FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
January 18, 2024
4:00-5:30pm
Approved

Attending: Kelly Goonan, Abigail Larson, Scott Knowles, Daniel Eves, Gary Wallace, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Cody Bremner, Chris Graves, Scott Hansen, David Hatch, Steven Hawkins, Maren Hirschi, Jon Karpel, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Andrew Misseldine, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Grant Shimer, Ryan Siemers, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Qian Zhang

Not Attending:

Proxies:

Guests: Jon Anderson, James Sage, Camille Thomas, Jake Johnson, John Lisonbee, Matt McKenzie, Alexis McIff, Heather Ogden, Katya Konkle, Grant Courser, Heather Callison, Donna Handley

1. Call to order (4:02):
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
   a. Grant Corser, Associate Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
   b. John Lisonbee, Staff Association President
   c. Alexis McIff, SUUSA VP of Academics
   d. Camille Thomas, Asst. Provost of Faculty Engagement
   e. Jake Johnson, Asst. Provost of Leadership Development and Compliance
   f. James Sage, Associate Provost
   g. Jon Anderson, Provost
   h. Donna Handley, Graduate Council
   i. Heather Callison, Director of Student Outreach and Support

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes (4:04):
   a. [December 7, 2023 minutes](#)
   b. Approved.

4. Events and Announcements (4:05):
   a. T4L Conference – February 28 – March 1, 2024 at BYU-Idaho. Registration in January.
   b. Save the Date – Grace A. Tanner Distinguished Faculty Lecture Thursday January 25, 2024 11:30am. Dr. Douglas Ipson
   c. Spring meeting dates:
      i. Jan. 18, 2024
      ii. Feb. 1, 2024
      iii. Feb. 15, 2024
      iv. March 7, 2024

   v. March 21, 2024
   vi. April 4, 2024
   vii. April 18, 2024 _in person_ (location TBA)

5. Information Items (4:06):
 a. Heather Callison – Director of Student Outreach & Support
  We would like to help you understand what services we provide and how to contact us for support of a student. Our [website](#) has faculty and staff resources to help you understand how we support students. We want to help students be as successful as they can be. Heather showed us how to find the early alert resources on their website.
 b. [Revisions to Policy #5.10 – Early Retirement](#)
 c. Emergency Response:
  i. SUU Emergency Management is working on building-specific emergency response plans. They need representation from each unit in each building to serve on a task force to help develop these protocols. Anyone interested in serving in this capacity should contact Mike Humes (humes@suu.edu)
  ii. SUU PD has offered to conduct trainings, perform walk-throughs, and consult with departments on emergency response. Please reach out to police@suu.edu
 d. Political Activity for employees ([Policy #5.20](#))
 e. Update on the [SUU Strategic Plan](#) This was approved in December.

Jon:
A number of you participated in the development of the plan and we had a significant committee that worked for about a year, and then took a year off and worked for another year to get us to where we are. The intended strategic plan is to set a general direction for the institution between its current year and 2030. So the plan spans about 6 years and outlines the areas of focus for the institution.

Above is the link [https://www.suu.edu/strategicplan/] to the strategic plan site. The plan follows some of the key ideas from President Benson's inaugural address about connecting people, place and purpose. We did not change the mission statement of the institution for this rendition of the strategic plan –it's still the same. The previous vision statement focused pretty heavily on national recognition and a few other areas. This is more of a student centric vision statement for the next 6 years that embeds the idea that we're about connecting students to each other, to the campus, to their disciplines, to the community, and to the world, and it retains the focus on quality and affordable academic learning and the experiential learning, which is still part of SUU, and has been for a very long time. The five strategic priorities are all listed on the plan and if you scroll down on that link and if you click on each one. It'll list the goals/objectives or the measurable pieces of what we hope to accomplish. We had a lot of the questions like: what are we going to do in terms of enrollment? We had the Benson One era, when enrollment held steady about 8,000 students, and then to the Wyatt era where we grew

