

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

WORKING MEETING

November 24, 2014

In attendance:

Alex Chamberlain (AC)

Curtis Larsen (CL)

Cynthia Kimball Davis (CKD)

Matt Morin (MM)

Timothy Francis (TF)

Erin O'Brien (EO; President-Elect)

Jim Haendiges (JH)

Sandy Peterson (SP)

Jerry Harris (JDH; secretary)

Helen Saar (HS)

Linda Jones (LJ)

Nate Staheli (NS; President)

NS: We shouldn't be super long, but we need to make some assignments that will carry through the next month or so. We're going to turn the time over quickly to EO, who has been to the Dean's Council meetings and has some information, and then she needs to go.

EO: Let's start with the handout everybody has—the Student Senate will be surveying the student body on academic integrity issues. They forwarded the survey to John Pugliese and me for input. It occurred to us that it might be valuable to send out the finalized survey to the faculty first and then provide the information to the students at the conclusion of them taking the survey so they know how their opinions differ from those of the professors. So we wanted to be sure that everyone got a copy of it. I'm meeting with these people and wanted everyone's take on this. We'd disseminate this to faculty the first week of the Spring semester for their take, and then do the students the second week of the semester once we have faculty responses to provide them. Does this sound like a good idea? Is it interesting?

NS: The faculty will take survey?

EO: Correct, then the responses would be compiled and provided to the students after the students take the survey. It's more to view the survey as a learning opportunity. Research shows that you're so receptive to material during, say, a stressful test situation that it's not a bad idea to slip in a few interesting facts that you want your students to retain on a test just because of their emotional state. When you're doing a survey, and see that someone disagrees with you, you're likely to retain it.

NS: We'll get the student responses, too?

EO: Of course. So is this something people would be willing/interested in? Good idea? Bad idea?

JDH: Who's going to analyze the data?

EO: Two students are doing this as a capstone project.

NS: So there'll be an advisor that oversees this.

CL: I see everything in black is what the students came up with—what's the red?

EO: Red is John's feedback. Are there questions other than his that we would want?

CL: Under the cheating question here, there are some suggestions—some faculty members might feel different than others.

EO: We fully expect that—that's one of the reasons why Academic Integrity policy has dragged on and on, because we have to be careful about how vague we make the institution's policy, because different fields have different definitions .

NS: Are there other questions faculty want to see on here?

EO: Yes—is this reasonable? Are there other definitions, even if faculty don't participate? We might even leave things a little more open-ended for faculty to beef up some of these options. So, instead of worrying about it, take this with you and think about it—if you have additions or modifications, e-mail me. And if you have objections to polling faculty on this, let me know, but I think it might be handy for a variety of reasons.

NS: Unless there are objections from senators from this group to doing this, we can approve it here unless it comes back to Faculty Senate and they make a motion to have Faculty Senate sponsor it or not participate.

EO: It's all very voluntary. (No objections.) That's old business. Deans' meeting; we need to decide if we want to get involved in supervisor evaluations. So, deans, vice-presidents, and even presidents. We had a dean ask to be considered for rank advancement this year, and it's in the policy that we don't do that. There's obviously some conflict of interest if you feel like you have to negatively evaluate someone that happens to be your boss. So (Academic Vice-President) Bill

(Christiansen) and the deans are all interested in having some degree of review based on models of other institutions—they would like to establish a subcommittee to work on this policy consisting of some faculty and some administrators since this will impact them. It seems like something that the Faculty Senate should probably do, and we should probably get some people here to volunteer to be on that Policy Subcommittee.

NS: This will probably be fleshed out better in the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities—there's a subsection in there on evaluation of faculty administrators. It talks about faculty being able to...(reads). That's what's written here.

EO: Does anybody know that?

NS: No, and that's the issue, that this is starting to be worked on, and we're going to finish it this year regardless. This issue might be addressed inside of this subsection.

AC: Is that what is meant by someone evaluating their boss? I'm trying to pick up on what scenario that would be in...?

