

Faculty Senate Minutes
August 27, 2015
4:00 pm in Cedar Breaks Room, Sharwan Smith Center
Action items are in red font

Present: Kevin Stein, Bruce Howard, Loralyn Felix, Scott Lanning, Amanda Wilford, David Berri, Abigail Larson, Michiko Kobayashi (also serving as proxy for Brian Ludlow), Katy Herbold, Kholoud Al-Qubbaj, Andrew Van Alstyne, Lynn White, David Lunt, Joy Sterrantino, Angela Pool-Funai, Ben Sowards (proxy for Rheana Gardner), Denise Purvis, Wendy Sanders, Alan Pearson, Derek Hein, Mackay Steffensen, Chad Gasser, Nasser Tadayon, Matt Weeg, Isabella Borisova, John Murray. Absent: Kevin Baker

1. Call to Order at 4:04 pm
2. Kevin S. asked senators to correct omissions, typos etc to the Faculty Senate Roll
3. Approval of Minutes: April 23 a typo “irritation” was identified, April 9 – need to capitalize ‘board of trustees’
 - a. Motion to approve with these changes: Andrew M. second: David B. all in favor
4. Senate Parliamentarian, Joy S informed senate that we are using Robert’s Rules of Order, stressed that time limits/topic will be informed, and the importance of being civil at all times
5. Recognition of Guests: Johnathon Puente., President Wyatt, Assoc. Provost James Sage (who was representing Provost Cook)
6. Remarks from President Wyatt: he began by asking if there are any rumors he can address. One senator said there’s a rumor that the deans believe our academic output is not up to snuff. President is unaware of this rumor – added that he wants to continue to build SUU’s reputation. He hi-lighted some of our students’ credentials, and praised our efforts to make SUU the best UG university around. Wyatt offered to come to a senate meeting any time we would like him to attend.
7. Remarks from Associate Provost Sage: Kevin stressed that he feels James is our ally. James wanted everyone to know that he has an open door policy. He indicated that we have 2 policies from last year that we need to finalize: early tenure and 6.2 (academic officers). Matt W. who worked on the early tenure policy last year believes FS role on early tenure policy is done and it’s in the deans’ hands. Will follow-up...
8. Remarks from Jonathan Puente (Executive Director of Access and Inclusion – i.e. diversity). He is working on developing an inclusive diversity plan – one that includes students, faculty, and staff – to help with retention of all groups on campus. A committee has been established to this end, and he would like to have this committee officially included in president’s council. His committee includes academic representation, admin rep., staff rep, student rep., community rep. ... Jonathan asked for someone from senate to join (senators Joy, Kholoud, Isabella volunteered). If anyone has any comments & suggestions, please email Jonathan.

9. Senate Treasurer's Report: Chad does not have account access yet. He will soon address the faculty senate scholarship fund and ways to increase it. FS' account balance in April was just under \$800
10. Senate President Elect's Report
 - a. Report on Board of Trustees' Meeting: Bruce Howard attended 2 so far (their minutes get posted online). Summary: trustees talked about the increase in student freshmen and their credentials, SUU is in the black financially, Ellen Treanor is working on a new marketing strategy (e.g. new electronic billboard coming soon), she was behind the housing shortage story which got us great publicity.
 - b. Standing and ad-hoc senate committees: need a senate rep on the library committee. Dave Lunt volunteered. Academic standards committee . Angela Pool-Funai is on it but her name was missing. So we are ok there. We need an at large member for many of these committees. Continuing ed was brought up as not having representation. Should they? Same with University College. The list of who we have on each committee is posted to the FS website. **Senators: please ask your faculty to update what we know.**
11. Senate President's Report (Kevin Stein)
 - a. Meetings are moving to Tuesdays starting October 13th. Kevin has a conflict with Thursdays. If any senator has a Tue conflict, you need to send a proxy.
 - b. Report on summer Deans' & President's Council meetings. LRT issues were addressed. We will be discussing these throughout the year.
 - c. Update on Summer Compensation Committee: passed FS last April. Reviewed the proposal as outlined in Appendix A. This is on the deans council agenda for their next meeting. Questions were raised about evaluating summer classes... Kevin said we will look at that.
 - d. Non-Cost of Living Raises. We did get raises this year, but some senators noted that not everyone received the "retention raise" this year. Kevin was under the impression that they were supposed to go to everyone. James Sage initially had the same impression as Kevin, but he then explained that the Provost could not apply the raise across the board (this order came from higher up). James Sage does not know why the parameters changed.
 - e. LRT will be the big issue for the senate this year.
 - f. Update on Policy 6.2: Evaluation of Academic Officers (Lynn White)
Lynn reviewed details of the policy and its weaknesses (see Appendix B). This went back and forth between FS and Deans last academic year. The latest revision will go to the deans in Sept and hopefully all their concerns will have been addressed.
12. New Business
 - a. Proposal to add additional categories to Provost office awards: anonymous faculty requested more awards e.g. with the single outstanding scholar awards – some

departments/disciplines are disadvantaged (e.g. book publications are not valued as much as creative activities). Could we add another category? Perhaps we could add a service award. Discussion: the make-up of the committees was questioned – how well can we judge scholarship from areas outside our own? What about awarding certificates of recognition? Add “distinguished scholar” to the list? Outstanding book award? Outstanding creative works award? There appeared to be strong support for a service award. After all, we value and require service from students. **Senators were instructed to ask the faculty they represent for comments/suggestions.**