to about 15,000 students and everybody was wondering what the Mindy Benson Administration's going to do with growth. She has settled on a strategic plan and those metrics are in the increased access and affordability link. We hope, over the next 6 years, to grow the face-to-face campus from its current student body population of about 8,719 students. to somewhere between 10,000 to 10,500. That aligns pretty closely with the amount of new beds we anticipate the community is building or we'll be building in the next little while. It also aligns with the buildings that are coming on during that same time period, which will be the new Business Building West, the Music building, Highway 56 property, and hopefully, a new Engineering & Computational Sciences building, which will probably be where the current building is. So we feel like the face-to-face campus can handle that amount of growth over the next 6 years. Online growth we expect to be from about 3,056 students to about 5,500, and that'll come in a variety of programs across campus. We hope to grow the other areas: concurrent enrollment, pre college, and continuing education from about 3,200 to about 3,600. So the campus should be bigger 6 years from now, but not substantially different than it is now. We also have metrics related to retention, progression, graduation, credentials awarded. Those were designed to align to performance funding from the State.

We intend and have a specific goal to keep the class sizes at about the level they are. Now we average about 23 in the face-to-face environment and about 27 in the online, those are focused on undergraduate metrics. We didn't set a specific goal for the graduate programs because we have a whole variety of models and each of the graduate programs are sent through a benchmark. So those are the primary goals attached with the plan. We do have some other goals we're working on related to enhancing or enriching the academic experience. We're trying to figure out how we can measure and improve those using course evaluation measures that we currently have. Christian and James are coming up with some templates of what that might look like. We'll share that around once those are a little more refined. All this is really just carrying on the good things that we're doing and hopefully being a little more focused or fine in a few areas. I'm glad to field any questions, and hopefully, you'll be able to take this back and have conversations with all the people in your departments about the strategic plan and the direction of the institution. As James says, we do have a template for the instructional quality ready to be sent to the Executive Committee to start that conversation which will happen in about a week. So that's the strategic plan. It really is pretty exciting to be at a place where we have a stated vision for the future and something we can all settle into and work toward for the next 6 years or so. Thanks to all of you who participated, most of you had a chance to jump in one form or another as we worked through the development of that plan. But I'm glad to answer any questions or provide any guidance.

6. Action Items (4:31):
    a. [Policy 6.2 – Academic Officers](#)

We do have the revisions to policy 6.2 on Academic Officers and on the Dean's ability to delegate specific tasks to the Associate Dean. Motion to approve: Maren Hirchi. Second by Elise Leahy. Policy 6.2 was approved. Thank you, Dr. Corser and your colleagues, and the Associate Dean's Counsel for the work that you did on that, and bringing that to the Faculty Senate.

7. Discussion Items (4:34):
    a. [Guidelines for Online Teaching](#)

The Provost's Office approached the Faculty Senate Executive Committee asking our thoughts on developing some written guidelines for folks who teach asynchronous online courses. My personal position is that anytime we can clearly communicate expectations to people and provide some kind of guidance and consistency, that that is a good practice. Camille and Matt Mckenzie have worked on putting together some draft guidelines for online teaching that again would guide instructors and asynchronous online courses. Really, to make sure that we're communicating expectations appropriately, setting some standards, and helping our online students get the same quality SUU experience that they would be getting in the face-to-face environment.

Matt: A lot of these ideas we're opening up for discussion are from different institutions who have shared their practices. This is just a starting point to begin this discussion.

Camille Thomas: To be clear, we haven't decided on these guidelines. We just want to put something on paper and then bring it to you as faculty and get some feedback and start having a conversation. So nothing's finalized here.

Kelly Goonan: We will be asking you to bring this back to your colleagues and get their feedback as well.