EO: One of the things that has come up as part of this—and probably as a new issue—is that evaluation of our supervisors is one thing, but there's also a question that, at a lot of universities, administrators can get tenure—not necessarily rank advancement, because “administrator” is their rank—but they can get tenure, which means that if they step down from their administrative positions, they could turn into regular faculty, even if they didn't start out that way.

NS: That was discussed with President Williams, in his becoming appointed as president, also included the possibility that he could get tenure. Currently, that is not something that is allowed. We don't have any deans now that aren't tenured, correct?

EO: All of our deans are tenured, but not all are full professors.

NS: Right, and that's what started this discussion.

AC: Are new deans hired on as tenured administrators?

TF: No, administration doesn't have a tenured status.

EO: They are basically at will. Oh, I was wrong—we have some deans that aren't tenured because they did not start here. We have deans hired from outside, and have had questions about this and triggered some of this discussion. Bringing in deans from outside is useful, but they don't have that protection.

NS: So are you requesting that a few of us step up to be on a subcommittee to determine that?

EO: Yes. In concert with some administrators. It ought to be clear that we don't want two dueling policies—the new one needs to pick up where the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities section leaves off.

NS: So section 3 of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will address that. After today, when we make assignments, four faculty members from the Senate will champion that section—I suggest that those four also be involved in the creation of the new one

EO: Yes, that makes a lot of sense, so that everyone knows where one stops and the other picks up.

NS: Were there any other issues? Because I issued a statement to Bill...

EO: There was some misunderstanding, but no one is in trouble.

NS: I'll read everyone my statement, just so everyone is aware.

EO: There's another issue that came up: Utah Valley University (UVU) went through their mid-accreditation visit, and Northwest Accreditation appears to have decided that they should be involved in some rather detailed aspects of our educating students...to the extent that they targeted an individual program and an individual class and an individual section, and looked at how students were being assessed, and because the assessment included an analysis question, and it was an introductory course, that it invalidated the assessment. Apparently, according to this particular accreditor, analysis doesn't belong in a first-year class—that part of Bloom's taxonomy does not belong in it. You can imagine the response to that! Our administration does not agree with that—they think that that was overreaching, and it appears that Northwest Accreditation is increasingly doing that, so there's going to be some discussion of whether or not we should leave Northwest Accreditation for another, alternative organization. This may happen at a state-wide level. We are up for the same process next year, and Deb Bryant is concerned that there's no clear guidelines. There's essentially no training for the accreditation evaluators for UVU, and there's no apparent guarantee of that changing for us next year.

SP: Can we switch at this point in time?

EO: We can switch, but it's a lengthy process. The decision has not been made to switch, but it's a conversation that will happen on campus.

MM: One of the first things that they'll look at, for which we got dinged last time, will be GE. We just did a massive assessment in the Spring, and assessed for critical thinking, and analysis is at the heart of that. That means that all of our freshmen and sophomore courses are going to be...

EO: Administration is supporting us in using analysis.

MM: I know, and because we did a thorough job with the assessment, there's a lot of ammunition to fight back if that's an appropriate place. Analysis *is* appropriate at those levels. So they're kind of crazy.

EO: It looks like these people are coming in with very little training and they're coming up with things on the fly, and basing things on their own personal experiences of what *they* would do in a classroom—that's obviously not how we want to be assessed. It's also indicative of what seems to be increasing concern that Northwest Accreditation is forcing us into boxes

to meet certain requirements. This conversation will take place throughout the USHE system, but the process of changing can take years—that might be a long-term solution. In the short term, we know that there are things they’re looking for that we ought to disseminate to faculty in our departments to ease whatever we might face. One of the big things is, since they’re going to a course level, and they’re looking at syllabi and individual assignments—this is part of the issue—and that means that as we develop our syllabi, we need to be spelling out our program learning objectives (PLOs) on our syllabi, spelling out our course learning objectives (CLOs) on our syllabi, and showing how they map onto the PLOs. They need to align—Assunta and I discussed this—what she suggested was (writes on board; see table, below). One of the requirements is that they have to be published—Nursing, for example, has a handbook that they seriously have to reference. In Biology, we have spreadsheets, that show the alignment, that apparently aren’t detailed enough. So are going to have to go back and emend our syllabi:

PLOs	CLOs	How CLOs map onto PLOs	Assignments
1	A	PLO 1, PLO2, etc.	
2	B		
3	C		
...	...		

