getting an adjunct at the last hour. So we understand in those circumstances that some deadlines may not be made.

e. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Formation (Chris Monson)

Chris: We would like a fully representative executive committee. If you would like to serve on the executive committee and guide what the faculty senate discusses each week please consider volunteering. It's an important job.

Scott: We will be constructing the executive committee at our final meeting, April 17th.

- f. As part of Sexual Assault and Awareness Month, the Health and Wellness Center and Canyon Creek Services will be hosting a Denim Day event on Thursday April 10. Denim Day is a worldwide initiative that encourages people to wear jeans with the purpose of supporting survivors of sexualized violence and bringing awareness to victim blaming and destructive myths that surround sexual violence. You can learn more about the initiative [here](#).

- i. To commemorate Denim Day, we will have a table at the Library Quad from 11-1 on Thursday April 10th before our "Take Back the

Night" walk that afternoon. Those who wear denim and check in with us will be entered into a raffle to win one of two prizes: a free Fitness Center Pass and an SUU Outdoors rental gift certificate! If you have any questions, feel free to email Madison McBride at [madisonmcbride@suu.edu](mailto:madisonmcbride@suu.edu).

ii.

6. Action Items:

a.

7. Discussion Items: (4:39)

a. Proposed Student Feedback Forms (Robb McCollum and Clint Broadbent)

i. [Proposed Feedback Questions](#)

ii. [Potential Revisions](#)

Clint Broadbent: We really appreciate the feedback we received from multiple departments. Most of it was very positive, very supportive of the brevity of the assessment.

I have had a lot of good conversations with some people about concerns over what we were measuring. I want to spend a brief moment on this, and then I want to open this up to questions. This first link is a proposed student feedback generation with online questionnaire. Some of the feedback we gathered we decided to change some of the assessment language. We added the qualitative questions which brought our 6 item measure up to 8 items, and we broke it into two questions for comments and feedback on what the professor did well, to enhance the learning experience, and what the professor could do to better help students' learning experience.

We also included at the very bottom the potential online iteration. If this iteration is approved, we'd be happy to look for feedback on how to refine it before moving forward.

We were able to speak with some of the people who designed the previous evaluation. If you look at the proposed survey options link, the past evaluation really looked at professor behavior and a lot of these behaviors are directly related or connected to better classroom outcomes that are empirically validated, which is different from what we are proposing with this more brief survey in option two.

What we were tasked, as the CTI group, was to work particularly on student perception of the class. We were not asked to do empirically validated measures. We really wanted to understand our task through the lens of the vision of the university as a person centric place, and use this to empower our areas of focus.

As we talked with the people who revised the previous version of the questionnaire, we said we would propose these ideas to the Senate for feedback. Option 1 is a version of the old survey without all the qualitative questions that bogged down responses and lowered the response rate. The new proposed version is about half that size while still fulfilling that it intends to measure. Each version measures two totally different things. I'd love to answer any questions.

Elise Leahy: Are you saying we're going to vote between the two? What's supposed to happen now?

Scott Knowles: Right now, we're just having a discussion. People will be able to take these options back to their departments. And then, when we come back on the 17th we will vote to either maintain the current evaluation system, or we could vote to take up the new proposed evaluation system. Are there any other questions or discussion at this point

Chris Younkin: You said that each option measures something different. Could you just briefly summarize what each is measuring, and then how you think we might be able to use this for teaching improvement?

Clint Broadbent: One of the biggest things we were tasked with was to address the feedback we were given. A lot of faculty were saying that no one was responding to the questionnaire and that there were too many clicks. The direction that we were given was that we wanted to offer a briefer, more generalized assessment. Particularly looking at evaluating professor performance. We understand that students are not very good evaluators of professor performance. Sometimes the best professors are not particularly liked by the students and that is an issue. One thing that professors identified was that students are very good at assessing their personal experiences with the class/the professor. If we made this shorter and more streamlined, we might be able to get more feedback from how the students are digesting the information, and what they thought about the class – an overall attitude of the class in general.

Shalini Kesar: If this is more about trying to get students feedback in general about, I'm guessing the atmosphere of the class, or how they understand the atmosphere rather than saying, this professor is bad, or this professor didn't give me feedback in 3 days. I like this idea. I went back to the faculty and suggested maybe we should revisit as I think most will not align with the new goal of the student feedback. At the same time the valuation tool goals have changed.