- b. Emeritus faculty policy needing adjustment? Tabled.
- c. Health care follow-up: how does faculty feel about the changes? Is the fight over? At least now we have a choice of plans. That might be adequate. Things seem “okay for now”, but we may want to revisit this in the future.
- d. Potential Senate Objectives – Kevin asked for a list of any issues that FS might address this year. Suggestions included: salaries, full disclosure on merit pay, salary lines and targets, and whether there should be merit increases if we cannot even give cost of living increases. **FS senators: ask the faculty you represent to see what else may be of concern.** Kevin stressed the importance of LRT issues: the challenge of how to evaluate teaching, scholarship... is the current process working? These need to be discussed – Kevin asked whether they should they be discussed at every FS meeting, or should we develop an LRT task force. It was decided to establish an LRT task force. Kevin S volunteered, as did senators Scott L. MacKay S, Angela F, Joy S., Abigail L. Task force to present at each FS meeting.

13. Motion for Executive Session: Andrew Van Alstyne, second Bruce Howard

14. Motion to Adjourn at 5:20 PM Loralyn F, sec Katy H

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 10 @4:00 pm in the Charles Hunter Room (HCC)

Senate Executive Committee Meetings (4:00 pm, Leavitt Room, Special Collections, Library)

Fall Semester 2015: August 26, September 9, October 8, November 5, December 3

Spring Semester 2016: January 7, February 4, March 10, April 7

**Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule
2015-2016**

Date	Time	Location
September 10, 2015	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
October 13, 2015	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
November 10, 2015	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
<i>December 8, 2015</i> <i>This is finals week</i>	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
January 12, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
February 9, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
March 15, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room
April 12, 2016	4:00	Hunter Conference Center Charles Hunter Room

Appendix A Summer Semester-Faculty Compensation Proposal

Situation Analysis:

The current faculty compensation model is based on the faculty member's 9-month compensation rate. That rate is annualized with the expectation of a 12 ICH per semester teaching load.

The summer compensation model has incentivized a healthy selection of general education, bottleneck, and gateway courses over three sessions of the summer semester, with both face-to-face and online formats for students to participate. Due to the expanded selection of courses offered, summer semester is more robust than the actual student participation and many faculty contracts are being pro-rated as a result. To ensure the greatest flexibility and faculty autonomy, summer semester curriculum and scheduling is done directly by faculty/departments, with the only constraint being that courses attracting less than 10 students be quantified toward workload as individualized instruction—a 1/10th proration per student (most liberal workload prorate aside from graduate thesis instruction). Due to the number of faculty receiving reduced compensation and teaching small classes or choosing to cancel classes entirely, there is growing frustration among both faculty and students. In 2012, surveyed students expressed the critical importance of being able to trust that courses they had committed to would hold.

Additionally, there are many obstacles that impede and even disincentivize students from participating in SUU's summer semester. Students are not offered the same conditions that are extended during the traditional fall/spring semesters in terms of housing or scholarships. Many students stay in Cedar City over the summer semester and are even working on campus, but do not progress academically for the simple reason that their scholarships can only be applied to fall/spring semesters. Moreover, SUU's new freshman demographic is changing due to the LDS market segment that is now serving missions at an earlier age. This evolving demographic is no longer seeking a summer break after high school graduation and are no longer seeking admission to the university in the upcoming fall as a single cohort—their entrance into higher education is being dispersed, making multiple entry points even more essential to our recruiting process. A summer semester entry point is going to become even more essential in recruiting students ahead of other USHE institutions. It will not be acceptable for most students returning from church service in late winter or spring to put their educational pursuits on hold until the upcoming fall semester when their SUU scholarships become active. Other barriers to students participating academically in summer are the limited on-campus housing options, students not being required to be enrolled in order to have student employment, and limited student activities during the summer session.

Summer Semester Strategies:

