

Faculty Senate Minutes

September 19, 2019

4:00 pm

Charles Hunter Room

Attending: Dave Berri, Steve Barney, Randall Violett, Andrew Kent-Marvick, Rachel Bolus, Lijie Zhou, Shalini Kesar, David Tufte, Richard Cozzens, Jennifer Sorensen, Jim Mock, Matthew Eddy, Kelly Goonan, Carlos Bertoglio, Doug Wayman, Michael Kroff, Andrew Misseldine, Doug Ipson, Brandon Wiggins, Daniel Swanson, Danny Hatch, Lee Montgomery, Wendy Sanders for Richard Bugg

Guests: President Wyatt, Johnny MacLean, James Sage

Not Attending: Mark Baltimore, Bill Heyborne, Melinda Ford, Donna DeSilva

1. Call to order (4:00)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
 - a. List names of those attending
 - b. President Wyatt
 - c. Johnny MacLean
 - d. James Sage
3. Approval of Minutes from last meeting and April – Minutes Approved
4. Action Items
 - a. None
5. Information Items
 - a. President Wyatt -Provost Search, Campus Initiatives, EDGE, SIEL, etc. (4:05 minutes)
Provost Search
I've been meeting with every college – in current process of research and setting up the search committee, writing up job description, we are using a national search firm for the most diversity. We will be interviewing in January, at the latest. I, as university president, will choose the candidate.

Some requests have been to hire someone who is interested in experiential education, online education experience, an advocate for faculty, someone who's been through the tenure process to be supportive, we have about 100 qualifications.

Search committee will share job description. If you know anyone who might be interested, help us recruit.

Campus Initiatives & Enrollment

Demographics – the main concern in higher ed world is students. In 2008, during the recession, the birth rate dropped by 13% and hasn't rebounded ("birth dirth") 2026 we will see a 13% reduction in higher ed seeking students. The implication is that we stand to lose about 450,000 students nationwide which will trickle down to faculty loss, which could be down to 25,000 nationwide. Tenor faculty will continue to decline. What's most interesting to me about these numbers is that the birth rates in UT did the same. Elite universities will likely change their admissions standards slightly but they will still have students and it is anticipated that they will be taking their students away from us, University of Utah, etc. (UofU recently launched initiatives to grow their student population to 8,000 students over the next several years.) These universities will conceivably begin directing their recruitment efforts toward our typical demographic. We will keep working on improving our approach and preparing for this.

Barney: It's helpful to know the concerns of the university president so we can understand the motivations behind his decisions and bring context.

Question: Is this where you see us handling the loss of growth?

A: Yes – diversify by providing online programs for the non-trad student and we're uniquely poised to do that well. The advantage we have is that we are as close to any student online as the University of Utah is.

We are in a position to put ourselves in the very best possible place – our goals project this to 2025, ideally to have a 5% increase in students with ever increasing online students.

Q: The bump you're seeing is online exclusively?

A: It would be great in 3-5 years to have about 30 online degrees – no department will be required, merely encouraged.

In business management we have a contractor, AP, to manage the online development and they are adding 6 faculty and 1 staff to support this MBA program.

We're still fine tuning compensations.

Barney: Can we target populations that will be less likely to show that decline?

A: That is part of the drive to find out-of-state enrollments for our online programs.

Berri: Diversity means hiring people we don't know. That is a much bigger pool.

b. Summer Compensation Proposal/Resolution – Steve Barney (4:30)

Proposal is on the Canvas page based on the sentiments of the Senate and we moved forward with this – it's been presented to Daniel Bishoff and the Provost and the Presidents council. We want to identify any barriers to student's graduation.

Other issues – 11-month contracts for Department Chairs. Administration is looking at that so there won't be a burden for dept chairs.

We've asked questions about how this will move out.

We have created a survey with pointed questions to get info from students on what classes they'd like to take in the summer, which we will incorporate into our planning.

Assurance has been made at every level that compensation will be substantially higher for faculty and adjuncts.