David Hatch: I am excited about this, because as a person who works in a department where we teach primarily online asynchronous courses, I've felt sometimes the student evaluations don't speak specifically enough to our teaching situation. I also hope that as part of the process. There'll be some training opportunities to help faculty develop some of the skills that are going to help them do well on those. Thank you.

Michelle Orihel: Appreciate these guidelines. I am seeking clarification on when the content should be available. For a 14-week semester, for instance, I release modules one week at a time but I have some students who have asked to have modules released earlier. What should I be doing? What should students be expecting? What's fair and what's a good way of balancing student expectations and flexibility with a reasonable workload for faculty.

John Benedict: I run into this frequently in my 15 units. I tell them that I don't mind them doing the modules ahead of time but participate in the discussions within the schedule.

Josh: I believe that guidelines for online courses should be provided by CTI, as they have expertise in online courses. They should not need Faculty Senate approval to provide faculty with best practices. But the adoption of how online courses are taught should be governed and supervised by departments and colleges. I do not think it should be determined by the Faculty Senate.

Mike: The first question is what are these for – guidelines become expectations, which become evaluations. Do we have this face-to-face? What is the objective? Are they just suggestions? Or are they expectations?

Camille: The way we are looking at this is how we can enrich the student experience. We do a phenomenal job on this already. But we do want to engage in how we can continue to improve and enrich and access all resources available. We do have some expectations in these guidelines. We are also working on some different feedback questions.

Jon: I agree with everything you said. Our primary responsibility is to provide an excellent instructional environment for all students in all modalities. We've looked at all of the course evaluations for the fall semester in aggregate to see if we could find trends, and across the board, college by college, department-by-department we provide outstanding instruction. The feedback students give across the board is that the students rank the instructors very high in almost every area. What we do have in the face to face environment is we know what the SUU flow is. We know there's a flow to a face-to-face class, students come two or three times a week, they check in with the faculty member, there's regular engagement, etc. We don't have a flow for an online course and that's really the genesis of this. We'll get feedback in our office occasionally from students that say, I'm taking two online classes, one of them is the Wild West. I've got 3 things due 3 months from now other than that I'm good. Then you'll have others that will say, there's regular engagement and all kinds of things. Some of our courses have gone through the CTI development and that has a structure and a flow to it. So the question really is, what is that flow for an online course at SUU? And that's what we're trying to capture so that a student can have a similar experience regardless of the modality, face-to-face or online.

Mike: I could use some best practices myself, I'm just kind of thinking in terms of what it is that we're putting out there. If it's something that's best practices, here's how to help you with the courses. But then, when we start to lean into things that are closer to here's what you need to do. Then we're starting to face issues/expectations that maybe we don't have face-to-face, cause I know there are some Wild West courses face-to-face also. I'm just trying to make sure that we're being realistic about best practices versus expectations. And still maintaining that freedom for faculty to do what they feel is best. But I totally get online is a completely different animal and anything we can put out there that helps faculty, I think, is great.

Matt: The one thing I want to follow up on is something Camille said, that there are a couple of guidelines that are mandated to us by the Department of Education. Right now, that is accessibility and regular substantive interactions (RSI). The Department of Education does not state how many times you have to do something, but they do say that it has to be instructor initiated, a two-way communication between the instructor and student, and it has to happen more than once. I mean, we know the Department of Education and Department of Justice have already done audits on 100 educational institutions. They've started their next 100 this year. So it's a matter of time before they come knocking on our door. Those are the two main areas in online education right now that they are nailing programs for: RSI and accessibility. Those are two that CTI does audits for internally. During the second week we start those at the end of the

second week of every session and share those results with Department Chairs and Deans. Those are the only ones we've got to hit because it will come back to us.

