Senators in Attendance: Steve Barney, Julie Taylor, Nichole Wangsgard, Janet Seegmiller (also proxy for Steve Irving and Selwyn Layton), Sarah Duffin, Lee Montgomery, Wayne Roberts, Emmett Steed (also proxy for Jeff Barnes), Griffon Edwards, Artis Grady, Helen Boswell, Richard Cozzens (also proxy for Connie Nyman and Des Penny), Kim Weaver, Mark DeBeliso, Randle Hart, Rachel Kirk, Kyle Bishop, Shobha Gurung (also proxy for Michelle Orihel), David Shwalb, John Howell (proxy for Randall Allen), Christine Frezza, Keith Bradshaw (proxy for Lynn Vartan), Jim McCoy, Jeremias Paul (proxy for Andy Marvick).

1. Steve Barney: Call to order at 4:02 p.m. Motion to approve the minutes of January 31st, by David Shwalb; seconded by Kyle Bishop. Corrected surname of Wayne Roberts and amount in Faculty Senate gift account. Minutes approved with corrections. No one opposed; two abstentions.

3. Provost unable to attend; no report.

4. Recognition of guests:

Library Committee Report: Helen Boswell, FS Senator on the Library Committee, discussed last week's Library Committee meeting and asked senators to get the word out to faculty regarding possible cuts in online databases. Faculty response to the library's database poll was minimal. Library is facing an $113,000 budget cut for upcoming year and expected costs of current online databases are over $116,000. There will need to be databases cut if the Library budget is cut. A spreadsheet has been sent to college administrative assistants showing subscriptions, costs, and database usage which yields a cost per use. Senators were asked to survey their colleagues to determine which databases are critical. Helen created and sent a Google document survey to her faculty regarding the databases used by them and their students. One question asked whether faculty would give up their annual library allotment for two years in order to keep the online databases. She offered to send the survey to senators or your dean's assistant to use. Results should be forwarded to Sheri Butler, Library administrative assistant. Response is needed by end of March.

Discussion: Randle Hart asked what safeguards are in the decision making process to protect smaller programs that have fewer students and faculty so that those resources will not be lost to bigger programs with more students. Helen said poll wouldn't be final determinant and library selectors will consider his concern. David Shwalb is also on Library Committee. Helen agreed to send her survey to deans for sending on to departments.

There is a movement that the library be held harmless in budget cuts. Question was asked if a database is stopped for a period of time, are there costs to resubscribe? There are no known additional start-up fees, which is better than when we stopped print subscriptions and eventually had to buy back issues when it was restarted. Steve said that when you lose a database, you lose

everything in that database. He encouraged senators to use the survey Helen would send to deans and get faculty input. He encouraged faculty to respond to questions of what is important to them.

The question was asked if it would be appropriate to pass a resolution asking to hold the library budget harmless in current budget negotiations. Steve Barney responded that if the Senate wants to have a unified voice, we could have a resolution. There are also methods for faculty to offer suggestions for budget cuts and solutions. Steve sits on the Budget Recommendation Task Force as Faculty Senate President and will meet directly with Dorian Page, Donna Eddleman and Provost Cook. He would be willing to take to that meeting that the Faculty Senate has a unified voice that Library resources should be spared. Another option is for Faculty Senators to email Brad directly as he is meeting with the President's Council and others about budget constraints. Budget decisions will be made in the next couple of weeks.

7. Vice President Report:
Julie Taylor attended Trustees Meeting on February 1st, the day after the Senate's last meeting. She provided a summary of the approved agenda items, including policies approved. Approved policies 6.3 and 6.36 are on the Faculty Senate Canvas site.
-Revised Policy #6.3 Internships
-Revised Policy #6.36 Course Syllabus
-Revised 2013-2014 Academic Calendar
-Established the Betty McDonald Pre-Med Institute. (Funding is not coming from SUU)
-R401-AAS in Aerospace/Aviation Technology – Professional Pilot Rotor-Wing (Costs minimal)
-R401-AAS in Aerospace/Aviation Technology – Professional Pilot Fixed-Wing
-Deletion of Policy #11.7 Counseling & Psychological Services
-Deletion of Policy #13.11 Faculty/Staff Associated Women
-Deletion of Policy #13.7 Scheduling Committee

8. President's Report:
Proxy for Des Penny: Steve Barney indicated that cards and small gifts will be sent to Brian Hoover and Des Penny, faculty members undergoing medical treatment to let them know we are thinking about them. Des Penny asked if he could designate a proxy for the remainder of his term on the Faculty Senate. He will resign at the end of this year. If no one objects, Richard Cozzens will act as his proxy until a new election is held by his College of Science & Engineering in April.

Benefits Committee: Steve reported on communication with the Benefits Committee with regard to our letter asking it to explore benefits for domestic partners. Steve sent letter; committee hasn't met. Randle Hart, FS committee member, reported the committee meets once a semester. They met in September. Next meeting is March 4 at 8:30 am. He has class; cannot attend. Steve Barney asked for a volunteer to attend the meeting. Randle has accepted a position at another institution, and we will need a permanent replacement on the committee. Steve suggested that whoever

attends that meeting be willing to represent Senate next year to provide continuity. It meets spring, fall and summer sessions, and if there is an emergency. Christine Frezza volunteered.