Debates and dialogues continue.

c. Anonymous Faculty Survey -Johnny MacLean (4:35)

Steve sent out the link to the anonymous survey to everyone and they are on the Faculty Senate Canvas page. I will do this every month before FS meetings and Dean's council.

It's a great way for me to find out what is on the minds of faculty.

Steve Barnett and I have been working with Webservices to create two websites on for the FS Committees and Awards Committees. Please let us know if there are any mistakes.

There is also a link to University Committees (on the Provosts Website) all the University committees are listed there. Please let us know if there are any mistakes on this site.

We hope to get this updated year by year.

This is the first time we've coordinated to present this information and have it accurate and ready for viewing.

We will have Academic Affairs Office Hours in the Sharwin Smith Center during the 1st and 4th Thursdays at 4pm.

d. Committee updates

i. Student Feedback Survey -Steve (4:45 minutes)

The contract we had with IDEA has expired and a committee got together and made proposals to come up with items that were reflective of your values for quality teaching. We distilled that down to five core themes and 11 questions based on the research of the committee. We have finalized the student feedback survey with 12 items and each are reflective of specific teaching behaviors and practices, each slightly different from the others. We also wanted a survey instrument to allow students to provide feedback, so that has been included.

We have a deadline for tomorrow morning to get this complete in time for the first session ending. It will go out tomorrow. Take a look and let me know if you see needed adjustments. It will be too late for this next round but will take under consideration for the next time we use it.

All this is up to us. We are not locked in – we're still pilot testing. The purpose is ongoing growth and development for faculty. It is designed to be a reflective process to help identify changes needed. It was never designed to be a comparative evaluation.

Wendy Sanders: I did not understand the rationale behind each question and answer.

Barney: We have received feedback that this didn't work and we have changed some of the response options. This version is very different. It's on the FS Canvas page. There is a document on Canvas as well with the rationale behind the choices we've made.

There are options for students to articulate their thoughts and feelings.

We have been holding open meetings about this process and will be holding 2-3 more this semester.

Q: What will the report look like compared to IDEA? Numbers or % of students

A: It will be a percentage of student who have endorsed each item. We are trying not to create a composite score – each item will have its own percentage.

Q: Berri – do Deans and Chairs agree with this idea?

A: Deans are no longer involved -- it's the mentors and Department Chairs. Deans contribute to the decision for tenure. We will be meeting with the Deans Counsel.

Q: The concern is interpretation – do they know how to interpret it? We need to educate the Deans so they understand how to use this.

A: There will be meetings with Deans, and meetings about the ins and outs of being mentors. We are mindful that people need to be informed and educated and we are taking on that task. This is about development and ongoing improvement and students.

Comment: The design is to benefit us – we don't want numbers for deans to misuse. We want this instrument to be the only piece in our evaluation. We wanted multiple ways of assessing competency – this is the purposeful design.

You can put more questions on these surveys.

Its mobile compatible. And the response rates are already higher than IDEA. You can do it in your classrooms. It's mediated through Canvas and students are reminded every time they go on Canvas.

The cutoff date – Allison will send out an email with the dates for survey feedback/additions/changes.

Comment: Provost's office completely supports this approach and are trying to have conversations with the Deans to go through this process. There is administrative and faculty support to change this culture. It's a sustained effort.

Have we empowered faculty beyond what's reasonable? With this renewed empowerment we need to show that we are capable and confident in continuing to serve our students and improve ourselves.

Comment: all of of work in store for the evaluation process with these surveys and mentoring teams – how much time do we really want to spend delving into this for every faculty member, every year?

Value comes from getting the students to comment/getting feedback. Will the fact that they need to think hard about their responses inhibit them? Students can decide which questions/value statements are important to them to respond to.

We're hoping for a critical mass that will indicate themes – but it will be time well spent.

We are looking at all the numbers holistically to help us reflect. What are the artifacts that I can show? And move on to a different component.

Q: Are we at risk of moving to eliminating individual styles – is it too prescriptive?

A: The literature has guided us to this – we don't want a one style fits all approach, but we all need to be mindful of best practices in pedagogy.

Comment: test fatigue concerns in these 12 questions – we need to go back to a more modest university level of questions. Each department will also add their own question and the worry is it could be too much. We need to reconsider these questions and have less of them.