Maren: I really appreciate the conversation and thought around this – expectations vs. guidelines. Grading time periods like 4-5 days could be problematic. Are we, as a part of this process, also putting out guidelines for how students engage? I've had a lot of online students who I have been able to be very connected with, and some the complete opposite. One of the best compliments I have ever received about my teaching, especially online teaching, came as a criticism from an online student, which was that the class is too much like a face-to-face class, to which I responded in my head with, thank you. That was the goal. I just think it's important that we're putting these expectations and guidelines together for faculty, we also need to be educating students. I've heard multiple students comment that they take online classes because they're easier, which is really frustrating to me as faculty trying to develop a quality online course.

Chris: I may have missed something because I was skimming, but there's a lot about how to actually run the class. There isn't really anything about how instructors can prepare for the class? I know in the way that faculty time is calculated there are prep hours and if you're teaching a face-to-face class, you're probably doing some more prep and I don't know if there's anything that could be added to this that could help guide instructors on how to prepare or even if that's necessary, I'm not sure.

Matt: That's a great point. We can talk about this.

Camille: There is a Canvas shell for this to help faculty that lays all this out.

Josh: Thanks to Matt and his office, I've worked with them a lot, and they provide amazing resources and best practices and guidelines. In terms of this document, I just don't know if the Faculty Senate is the best place to approve this. I hope CTI would have the ability to create a living document and to change it on a regular basis and that any steps towards trying to make this an expectation be taken through the Deans and the Department Chairs, because they're the ones that really have ownership and and supervision of how online courses are taught and how instructor interaction is measured and evaluated in an online course. A lot of us are saying this is an awesome document and if there's things to add or there's things we might change, we should give Matt the power to keep this going and make it very clear on the website here's where I go to find this information. Not have the Faculty Senate be the body to make modifications or to see it through from guidelines toward expectation, because we're not in a supervisory role over how courses are taught.

Kelly: To be clear, these are guidelines – we expect our instructors to be good at what they do. This is SUU trying to communicate to those who teach online what good online interactions look like. We are not approving this – the Provost wants to engage with us and get our feedback. This is the intention to engage in developing, not approving. This is not intended to become a policy. I will be setting up a Google doc for feedback and please share with your colleagues.

John B.: I want to agree with leaving this in CTI's hands to use it as a jumping off point, especially the new people who come in to start doing online. I know I struggled quite a bit with Canvas because of the little hidden, unmentioned types of things that Canvas can pop on you in a given day. For example, migrating grades from canvas to the portal. Canvas recalculates the grade if there's a dash in a square as opposed to a 0. I learned this because my students emailed me: hey, I had an A- and now I've got a B+. These are things that would be very handy for the online instructor to know prior to teaching online. There's a lot of little nuances in there that can really catch you and you have to scramble to fix it. It's definitely a learning curve.

Chris: I'll definitely wanna share this with our instructors because we have a lot of online courses and we have a lot of remote adjuncts. I didn't know if, when we're sharing this with our faculty, we should be also sharing this with adjuncts or if that's gonna be kind of a separate feedback loop?

Camille Thomas: Chris, we did not plan on doing it separate. So you can share and get feedback from your adjuncts so they feel part of the SUU community and what we do. That would be fantastic.

Kelly Goonan: It sounds like the Senate supports developing some guidelines. Please take these back and share them with your faculty, your adjuncts, anyone teaching online that you would like to share them with and I will follow up with that Google Doc where folks can input their feedback. And I'll set it up by department just like we did with the previous versions. So that folks can continue that conversation.

I will also mention, since it was kind of brought up and alluded to in this conversation, that part of this effort does also include developing a new set of questions that will be administered during the end of course feedback that are specific to asynchronous online courses. Since several of the questions that are currently included in that feedback don't represent that kind of modality. So that will be a discussion item likely at our next meeting, to look at the initial draft of those feedback questions and again get some feedback from this group on how we feel those questions reflect online environments.

   b. Gathering data about faculty concerns
President Benson has asked what faculty concerns are – thinking about sending out a survey to ask three questions: (1) What are your concerns? (2) What can SUU do to address your concerns?(3) How can the Faculty Senate support you? Because things happen in the order that they happen, I also got an email from one of our senators yesterday with a very nice list of things contributing to burnout, in fact, for faculty in their department. So my question to you all is number one, is it worth polling faculty about what they're concerned about? And, number two, what's the best method to do that? Is this something that you feel would be best handled by individual senators approaching your colleagues? Or would it be better to send an email invitation to all faculty on campus to provide their responses? I wanted to open that up for your consideration and discussion.