Senate Elections: Steve reminded senators that elections for next year's Senate should take place soon. The senior senator is responsible to conduct the election for new senators in your colleges. This should be done by the April meeting.

Student Phone Calls: Steve has had phone calls from faculty who were not happy to be asked to make recruitment calls and he wanted to explain that this request came to faculty due to the potential decrease in enrollment. Either we cut programs and eliminate people, or we can bring more students to campus. Stephen Allen came to Dean's Council with statistics showing the higher impact of having faculty call potential students versus his recruitment staff. When faculty call, students are more likely to commit to come to SUU. Steve said that faculty do not want to do this, but in our situation, it is one thing we can do to offset budget problems in coming years. They are targeting students with highest admissions index, i.e. highest GPA and high ACT scores, who are more likely to come and to complete their education. One senator commented that this can count as service to University and be part of the annual FAAR report. Question asked if it would it work with senior or junior students doing the calls? Steve said statistics show it is more effective with faculty. Keith Bradshaw indicated that there are departments, including his music department, that are actively involved in recruiting students to SUU every year. Further discussion on whether SUU could reduce admission standards for 1-2 years and admit more students. With emphasis on completion rates, this may not help. Comments made on poor quality of script given to faculty and limited time to make calls.

Dean's Council: Dean's rejected the Senate's change in Policy 6.27 on Graduate Workload, to change "may" to "shall" in statement "Faculty may or shall receive up to one quarter of their time reassigned who are teaching graduate classes." Deans voted against it 7-1. Process went to mediation with the provost. Steve finally agreed to leave the word "may," but he indicated that Senate would like to see oversight and transparency in the process. They proposed to deans that the decision making process must be done jointly between dean and department chair, so the dean may not unilaterally decide who gets reassignment and who doesn't. This will come up for vote in next Deans Council. He didn't get additional feedback from senators, except for College of Business. If these decisions are accreditation driven, they will not change.

Next changes in Policy 6.27 update came from our Policy 6.0 discussion on Definition of Faculty. FS ad hoc committee changed policy to make it clearer, but added language that non-tenure-track faculty are not required to do scholarship. Deans rejected it 7-1 and said there was no definition in the policy that outlined who are the "voting faculty." Steve wrote this paragraph:

> *Voting Faculty- In those academic matters where faculty voting occurs (i.e., Faculty Senate elections, alterations to the Senate Constitution, requests for evaluation of Academic Officers, etc.), the body of voting faculty are those who have full-time appointments and are either tenured, tenure-track, or in a non-tenure track appointment (Lecturers,*

Professionals in Residence, etc.). Also included are those full-time faculty with workload reassignments. Those who hold administrative positions beyond department chair, faculty on temporary special appointments, or those who have emeritus status are not voting members of the faculty.

If you have feedback from faculty about this language, get back to him. It is on agenda for March 18.

Deans also want the Senate to take the language about what non-tenure-track faculty are expected to do out of the Definition of Faculty and put it in the Workload Policy. Steve did this, but that language violates Policy 6.1 which contradicts itself in several places. What do we want to do about issues in Policy 6.1? Academic Affairs committee worked on this last year, but there is still a need to bring in consistency on whether non-tenure-track faculty can be required to do scholarship. Senate needs to decide philosophically the direction that we need to go. There are examples of faculty who are remiss in fulfilling their duties to students because they are not the tenure-track tier. Some have full-time jobs elsewhere. Deans have indicated that having extra expectations increases the likelihood that these teachers are going to be here on campus working with our students.

Kyle Bishop: If the policy is inconsistent, we must address it. When we went over 6.1 last year, because non-tenure-track faculty are not represented in this body, we didn't pay close attention to their needs in our language. But as senators, we don't represent just tenure-track faculty and we need to talk to non-tenure-track faculty. If we are asking some faculty to teach a 5/5 load and others a 4/4 load, we cannot have the same non-teaching expectations for both of those groups.

Artis Grady: This is an issue in College of Science. During discussions last year, she heard from colleagues who said that in other colleges there were no expectations for scholarship and they felt the policy was not applied consistently or fairly across campus. We need to clarify how much difference there should be between a 5/5 and a 4/4 faculty.

Steve indicated that Deans will want a policy that says there are expectations for scholarship for non-tenure-track faculty and that faculty are working with students fairly and consistently. Steve postulated three possible directions for Faculty Senate: 1) we can leave it alone and resolve conflicts in 6.1 with more permissive language i.e. with approval of department or college, 2) try to texture language so that it is flexible and protects faculty by inserting "a limited amount" or "related to pedagogy" or "consistent with mission of university," or 3) for faculty with 5/5 load, we could put in language which required service. We could put together a really strong white paper for the Deans Council indicating our wishes. In those colleges that expect scholarship, the deans have to financially support attendance at conference for non-tenure-track faculty. Please contact faculty and seek out non-tenure track faculty for discussion of this for the March 28th meeting.