Clint Broadbent: I really appreciate the question. One thing that kind of caused us to go back to the drawing board, or really kind of reflect on, was whether this was an evaluative measure. We did receive clarification that this was an evaluative measure. However, that is department by department, and that is something that I would definitely encourage our senators to come and to really move forward with this, so that there aren't any surprises. One of the things that I believe, at least in my department, is that SUU, with the new changes to P&T values reflexive teaching. So this idea that I can take feedback from my students, and incorporate that feedback and improve my



teaching. The problem is with evaluating teacher behaviors, for instance, a student says, my teacher didn't return paperwork from my assignments fast enough. That's something that most professors already know. There's quite a bit of overlap between these two options. I liked question number 2 of option 2 – My professor made an effort to connect the course content to my life and career goals. This is relevant considering how the state legislature is directing universities to help students more directly on their career path.

Kelly Goonan: I'll remind everybody that individual faculty as well as departments can also add questions and those questions directly relate to the evaluation of the faculty in their P&T. Your department could certainly consider whether they have specific questions that they want to include that align more with the evaluation criteria, and just add those. I think that's the challenge that our working group has. Right is, they're trying to come up with a set of questions that students will answer, that apply to every single class and we need to have that flexibility for the individual disciplines and departments.

Scott Knowles: I did want to remind you all that the evaluations are required in the P&T process. So whatever the evaluation system is, it has to go into the document that's in 6.1. The deck can determine how we use that information, but it will be included regardless.

James Sage: I really appreciate the revision to the questions and focusing on what students are good at, which is reporting their experience. And so to Clint and Rob and others, I think it really helps put a focus on what it is that we're asking them to do. To Shalini's point, I think if the DEC's currently refer to the current instrument and specific questions, we're just changing the questions. So I don't know if the DEC is going to need that much revision, because you're really just kind of swapping out some of the details. There should just be a placeholder in the DEC criteria that points to it. If the instrument changes the questions that shouldn't be disruptive. And you know I'm thinking about this from tracking on the strategic plan. We use the results of this in aggregate as a proxy for a certain metric for instruction. I wanted to give you all the reassurance. Clint, you might bring this back if the questions change, we can adjust the KPI calculation. I have talked to Christian about this a year ago when we started considering this, or maybe a little more than a year ago. Anyway, it's flexible. We can take whatever the questions are. So we're not constrained by accreditation issues or by strategic plan issues. So go forward, make sure it's useful. I totally support that. And I love the focus on asking students about their experience as opposed to evaluating instruction in some objective way.

Clint Broadbent: I really value the people that did the previous evaluation. They did a fantastic job focusing on professor behavior.

Scott Knowles: Thank you so much. We will have this as an action item at our next meeting.

- b. [Policy 6.15 Faculty Leaves Revision](#) and [Appendix](#) (Kelly Goonan)

Kelly Goonan: This revision stemmed from requests from the Faculty Leaves Committee, which is the committee on campus that reviews and ranks faculty sabbatical applications, as well as some questions about applying the parental caregiving with modified duties portion of the policy. Overall, we ended up making some additional cleanup modifications and some slight modifications to better align the language and policy. 6.1 5. With the updates to the promotion, evaluation, promotion, and tenure policy. 6.1. The sabbatical leave portion of the policy is not any different. We really just tried to clarify the timeline and when faculty are eligible, whether they're tenured faculty or advanced tenure track faculty, and if they have received a sabbatical leave in the past. There was some confusion when faculty would apply too early, and then be told that they weren't eligible. And then there was actually a question the following year as to whether they were eligible or if it was still early. If you look at section 4, part A under sabbatical leave, the content of the policy is the same, but we've restructured it and reworded it to be more clear and help faculty be able to determine when they're eligible to apply for a sabbatical. When they take that sabbatical, the proposed appendix is meant to just give a visualization of that so faculty can very easily see if they're a tenure track faculty who has not had a sabbatical.

