

## Faculty Senate Agenda

September 25, 2018

4:00 pm in the Charles Hunter Room of the Hunter Conference Center

- Call to Order (4:05PM)
- Recognition of Presenters (4:06 PM)
  - a. Lynn Vartan (Director of APEX)
  - b. Brad Cook (Provost)
- Approval of minutes from last meeting. (4:07 PM)
- Fall APEX speakers (Lynn Vartan, 4:08 PM)

There are a multitude of events that represent collaboration this semester. There is a diverse group of speakers that span a broad range of interests on campus. Dr. Vartan previewed the upcoming speakers for A.P.E.X. this semester.

Dr. Brad Cook (4:10PM)

A brief summary of some academic affairs and discussion 26,000 ft classroom building is moving towards the top of the list for the board of regents. It is possible to get 38-39 million dollars for this new building just west of the multipurpose building. Budget hearings are coming in January to help allocate the funds for the next year.

- Flexible Office Hours (Kelly Goonan, 4:12PM)

I policy 6.27 it specifies that faculty are required to keep 5 publicly posted hours per week to meet with students. There is an app call you can book.me app to have your student schedule time that would be using time more effectively because it allows you to know who is coming and what purpose they are using that time. There is another program called Zoom that allows you to share you computer screen with your students. It seems to be more effective for online learning classes. Tony Pellegrini and Brain Ludlow use zoom for their classes. Kelly would like to look at a revision to policy 6.27 to make an update to this policy. It may be worth it to look at workload policy to see if we can augment those required 5 office hours.

Brad Cook – Student affairs had an insight in office hours. This current generation think that the office hours are time for you to be in your office to do you grading and will schedule around those hours.

Kelly Goonan – The only time that she doesn't have her door open is when she is not available, either out of the office or on a phone call.

Dave Berri - How can we change this policy?

Steve Barney – There is a policy to change policies that we will need to use to make a change. This isn't strictly regulated by the state so we would just need to try and see if it has any traction.

Brad Cook – We need to be more flexible as an academy to deal with different types of students (online etc.)

Kelly Goonan – The current language states a publically posted 5 hours a week.

Brad Cook – suggested to make a first pass at putting some language together and see what obstacles we run into as we move forward.

Nathan Barker – I have adjuncts that are online so they don't hold office hours. It would

love to see something address their situation.

Any suggestion please let Kelly know. This isn't a plea to completely do away with office hours but to make them more effective. This will allow for more flexibility to meet student when they have time.

David Tufte – I can see us needing a log of the time that we need to show how much time we spend. Are those currently available?

Kelly – All of the programs mentioned will provide a log.

Lynn Vartan – can we use a different measure and not a number so we can accommodate a different requirements for individual courses.

Kelly – there are weeks where faculty will meet more than 5 hours.

Scott Knowles – the time is about accountability so we need to think about a way to keep faculty accountable. That was my impression of the initial intent of the 5 hours.

Steve Barney – the interaction with students can be apart of faculty development to improve the communication between the students.

- Ad hoc committee update (Steve Barney, 4:29PM)

The provost office has commissioned four ad hoc committees that we are going to hear from today.

P&T transition team. They will be a resource to help craft evaluation criteria so that it is in line with new policy. It also wants to help them figure out how to assign mentor teams. Please distribute that information back to your departments to let them know about that situation.

Matt Robert – If we want help, who should we contact if we want that help?

Steve Barney – I will have Dave send out a list of the committee member so they can get back to you.

Danny Hatch - Faculty Evaluation RFP committee we have met a couple of time and created a questionnaire to see if we are on the right track. We want to find a measure that will work for us but we do have a deadline of Dec. 14<sup>th</sup>. Please give us the feed back to ensure we are working in the right area.

Steve Barney – If we stay with IDEA is there a new program or course of action to make it more relevant to our campus?

Danny Hatch – There are some options available for a cost but we are open to any ideas to improve the student feed back. If you have specific suggestions please let us know.

Dave Berri – What is the cost for IDEA?

Somewhere around \$80,000

Is there discussion about online vs. live instruction and the questions that will be asked for those types situations

Further discussion about the questionnaire that was distributed on how to improve the current system for student evaluation.

Online Presence committee - they met about what would the mix of online vs. on campus students and how do we roll it out should it be area specific or more uniform through out the entire institution. We will field questions about this area.

Scott Knowles – I would guess 10% online but I don't know. I feel that I should be the one designing the courses.

Tony Pellegrini – some thing we have run into is that a faculty member will create a google doc that doesn't allow the adjunct to have access to that class.

Nathan Barker – A meeting of state faculty senate meeting dealt with quality control of online courses.

- Academic Integrity Policy Committee update (Dan Swanson, 4:50 PM)

Has met twice and we will meet a lot of the course of the semester to try and get things smoothed over. The policy is currently owned by student affairs. There were a lot of opinions moving from being easy on the students to a more hardline approach. There will be a dual route, one call the initial instance a minor infraction and any subsequent infractions will be called a major infraction. You can opt to have the initial instance be a major infraction. What will be the policy of the infraction and how do we deal with the students one the infraction has been identified. Should the faculty be involved in the punishment. We want to streamline the process to make it easy to get the student into the process. The flexibility lies with the faculty member. There a lot of kinks to work out but there will be a lot discussion before it will be resolved. There will be drafts as they move along but right now there isn't anything formal.

Scott Knowles – If we give then a break, what does that mean?

Dan Swanson – If you put a student in the system then regardless of the severity of the initial infraction, the second one would be classified as a major infraction. There was a variety of interpretations of the current policy so that is why the current policy is being revised.

- Faculty committee overview (Nathan Barker, 5:02 PM)

We heard back from all committees and so we now know which of the committee have been working. The current way that the university is being run is different at what is on the books. Each of the new ad hoc committees could have been housed in one of the standing committees. We crossed out committees that did not meet and some of them are vital which meet as needed. All of the committees that have representation should remain so that we can be informed, but some of these could fill the bill or have the senate create the ad hoc committee.

The faculty review board is currently staffed by the deans but it may not be appropriate if a

tenured faculty is being censured. The deans might have a conflict of interest.

Dave Berri – the provost office is creating committees but the charge of the committees falls into the purview of standing committees. It seems that they are going around the faculty senate.

David Tufte – another faculty senate at a different university would have a committee in place with a standing membership awaiting a charge so that when issues come up, the committee memberships would be set and could move quickly.

- Policy on dropping students who do not attend the first week of class (Daniel Eves, 5:15 PM )  
Inquiring to see if there would be support to generate a policy that would allow instructors to drop students who did not show up for the first week of classes. Some classes in physical science have 5 -8 people who would like to add the class but there is not room. If we could drop the no shows, it would accommodate more students.

Comments from the faculty senate

Financial aid can be an issue.

If they haven't contacted you, they aren't doing their job.

It isn't huge issue in business

Why can't you just add the student? Don't you have that autonomy?

Could be have student affairs involved.

Diversity committee – (David Berri, 5:20PM)

The diversity committee has come up with a list of goals for university. They will be forthcoming.

Salary update – (David Berri 5:25 PM) Marvin Dodge is trying to update the database and they have signed a contract with Payfactors. This is in a hope to improve and automate the way that we assign salaries.

Break (5:26PM)

- Executive Session (5:32 PM)
  - a. Senate Treasurer's Report (3 minutes)
  - b. Senate President Elect's Report (5-10 minutes)
  - c. Senate President's Report (5-10 minutes)
- New Business (5:38 PM)  
None to report.
- Motion to Adjourn (5:39 PM)
  - a. Next Meeting – October 30<sup>th</sup> (Cedar Breaks Room)