IRB Policy. Deans Council has a new IRB policy that brings responsibility back to a central board. It has been given to the colleges and process wasn't as efficient as originally thought. All IRB proposals

will now go to a central IRB office for processing. There will be due dates twice a month. These changes go to President's council next.

9. Treasurer's Report from Sarah Duffin:
In Faculty Senate Gifts Account: $11,327.31 (Scholarships come out of this account.)
General operating faculty account: $1,576.67

10. Ad Hoc Committee Reports Two proposals from Faculty Senate that were sent to the Deans Council have been tabled due to pressing matters and will be considered at the next meeting.

11. Action Items
a. **SUU Essential Learning Outcomes**. We have adopted Essential Learning Outcomes, but Associate Provost Bill Byrnes asked that they be defined more clearly. This went to Academic Affairs Committee and then to Byrnes office and back again. The paper handed out is the current version, and a vote is needed. Steve expressed concern as to how we are going to measure them. If we make them too complex, it will be problematic to address them. We can consider the options and get back to Steve. We do not know who put in the either/or questions. Comment made that we should not combine Information Literacy and Digital Literacy. No motion made; tabled.

b**. SUU Policy 6.22 Faculty Due Process Policy**. Julie Taylor headed the ad hoc committee. Definition of Faculty in Policy 6.0 will fit even with changes being made. One change added "in consultation with the chair of the Faculty Review Board" on p. 5 to include another individual to ensure a more balanced approach. They also included that a student must be current student. Christine Frezza moved to approve the policy, second by Lee Montgomery.

Discussion included a motion by Keith Bradshaw to add a window of opportunity for a student who may take action within three months of leaving the university. This paragraph on p. 2 was changed.

> Where the Petitioner is a University student at the time of the Petition, two students will be added to the Board. These students will be named by the SUUSA Executive Officers, approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and will serve only for the case upon which their appointment was initiated. Former students may petition on matters occurring while attending the University within 3 months of leaving the University.

After discussion, Christine Frezza reiterated her motion to approve the policy as amended. Seconded by Jim McCoy. Approved unanimously with no abstentions.

12. Old Business
Merit Pay Process Feedback/Salary Compression Feedback: Steve Barney summarized comments of senators as "We like the idea of merit pay; we hate the process." At some point, we may need to make a recommendation to administration of how we would like to see this done so it doesn't pit

faculty against faculty and doesn't make it so that every person in the department is exceptional. We need to reward people for doing fantastic work. It likely will not be an issue for a little while.

Strategic Planning: We are moving forward with the Strategic Planning Committee and based on ELO's we are developing specific goals for each unit within the University. Each academic unit has three specific goals and when approved, they will be distributed. Provosts Office involved. Academic Roadmap is a five-year plan which is set to expire next year and new plans are being created.

13. New Business:

Reaction to **Senator Urquhart's presentation**:

Comments: 1) The idea of expanding Advanced Placement tells faculty that they are unnecessary. It is important to secure the role of faculty in the university; 2) High school students are not all capable of receiving college education without additional years of maturation. To call what they are receiving "college education" is not the same. Development needed. To give the same instruction to a junior in high school as to a junior in college, they don't get the same thing out of it due to lack of development. 3) His white paper indicated that the high schools in Utah are not very good, but by the end of it he is asking that students in high school graduate with two years of college credit. 4) He did not present much of a plan for improving Utah high schools. 5) He said 70% of Utah's high school graduates are not learning math, so we have to do something on higher ed level to improve this? Higher Ed is supposed to supplement that, and he said those programs are coming. Students are not being prepared and HE will have to make up for that. 6) In some fields, AP classes are okay. 7) Some students in high school are capable of AP work. 8) In some fields, even if they come with college courses, they still have three years of rigorous work to do, i.e. chemistry. One comment that funding should not be based on graduation rates because students are coming to get jobs. Did he have solid data that support that philosophy? Steve Barney said Utah hasn't funded growth in student numbers in several years. That has hurt SUU. Having a different reinforcement might help us.

On-Line Graduate Teacher Training: Mark Atkinson brought proposal to Faculty Senate that graduate faculty would take an online teaching course to be certified and maintain certification. Comments: All negative from College of Business, strongly negative. One colleague had taken a 12-hour course and nothing was new. She was hoping to find something on the technology side, but didn't. Other graduate faculty have looked at it and found it "ridiculous" that they would have to certify and then re-certify in three years. They said it should be available, but not required. Offer it as teaching tool, but do not require it. Is using this going to allow for an excuse to keep a crappy online course? Perhaps it could be useful in a department where they don't already have quality online courses. Conclusion was to make it available, but don't require it. Specific suggestions should be sent to Steve Barney. Maybe we could incentivize it by paying faculty to take it.

Lee Montgomery moved to adjourn and moved executive session.
Adjourned at 5:50 p.m.