We also clarified the language for when there are cases where proposals have equal merit, we would like for a faculty member who has not received a prior sabbatical to maybe be ranked higher. And this doesn't mean that that person will get a sabbatical, and the other person won't. It just means that one person is going to be ranked number 4, and the other person is going to be ranked number 5, for example. But we wanted to clarify that a little bit in there as well. When is a faculty member eligible? We've recommended adding the date of a previous sabbatical, if applicable to the sabbatical application, and then just cleaned up and made the criteria for evaluating applications a little bit more transparent to faculty, so that hopefully folks who are applying for a sabbatical understand how they're being evaluated in that application process.

Next is the parental caregiving with modified duties. This is essentially the faculty parental leave policy. It provides an instructional release for faculty, so faculty do not have to teach while they are on Pcmd. But they are expected to fulfill some other responsibilities related to service and scholarly or creative activity. We added in there, under the scope we had neglected to include, what a half course release for an equivalent caregiver was for NTT faculty. We also changed some language to again better align with the language that we use in policy 6.1.

There was a question that came to us about a faculty member who was serving in an administrative role and maybe did not get the level of leave that they ought to have because of their administrative responsibilities. Administrative reassignment is covered under policy 6.2 7. For example, a faculty member serving as a department chair receives the equivalent of 6ich release to compensate them for their department chair duties. Graduate program directors receive a reassignment. Other faculty and administrative roles receive that reassignment. The Pcmd does not apply to that reassignment time. We added that language, however, faculty may have flexibility on the timing and specific duties as approved within the semester. That's the same language above that applies to service and scholarly creative activities.

Again, it does specify in B1a that the scope is a release from instructional duties, not other faculty responsibilities. The rest of the changes that are proposed are mostly cleanup with the exception of section 5 where we made the process a little bit more clear as far as what application faculty requesting Pcmd need to fill out, and where that goes and what that approval change is. We added point D asking supervisors to consider what constitutes reasonable timing and amount of service for their faculty who are on Pcmd.

Finally, the relationship to the tenure process. We adjusted that to again better align with our current version of policy 6.1 referencing the aim.

I do just want to answer the question in the chat – yes, parental caregiving is only granted to instructional duties. What that means is that if I was serving as an associate chair and I went on Pcmd for a semester. I received a 3 credit release for the Associate chair duties, and teaching about 9ich. Of course, Pcmd would give a release of that 9ich of instruction but I would still be expected to fulfill my 3ich of associate chair responsibilities if a faculty member does not want to do that the associate chair responsibilities would have to be given up for that period, and either an interim or another faculty member would have to take on those responsibilities. This was supported by Jake Johnson when we asked for clarification on this. So this does apply only to instructional responsibilities. It does not apply to service, scholarship, or administrative responsibilities for which faculty are getting reassignment. time according to policy, 6.2 7. However, built into the policy, we have included language that we are asking supervisors to be cognizant of what it means to bring a new child into your family and be a little bit flexible with faculty as to the specific duties and the timing of those duties that they're being asked to fulfill.

That's an overview of the changes that the Academic Affairs Committee has recommended.

Scott Knowles: Any questions or discussion at this point. If not, please go ahead and take this back to your faculty and collect feedback and ideas. And we will, of course, have this as an action item on April 17th.

#### c. Faculty Sick Leave Policy (Maren Hirschi)

Chris Graves: We met last week and began the conversation about a possible Faculty Sick Leave policy. We looked at other institutions around the state and they vary, some a little tighter than others. Generally speaking, it's on the loose side, nonspecific. If a faculty member is sick for an extended period of time we typically have three days, and then we can apply for family leave. We have concerns about a long term health concern/major health event that requires more than a few weeks. So we'd like for you to take it back to your departments and ask them for feedback. I'd like to open it up as well to the Senate.

Chris Younkin: Can you give us more detail about the current policy?

Christopher Graves: It's a 9 point policy, 9.10 paragraph 4. It says, faculty appointments do not accrue sick leave, whereas staff do accrue sick leave depending on their position and so forth.

That's all we have, just that statement that we don't accrue sick leave. So how does that apply when someone has an extended period of health concerns. When I'm sick for more than a day I still have to prepare lessons and do things for my classes, despite how sick I am. The question is, how detailed we want to take it. Do we want to keep it loose or do we want to make it so that it's a little more tight and a little more snug to protect us.