- ii. Faculty Review Board Members (COSE, PVA)
Reps in process – we need to get it up on the website we want to be ready to go on this committee

- e. Policy updates
 - f. Year-Long Registration Initiative - Steve (5:05)
Departments will be asked to put together a yearlong schedule for students.
 - g. Office of Equity and Inclusion <https://www.suu.edu/equity/>
 - i. Strategic Plan, Trainings, Search Committee Resources
Immigrant populations will be the most powerful demographic. Schvalla has put together a website and many resources for trainings (link on Canvas)
6. Discussion Items (items requiring discussion and debate)
- a. Policy updates under consideration
 - i. SUU Policy 6.15 Sabbatical Leave (Policy vs Application)
<https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP615Faculty.pdf>
 - ii. SUU Policy 6.22 and SUU Policy 6.28 (Faculty Due Process, and Faculty Professional Responsibility)
<https://help.suu.edu/uploads/attachments/PP622Faculty.pdf>
 - iii. E-mail Policy
We are subject to GRAMMA requests so please use suu.edu for official university business. You can request a suumail.net email account that you can use for personal usage and will not be subject to these GRAMMA requests.

Q: Can we have Matt Zufelt visit our Faculty Senate meeting and explain these new policies?

VARIOUS POLICES (5:29)

Policy on sabbatical leaves

Is all over the map on who qualifies and who doesn't for a sabbatical. It was written back in 1990. The question we have is who should be eligible for a sabbatical and under what conditions. Provost Eves would like this to be consistent and find a viable and equitable solution. Bring this back to your departments and have some discussion and we'll talk about it next meeting.

Policy 6.22 on due process

This policy is very cumbersome –

6.28 Faculty professional responsibilities

How do these two go together? I'm inviting Dave Berri to gather his Academic Affairs Committee and take a look at these two policies and ensure these policies are working together and not use one against the other.

Berri: If we don't have due process then we don't have tenure and it's a policy that has to be fixed. It's foundational.

If you would like to be apart of the process – start reviewing the policies and give us some feedback.

b. Issues/concerns

James: On the heels of the policy questions – Katya has done an assessment on these policies and has highlighted and coded many of these for analysis. This could be a resource that could help you and alert you to other priorities.

Steve Barney will post this to canvas.

7. Standing committee updates

a. Treasurer's Report (5:34)

President Elect's Report (5:35)

P&T policy might adjust due to the 3-year graduation move across campus.

Is there anyone who would like to work with us on making this happen? Johnny volunteered. We have empowered faculty to take on promotion and tenure and

own it and we've received support from administration. Please email me if you would like to join us – we are looking at getting started by mid-October

b. President's Report

Faculty Innovation Incubator initiative (5:38)

What are the issues and discuss them with President Wyatt and put our heads together and make these issues work for academics. We need academic input. We need a member of Faculty Senate on the cabinet.

Comment: The cabinet is a pretty protected group. There isn't resistance but the culture isn't currently there to consider this. James supports the move to be integrated into these conversations within the group.

We will be looking for members to be a part of this – David Tufte volunteered.

- i.
- ii. Faculty Affairs Office Hour
- iii. Mentor Training
- iv. Perspectives About Faculty (5:45) – One administrators' opinion: we (faculty) are empowered beyond what's reasonable. We don't know the context of this comment, but it's a representation of how active the FS has been in creating policy. Administration might be feeling a little bit of pressure because it was faculty driven and they aren't used to it. We need to be up to the task.

Comment: Our administrators have gotten increasingly farther away from understanding what we do from day to day. There is a growing disconnect. Worried about a cadre of administrators who are hiring administrators like themselves who don't know what we do.

Barney: We can continue to drive that wedge or show them and collaborate and send our message about what we do and our commitments. Excited about the possibilities and President Wyatt is open to dialogue.

James Sage: The very deliberate things Johnny and I are trying to do have been noticed by people. We can only do so much but the Faculty Senate has the balance but we can help set you up to have a voice.

8. Adjourned (6pm)