...realizing that it’s OK if not everything you teach maps on. If you’re claiming that it does, you have to show it in your CLOs, and then if you do assignments—term papers, etc., homework questions, how do those align to your CLOs. In table form.

NS: Would it be useful for faculty to see a standardized syllabus that has all of this?

EO: Every program has different PLOs; this format is just Assunta’s quick way to show the mapping. How they all fit is entirely dependent on individuals. Something else to remind your faculty about: this web site (<http://www.dixie.edu/reg/syllabus>) is all you need to cover all the required boilerplate material on your syllabus, which will cut down on the length of the syllabus. What they’re trying to do is make the evaluation process easier on them—this literally has nothing to do with our educating the students. It has to do with them evaluating *how* we’re educating the students.

CKD: I have an APA psychology course syllabus from Assunta that has things mapped out like this.

EO: Yes. Maybe we can check with her and see if she’d be willing to share it.

MM: In her perspective, this is not about defending against accreditors as much as being intentional about what it is that we’re teaching in our classes, which is valuable.

SP: Honestly, it’s a few abbreviations or letters after assignments—it’s good practice.

NS: Are you recommending that senators go remind their faculty that these things need to be embedded, and if they have questions, we get with Assunta?

EO: It’s my understanding that in a number of programs, these things are *not* being built into syllabi. If you have programs that you represent that have not, we have a deadline of March, meaning our Spring syllabi have to have this format.

NS: So go back to your groups and remind them of this concept—if you’re doing it, continue; if not, let’s get you some assistance.

JH: How much detail do we give our faculty about the accreditation debacle?

NS: From their experience, we just need to be prepared—don’t bring up the potential switch of accreditation—that’ll be a decision made later.

EO: That will be made by Board of Regents, not this campus.

NS: It’s more of a state-wide issue. So our responsibility is our PLOs and CLOs.

EO: Next year, we need to make the process as easy as possible on the accreditors visiting campus. Things could become more of a free-for-all in trying to figure out how to evaluate us if we don’t hand them clear guidelines.

NS: And without scaring faculty, reminding them that a syllabus has a purpose that reflects what we are doing in the classroom.

EO: And we have no power over which classes they pick—anyone could be randomly picked. So everyone does have to do it.

CKD: Assunta told me that one person could create this for everyone’s syllabi, but it’s best if you customize it yourself in case someone else’s doesn’t align that doesn’t know your assignments.

EO: Next issue: there’s been more concern about rubrics for Faculty Review and the e-portfolios. I got feedback that lots of schools had problems understanding the portfolios they were asked to evaluate, trying to find information. So we’re

moving more toward departments and/or schools coming up with rubrics and asking Becky Smith to make output match a certain format, which she can do. But she's never been given guidance on how to change things; she's just heard that everyone hates it.

NS: We've had dialog with Becky, and she's saying it hasn't happened yet. What we're going to do, and I'll invite Dr. Randall to talk at our next Faculty Senate meeting about the faculty review process this year. After that, Robert Carlson, who is in charge of the Faculty Excellence Committee will be charged to make sure that process is looked at during the Spring semester.

EO: We need whatever they come up with to be established well before people leave campus for the summer so that people don't come back in the Fall to something totally new.

NS: The faculty members that will be up for review will be notified and have to make notice that they want to be reviewed in April, so they will know; we need to have that mapping fleshed out before then, and then each school decide on a potential rubric for their faculty. That'll go back to the deans and the faculty. Randall will come to the next FSEC meeting and do a short presentation on that.