Elise: Are we finding there are good responses to surveys? I'm willing to have personal chats with my colleagues.

Ryan: Perhaps doing both. My department is large and the survey might loop in people who I'm not connected with.

Chris: I think doing both is a good approach as well in case some people are more comfortable sharing concerns via a survey.

John Lisonbee: Staff Assoc goes the survey route and we do a lot of promoting to get responses. We include an optional field for follow-up, if they would like that.

Josh: I think it's important for anonymity to be maintained. Some departments are small and identity could be detected. In order to get good feedback this needs to be maintained. Also, describe in the process how their concerns are going to be addressed. I think that oftentimes we feel like we can voice some of our concerns, but we don't know what happens to them after we voice them.

Kelly: I will work with Christian on this to make anonymity possible and hope to send something out next week. I will try and keep the questions open.

Chris: Is there going to be any kind of scoping of this or is this just a catch-all? Because, you know, some concerns might be I can never find a parking spot when I have my afternoon class, or it might be something very serious. Do you want to collect everything, and then farm that out to whoever should take care of that? Because maybe there are already things in place that are taking care of that.

Kelly Goonan: I think keeping it as open as possible because there may be things that somebody is struggling with or concerned about that I simply haven't thought about. You know, and again just raising it as what are your concerns? It should be something relevant to SUU that can actually be addressed. Being aware is good. I was not prepared for that question. Mindy asked me, she asked John the same thing about staff, and she asked Carson the same thing about students. She said, I'm going to keep asking because I would like to be as informed as possible. I can say that most of the concerns I and the Executive Committee have gotten from faculty never make it to this meeting because we're taking them to other folks on campus to address. For example, the discussions around workload and departmental guidelines and policies and things like that are moving forward because of concerns that have been raised and addressed by certain folks on campus. There is value in asking these questions because there are certain things that the Faculty Senate can and should do but there are a lot of things that we cannot and should not do. But it doesn't mean that those concerns are any less valid or significant and we can reach out to other people on campus who may be able to to address them in a helpful way.

John Meisner: In setting up the survey, it would be good to indicate what the intended plan of action or plan for feedback is for those who submitted their thoughts in the survey. I don't mean individually, but just an aggregate. Just so people know that it was addressed, or there was a plan of some sort. I think that's part of survey fatigue – here we go again, people are asking but it's not gonna make any difference – just knowing that there's a purpose to it and that there will be some reaction or action.

Jon Anderson: In addition to concerns, it may be good to ask for areas of progress or things people are grateful SUU does.

Kelly: House Bill 261 has passed, Will get more information on state legislature issues/bills in our next meeting.

Bri Kramer's tracking sheet:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YO7_Zx7TOdv-AUZfEoOQ81oMb_EJ4IwVWYlSA7tDXtQ/edit#gid=0

8. Standing Committee Updates (5:05):
    a. Student Association (Alexis McIff)
        Thank you for a great fall semester. I just met with the Senate and they said the most impactful was the network they created with you. Students would like to do service projects and would like to have any suggestions you may have. We passed a bill this week to add a graduate senator. Next week we'll have a resolution on where to put a new vending machine. Another bill we're working on is to get funds for the Center for Hope for students who need child care during classes. We have a few senate meetings this semester and you can attend these if you are interested. They are held on Tuesdays at 5pm in the StarLight Room.

    b. Staff Association (John Lisonbee)
        Policy 5.10 we have some questions for Kevin Price on this – feel free to reach out to us with any feedback. This is an employee driven policy.
        Abby: What are the major changes?
        John: See Jill Whitaker for details.
        The Super Start Stations were a success and we appreciated rubbing shoulders with our faculty colleagues and serve our students. In those two days we accumulated over 200 volunteer hours. I think that says a lot about the kind of connections we're trying to make with our students. We gave out a lot of cookies, and we heard some feedback for next time having some fruits and vegetables, or some healthy alternatives at 7:30/8:00 in the morning.