- SUU generally discounts 75% of its tuition, but does not allow scholarships for summer semester. 25% of summer semester revenue should be dedicated to summer aid (25% X \$3,000,000 in gross tuition = \$750,000 in summer aid). Last year, 146 students withdrew after they were billed for summer semester, presumably because they could not afford to pay for it. This year, 195 students have already withdrawn who had previously registered. The summer scholarship money should be placed in its own unique account so that it can be managed easier and, quite frankly, so it won't be reallocated for other purposes. A full scholarship would fund a student to take two classes in the summer and a half scholarship would pay for a single class. Only resident students will be eligible and preference will be given to students who have not already received a federal Pell grant.
- SUU needs to accommodate students who had on-campus housing with similar accommodations for summer semester.
- All courses with at least 10 students enrolled 2 weeks prior to the start of the summer semester will carry. When courses are initially submitted to the registrar, the faculty member who committed to teach the course will indicate an individual minimum enrollment for the course. This will be noted on the course description. If two weeks prior to the beginning of the course, the requisite minimum (as dictated by individual faculty) is met, he or she is obligated to teach the course. In order to protect faculty compensation for that course, two data points will be set to determine enrollment. One data point is two weeks prior to the start of the semester, when it is determined that the class will hold. The other data point is one week into the summer semester. Faculty compensation for that semester will be determined by whichever data point shows the higher enrollment.
- Due to Fall and Spring semesters accounting for 9 of the 12 months or 75% of the year, it is overly aggressive to consider a 12 ICH load for the summer semester that only spans 3 months. This 25% available time for the year should be compensated at a 9 ICH load for full time. This implies that the rate per ICH would move from $25\%/12 = 2.1\%$ to $25\%/9 = 2.8\%$. So a faculty member making \$60,000 that used to make \$1,260 per ICH (\$3,780 for 3 credits) would be more appropriately compensated at \$1,668 per ICH (\$5,004 for 3 credits). The previous cap of \$4,000 dollar per class was based on a faculty salary at the 75th percentile (formerly \$64,000). Now, the 75th percentile is at \$65,500 and the new model would move the cap to \$5,500 per 3-credit class.
- Time will be allocated during each college's opening fall retreat to discuss "best practices" for filling summer classes, generating interest among students in registering for summer offerings, and emphasizing the importance of faculty commitment toward teaching summer classes that have been scheduled.

Appendix B: *Perceived weaknesses of policy 6.2*

1. 5 year formal review cycle: given that academic officers play a pivotal role in the well-being and growth of the institution, a 5 year review cycle seems excessively long. Problems and concerns, if any, need to be addressed sooner so that appropriate course corrections may be made.
2. The formal evaluation of academic officers: Policy 6.2 does very little in the way of describing the mechanism, tools, and procedures through which formal evaluations take place. The lack of transparency is a concern among faculty/staff. One concern, for example, is the perception that feedback is solicited from a privileged few.
3. Key evaluative criteria are missing: *What* academic officers do is important, but so is *how* they do it.
4. A non-anonymous trigger mechanism: Policy 6.2 currently provides a trigger mechanism (i.e. a public 2/3 vote of eligible employees) through which faculty and staff can request a formal evaluation of an academic officer. This mechanism is arguably unethical, contentious, and divisive. It puts faculty and staff at risk for retaliation and/or alienation. A faculty-staff triggered evaluation is also potentially demoralizing for the academic officer involved.
5. No opportunity to provide regular feedback: Unless the “trigger” mechanism described in policy 6.2 is invoked, no formal, anonymous mechanism exists for faculty and staff to provide feedback to academic officers. This has led to feelings of marginalization among faculty/staff. Moreover, without regular, systematic input from these employees, academic officers may not have a true sense of their effectiveness as perceived by the faculty/staff. As such, academic officers may be caught off-guard at their regularly scheduled formal review when such input is solicited.

Changes to policy 6.2: *Proposal 1*

1. Change the formal review cycle from 5 to 3 years: to address concerns/issues in a more timely manner and before they can become even larger problems for the institution. Shortening the review cycle could also provide more frequent confirmation that there are no concerns/issues that need to be addressed.
2. Utilize a standardized, objective, anonymous, and comprehensive evaluation tool: All faculty, staff, and academic officers who interact with and who are affected by the individual under evaluation should be able to provide feedback. Recognizing that the logistics need to be worked out, we request that these individuals be identified and afforded the opportunity to participate in an evaluation, conducted by a third-party (e.g. SUU HR, SUU IT), in a manner to insure their

anonymity and that only one evaluation form per individual is submitted. Standardized evaluations forms already exist for this purpose (e.g. IDEA Feedback System for Academic Officers), but tools with similar questions could be developed and administered using an online survey system such as Qualtrics.

3. Include additional evaluative criteria: Honesty, integrity, reliability, courtesy and respect for others, consistency and related positive character traits should be included in the list of evaluative criteria. These criteria should also include commitment to the academic and educational goals included in the college/school and University's philosophy, planning, and mission statements.

Note that proposal #1, while it addresses weaknesses 1-3 in the existing policy, does not address weaknesses 4 and 5.

Changes to policy 6.2: Proposal 2

In addition to the changes outlined in proposal #1, the following changes are proposed to policy 6.2

1. Implement an annual feedback system: Just as faculty receive feedback from students in part, to become better teachers, academic officers can and should receive feedback from faculty and staff to become better leaders. Such feedback can and should come at regular intervals to be useful. This feedback will facilitate and guide professional development. It will address the concern that some faculty/staff feel marginalized by giving them a voice they currently do not have. These annual feedback surveys would need to be administered using the same mechanisms, procedures, and tools described in proposal 1. 2. The annual feedback surveys, reviewed each year by the academic officer's supervisors, would help identify strengths and areas for improvement. They would provide a valuable tool to gauge faculty/staff support for effective academic leadership – a critical factor in the success of any institution of higher learning.
4. Remove the "triggering mechanism": should policy 6.2 be amended to include an annual feedback system as described above, this would make a triggering mechanism obsolete, along with all the problems associated with the triggering mechanism.