EO: Last: reminder that we want Andrea Brown to come talk to us about great colleges. (Departs.)

NS: Andrea Brown finished up the "great colleges to work for" survey--she's presented a lot of data in executive meetings, but not the university at large. Probably the most appropriate time to do that would be the General Faculty meeting, but that's not until January--do you want her to come here to present the findings of that survey to us, and we'll take it to our faculty members, or have her present it to a large body?

CL: Unless it happens before a week from tomorrow, it doesn't matter.

NS: OK, so we'll invite her to the January General Faculty meeting. Are we comfortable with that?

IJ: Is this in addition to the URL that they sent out?

NS: Yes; some faculty have probably seen it, but we want to make sure everyone sees it.

MM: She presented it for the School of Education, and the chairs distributed the findings to their faculty. Just the findings, the way she presented them.

NS: Would that be a better way to do it? More intimate? Go to your deans and ask that she present at your department/school meetings?

MM: She had a more targeted data set for the school.

JH: I like that opportunity.

CKD: She can customize it for everyone.

NS: I'll send her a message about that, that you, in your schools, will get with your deans to have her come present, or at a department level. It takes about half an hour to go through it. We're an OK college to work for in the survey; the biggest thing probably holding us back would be communication and transparency with administration--we talked about that in a meeting about a month ago, and if we can address that, it'd fix a lot of problems. And we're working on that a lot.

CKD: Anything about adjuncts come up at all?

IJ: Adjuncts were the least amount of responses they got on the survey. So there were issues seeing what problems adjuncts had.

NS: You might want to look at that--I'll send you the URL. OK: let me quickly go through a couple of reports. In our last business meeting, we went over the bell schedule issue (reviews the motion made)--I have not gotten a written response from Bill, and we're meeting with him on the fourth. I'll ask him to document in memo format what the process will be to make sure that this is not just a "let's put it in and now that it's in, let's keep it going" thing. The reality is that if it's a good thing, it'll keep going. But we wanted to make sure at the last meeting that it was vetted the way it needed to be. I haven't heard any complaints, but I'll make sure Bill commits to the process of making sure before it becomes policy. Dean rank advancement--(reads e-mail NS sent to Bill). That was my communication back, so if deans apply for rank advancement, our position is that we don't honor that and can't--it's not under the purview of the Faculty Review policy. That's what EO brought up earlier, our ability to review sitting deans, and that will come up as part of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy. Objections to that? (None.) I had a meeting with the Board of Trustees--Chair Durham, Gail Smith, Julie Beck--regarding assistance of the Faculty Senate with creation of a University Policy Committee. Right now, the policy department comprises one person, and there's no governance of creation and review of policy, so the Board of Trustees wants to align itself with Faculty Senate to watch over policy. I assured them that I trust them in starting this process, but we don't think the Trustees should be involved in the day-to-day operation of the institution, especially in the creation and review of policy--they don't have time for that. So my suggestion was that this would be an interim committee until we get an appointed or selected University Policy Committee made of people from Human Resources, faculty, staff, etc. to oversee creation and governance of policy. They would report separately to the Trustees in terms of letting them know what's coming down the pipe. Sometimes we get policy put in front of us that we've only been able to review for a day, and they get rubber stamped. So they want a heads-up of incoming policies. There's a web site where that information is, but this University Policy Committee would be 5-6 people making sure policy is moving forward and is proper. Any questions or comments?

LJ: Martha's been begging for that.

NS: It'll be really good to give policy momentum. OK: last two information items—Strategic planning update: on Dec. 4 at noon, Steve Johnson will do a press release to announce town-hall campus meetings for all those that can attend, on Dec. 4 from 12-3 or Dec. 5 from 8-10 AM. The consultants and the Strategic Planning Committee understand not everyone can get to these, but if you can, or can have faculty members you represent that can get there, encourage them. You don't have to attend both. Room to be announced. The format will be round tables where you'll be shifted around to answer some questions. We've asked as faculty that when they decide on the format for the meeting, we want to get information to the faculty ahead of time so they will have had the opportunity to think about answers ahead of time. When the web site is up to date, we'll blast that information out. But get the faculty you represent to support this process—a lot of good things can come out of it.