David Hatch: I'd like to ask people to think about what the parameters are here, because you know, I think we enjoy as faculty members a unique autonomy when it comes to being able to cancel classes without a lot of oversight. Obviously we don't want to abuse that. I don't know if we're talking about two weeks or a couple of days, we just maybe need to think about if we do this, where would a line be

Chris Younkin: We had a conversation a while back in Faculty Senate, about canceling classes for snow emergencies, and we had discussed the requirements of how many instructional days you have to have. I would think that whatever those requirements are would apply to this as well, if you have to cancel class for illness, so having something that accounts for that in these cases might be a good idea.

John Meisner: Do we have reason to believe that this is being abused in any way? And also to Marin's question, do we also have reason to believe that there are conditions where somebody is being inflexible or are we making work for ourselves?

Scott Knowles: Historically CPVA, for example, we currently have a new dean who's not as strict. But CPVA has actually been pretty Draconian compared to other colleges about canceling a class without any sort of backstop, or what's gone on there. So I do know that some of my colleagues have gotten some heat for canceling classes in a variety of circumstances, including going to a conference or getting sick or a need for a mental health day. I think that's kind of a different conversation, although it's very tied up with this conversation about what do we do if somebody gets sick for an extended period of time or is out for a semester. Do you lose your job because a semester is actually longer than I believe the family medical leave, or long term disability allows us to continue being paid, I think that's 6 weeks. We don't accrue sick leave. We can't even have the university community band together and donate sick days to keep us employed throughout, not that I really want that to be the solution. FMLA is 12 weeks, which is 3 months, so it might get us through a semester, but not quite. And then how do we cover the classes of that faculty member? It gets really complicated, really fast. But there are two different things there. One is, should we accrue sick leave so we can take a day off in the middle of semester when we're sick? But what do we do with a long term illness? I don't know the answer to either of those questions.

We need to take this back to our departments. Bring that information back on April 17th for the Faculty Sick Leave Policy Committee to consider.

d. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:19)

a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)

Mike Kroff: As an update, we have been meeting over the past couple of months, about 4 times as a committee to try to put together some of the procedures in case we happen to have a hearing with the Faculty Review Board. We're under the direct supervision and tutelage of Jake Johnson, who is helping us understand our responsibilities. We are putting all this together in a form that will help us be prepared and we will certainly bring that before the Senate to look over and approve the procedures.

b. Sick and Medical Leave for Faculty Committee

c. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

We had a meeting yesterday, and we only received 3 appeals this time, and we accepted two of them with a reduction to one of them.

d. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)

e. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

Camille Thomas: We sent out a request to faculty for those area and breadth working groups. I will share that with the Faculty Senate. we are now in the process of getting nominations to populate a USHE working group. This group would work within each area and breadth of the GE designations. So we just need two representations from SUU to serve on each of those working groups. They'll work with other representatives across USHE to make decisions about GE learning outcomes and probably be apprised of the progress of USHE's Ge programs. The requirement would be to attend the What is an Educated Persons Conference in the fall, and then there would be an online meeting in the spring, and maybe some work to do in between those as needed as the council would assign. We'll have a new co-chair, Emma Turner will return from sabbatical, and has agreed to be our co-chair moving forward in the fall as well.

Grant Shimer: I was talking with my department chair about that today. One of the questions we had since the department chair knows the department really well is are they eligible for this community committee or not?

Camille Thomas: There's no guidance from USHE on who's eligible or who's not eligible. This was something internally that the GE committee had set up some sort of guidelines. If they would like to nominate themselves, we'll definitely consider them.

Grant Shimer: Do we have a rough estimate sort of the workload? There's the two meetings, one a semester?

Camille Thomas: The workload in the fall is going to be a full day, maybe an evening into a full day. The spring meeting could be anywhere between about 2 to 3 hours. This has been in policy for years, but never implemented. We implemented it when I first started in 2023, and the big ask was to go to that Educated Persons Conference and then it petered out after that, and there wasn't much being done. It's hard for me to judge exactly what's going to happen in between those two meetings. Especially with some of the things they're working on now like common course numbering. I know the majors meetings are happening, and we're trying to coordinate those major meetings and common course numberings and make sure the GE is coordinated with that. So there could be some extra work done outside those meetings, and I would say maybe 2-3 hours per month would be a very optimistic or realistic view of the workload.