        The Performance Management Committee, this does impact all of you a little on the academic side, is seeking feedback to make sure that the performance

9

evaluation and performance management side of things for the staff and employees is done well and is impactful for our campus. The efforts being done on this committee are being done by Kevin Price, David Mcguire, the Provost, Dean Mendini, and department chair, Sarah Allen. If you have any interactions with Laurie Garfield in scheduling on campus, she is our staff of the month. Finally, we obviously have wrapped up the Employee Giving Campaign but as we get those T-shirts ordered for anybody that has made contributions, Kelly and I will make sure that you are informed when those T-shirts are available, likely at the Cashiers Office. Thank you for that effort, and that's all we have from the Staff Association.

c. Honors Program (Maren Hirschi)
Katie Englert is the Director of the Honors Program. She's currently working on recruiting for the next academic year, and she is happy to come visit your department meetings, chat with you, come to your class, whatever you would like to learn more about the Honors Program or to inform students about it. She's primarily focusing on freshman and sophomore classes. But I teach two upper division classes in which I do get some freshman and sophomores, and she came to both of my classes. So it's not off the table if it's upper division. I think the Honors Program is a fantastic opportunity for students, so I hope that you will reach out to her to learn more about it.

d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)
We are continuing to roll out pilots for next academic year and surveys for these new expected learning outcomes. If you haven't been contacted you might be relatively soon. James has also put together a nice one page description of what this is and what it's intending to do. So we'll have that available as we reach out to people.

e. Graduate Council (Donna Handley)
https://www.suu.edu/graduatestudies/conference.html
We have a couple of action items that we've recently approved through the Grad Council. We have the Grad Path Program, which was the program formerly known as Graduate Bridge, that was put forth from enrollment and admissions based on the Federal regulations. We made sure that we meet all of the hourly requirements of undergraduate hours and graduate hours. There are 11 graduate programs and most of them have about 6 hours that we would be able to use. We're excited to have that opportunity to try to promote and have undergraduates join us and start doing that program again. So that was approved. We also received the FY 25 tuition waiver funding amounts that we've approved. The only thing that we're looking at in the next couple of months before graduation would be an ongoing item about summer compensation amounts for the graduate program directors. The current tiers don't include for summer compensation eight graduate program directors and we have been in

discussion with the Provost since last year and we hope to come to a resolution. Last item is we have a fund for graduate student travel. So let me put it in the chat. Graduate students can apply for this funding. If they attend a conference they receive $250, and if they are presenting at the conference they earn $650. We would love to be able to fund more grad students in that way so please share the link.

f. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
g. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)
h. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)
i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
    Meeting next Thursday. Feedback has been in support of continuing for another year with the benefits we have so we can get more information on how to proceed.
j. Faculty Awards Committees:
    Nominations are open. Please note the email that was sent. Please encourage your colleagues to nominate people that they know are doing good things. It should take about 5-minutes.
    i.   Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
    ii. Inclusion & Diversity Awards Committee (Kelly Goonan)
         We are changing the Inclusion and Diversity award to Belonging and Access. This language is being used in the strategic plan and how the legislature is approaching this topic. We are going from a total of four awards to two. One will be for any employee and one will be for a student.
    iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)
    iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
    v.   Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Andrew Misseldine)
k. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)
l. Past President's Report (Abigail Larson) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee
    Academic Affairs have wrapped up revisions on 6.1 based on faculty feedback and the rollout of the process last fall. Potentially this will be an information item at our next meeting. Coming down the pipeline as an informational item will be changes to the intellectual property policy 5.52, probably at the end of February waiting for Maureen Redeker to provide some final feedback on that. And finally, something that we will have an active discussion in February, possibly March, is 6.33, the academic integrity policy. I've gotten feedback from Heather Ogden and Jared Tippitts so we are incorporating their feedback and then I'll pass it on to Maureen, and make sure it meets all those standards, then we will move it forward as a discussion item with Factory Senate. Also, I want to send a thank