- f. Honors Council (Maren Hirschi): <https://www.suu.edu/honors/>
- g. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)
- h. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- i. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)
- j. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
- 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)
  - iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
  - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)

Seeking a new finalist as Kenton Pope said the person the committee chose was being awarded in another capacity. We are wondering why it matters if some super awesome person on our campus is a finalist for 3 or 4 awards.

Scott Knowles: I don't know, but that is certainly a question I can follow up on and ask about and get back to you. I will work on that.

- l. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

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

Kelly: We've moved on from policies in academic affairs, and they are now working on some guidance to go along with policy 6.22 on program discontinuance.

- n. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC); Ad Hoc committee on policy outside of 6.0
- o. President's Report (Scott Knowles) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

We did have the Great Faculty Bake /off. Many awards were given, and many delicious desserts were eaten. I did want to announce the awards: Our creme de la creme for the best tasting award, went to Daniel Eaves in 1st place, for his lemon scones with clotted cream. I'm here to tell you. It was freaking delicious.

Second place was Richie Uminski for his dark chocolate raspberry pie. 3rd place, went to Clint and Hadley Broadbent for their Biscoff cookie cake, and we had an honorable mention for John Smith, for his peanut butter fingers, the Gilded Gauteau for highest aesthetic value award 1st place went to Clint and Hadley Broadbent for their Biscoff cookie cake. Second place went to Richard Saunders for his tomato cake in a Dutch oven. 3rd place, went to Gina Profeto for her blueberry ficcata lemon delight, and we had an honorable mention for Richie Yu Minsky for his dark chocolate raspberry pie, the grand Macron award for the Top College went to the College of Health Sciences as they had the highest participation in the event, and then the confection collection for top department went to the library as the largest individual unit, as far as participation goes, so congratulations to everybody. We had a whole lot of fun. Incidentally, if you have thoughts on how to get more faculty to come for delicious free food, please send me an email because I would say that the only disappointing thing about the event was not many faculty came and partook of the delicious treats that everyone prepared.

We did have a Board of Trustees meeting last week, the Board of Trustees scholarship. The Board wanted me to pass on a compliment which was that every single Board of Trustees scholarship nominee that presented to them spoke about the faculty extremely highly, without any prompting, they just went on and on, and gushed about how important faculty were to their lives, their careers, both personally, professionally and in other ways. So thank you all very much for all the wonderful work that you do.

The Board Trustees passed a number of policies, including 6.1 faculty evaluation, tenure promotion, 6.2 2 bona fide program, discontinuance, 6.2 8 faculty professional responsibilities and due process 6.4 student location, 6.3 8 faculty hiring 5.7 conflict of interest policy, and some others that weren't discussed in Faculty Senate. But those ones definitely were so I wanted to make sure. You know those have gone through the Board of Trustees successfully. We also approved a number of people for rank and tenure advancements. So you probably have been catching wind of that. Just make

sure you celebrate your colleagues. It's always a stressful time and a big relief when you get the big news, so try to celebrate everybody.

It was reported at the Board of Trustees meeting that President Benson will be serving on a committee with USHE to define the new performance and growth metrics for the Utah Higher Ed system. It is great that we're going to have a direct voice on that committee.

We've got some good indicators from the legislature that we are likely to get that engineering building picked up possibly next year. There are no guarantees, but we're excited about the way things are sounding.

Hb265. They're still working on the plan. I just wanted to update you that they do have to turn in that plan by May 9th and we are likely still on the same timeline that was shared in the town halls and that faculty who are going to be impacted by this over the next 3 years will be notified, and discussions will be had by mid-April to late April early May. Kelly, Chris, and I continue to have conversations with Provost Mendini and President Benson on these issues. We last spoke with them on Monday, and discussed many of those issues as well. More information about that will be coming out soon. If you have any questions, or you want me to ask specific questions to President Benson or Provost Mendini, please always feel free to email me. I will take those questions and I will get you answers. I can do that anonymously, and I am happy to do it.

I also want to thank everybody who participated in the annual faculty senate survey. We got a lot of responses. I'm not 100% sure exactly how many, because we got a whole bunch of fake responses, about 30ish, that are blank. I will be compiling that data, aggregating it, and hopefully presenting on that at the April 17th meeting.

9. Call for Executive Session (5:30)

10. Adjourn