you to Jake Johnson, who's been really instrumental in crafting a lot of the policy language for us.

m. President Elect's Report (Scott Knowles) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)
    WAFSEC should be meeting soon. UCFSL met last week and Julie Hartley was there and gave updates on the legislature and the things that they were concerned with. She tasked us with two items that we are working on – and we welcome your feedback on this – (1) how shared governance operates here at SUU and (2)how we would like it to operate. There are concerns over how faculty are evaluated. We're also gonna be preparing a report on post tenure review and tenure reviews. Julie's point is, they just don't know that we're actually already rigorously evaluating everybody and doing post tenure reviews. So having that information and being able to communicate it to legislators on the hill will help that go smoothly. So we're gonna compile that data for Julie. We did talk about some big issues that faculty are generally concerned about across the system. That John Ferguson has polled faculty on to bring to these meetings, and those are faculty representation on the Board of Higher Education as well as the individual Board of Trustees. There are EDI concerns/ issues, and that is largely because of the bills that are being proposed by our State Legislature. There's general concern about faculty health and welfare in the context of faculty safety like faculty shootings and other disaster responses on campus, which we're addressing here at SUU as well as protecting faculty mental health. So those are kind of the initiatives that they're focused on and then the last thing that we have to report on is that organization, UCFSL, the University Council of Faculty Senate Leadership is working to codify itself a little bit better. They're going to model themselves after what the state organization that represents staff associations are doing across universities. They have a great website, which is the Utah Higher Education Staff Association. Similarly, it's an organization that actually has some funding behind it which will help them run their website and communicate better across all staff associations and make their organization run with more continuity from year to year. So UCFSL is going to try to solve that problem by doing what they're already doing. Salaries are also a concern across the state.

n. President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council
    Deans Council – Deans and Department Chairs have been asked to look at course scheduling and fill rate and be more strategic and intentional in how courses are scheduled so that we have healthy enrollments. Make sure that courses are offered when students need them to complete their degrees. The Provost does not want to go back to protrating, so please be more thoughtful about scheduling, particularly this summer. The Dean's Council also discussed promotion and tenure and colleges have been encouraged to take a fresh look at

the department and departmental criteria. Spring is a great time to look at these things.

Presidents Council – presidents of the USHE institutions met with the governor and he told them that there is no tuition freeze. So SUU is having discussions with the Cabinet and with the Student Association about the possibility of looking at a modest tuition increase. Students have already weighed in that they would like small incremental increases for a few years rather than perhaps a 15% increase 3-5 years from now. There are several updates related to the Legislative Session. Pres Benson will be presenting to the Higher Education Appropriation Committee on the 26th and SUU Day on the Hill is Jan 30th so we'll have lots of folks up there. Pres Benson also gave an overview of some of the budgetary asks. There was a lot of discussion about the free speech resolution, which I mentioned at our last meeting. If you want to hear more about this we can add to the agenda next time. I want to assure faculty that the policy applied more to university administrators. It does not affect faculty, your research, your teaching, your curriculum, anything like that. But it is something that the institutional presidents are now very aware of, and and will be subject to. Remember, Mindy is asking about what faculty's concerns are. If there is anything that you feel is important to address at the meetings, please feel free to email me, and we can certainly work on adding that on the agenda. I hope that these meetings are a meaningful use of your time.

9. Call for Executive Session (5:44)

10. Adjourn (5:45)