MM: I was curious: some of us weren't here when they talked about the name change, and President Williams mentioned that it's not really on the table, but then again, we've hired this consultant, and they want to know what faculty think and it seems like the majority of faculty supported the change—would that be on the table to mention?

NS: In several meetings I've been in, President Williams asked that the name change and mascot not bog down the process of the strategic planning. It's fair to ask, but I'm hoping we don't get caught up in a match that will bog down the process. We'd be doing ourselves a big injustice.

JH: But if we go over all things, the change doesn't have to be in the discussion, but the name is part of the strategy of appealing to students, and it drives students here and away—it'll be mentioned as a factor, I assume. That won't be struck from the record?

NS: As faculty leadership, my comment to you is: we can't tell you what to say or not; I can just encourage you that the name change issue that has been resurrected through other things that have happened recently, like the homecoming parade, that, out of respect for where we need to go as an institution, we don't slow process down with a huge dialog on the name change.

MM: Yes. I'm thinking more along the lines of a question in the survey that the consultants send out so the consultants are aware of what the sentiment is on campus, but it's not a big discussion item.

NS: I like that—that's be fair for consultant to consider in their dialog. I think the student-body president brought that up, too, and understands the importance behind it. We just need to figure out how to discuss it without causing problems.

JH: It's a matter of consequence, for keeping or getting rid of the name, but changing it is a whole 'nother thing.

HS: This might come up as one of the issues we might consider in the future, but let's not discuss what the name should be in this process.

NS: Yes, just in terms of the consequences of maintaining it, and whether we want to deal with those. It's been brought up in multiple meetings, and the President is dealing with that issue in light of recent events. Again, encourage your faculty to participate. Now, Constitution and By-laws: Martha's been bogged down, but finally finished up, and I have a draft of the wordsmith that I'll send to you along with what we had sent to her so you can see them in parallel, but by next meeting, in December, we can approve the document and then it'll go to the faculty for 30-day review. We just need to ensure that it's what we intend it to be. OK: the only other thing is make assignments for the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy.

SP: Can I take 20 seconds? I gave everyone a handout about the Teaching & Learning Committee, which is planning a conference for end of March for faculty—it'll be similar to the workshops we attended, except this is voluntary and internal. The purpose is to highlight our own faculty and effective teaching practices, so we have opportunity to share—there will be roundtables, workshops, poster sessions, etc. and everyone is invited to participate in a collegial format. I wanted to make you aware of that before it goes to the general faculty. I don't think there's a date on this yet, because we're still vetting it, and checking on food services, rooms, etc. It'll be a nice event to highlight who we are. David Merrill will be the keynote speaker.

NS: This will be set up for faculty to come and go as their schedules permit.

SP: Becky Smith suggested doing it in May after classes let out, but we nixed that. Take advantage of it as you see fit, and it'd be good to put into your e-portfolios.

NS: OK: Anything else before we make assignments for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities? EO and I have appointment with Bill on Dec. 4, so get us issues before that. OK: there are four sections to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities policy, and here's a suggestion: there's basically 19 of us on this committee, so I thought we'd take me and EO out of this to serve as supervisors, and that leaves 16-17, for four people per section. So someone from each of the four groups would lead; EO would be over two sections and I'd be over two—basically ensuring that they're getting done. Or do we want to work on it all at once? (Want it broken up.) Nominations or volunteers? (People volunteer, and absent senators are assigned to groups.)

LJ: Section 3 has to do the dean rank thing, too.

NS: Yes, that group possibly will also create a policy for evaluation of deans and administrators. In my opinion, the way this will work is that we don't have another working meeting until January, but in the interim, I have a PDF of this that I'll

send out, and I'll send a Word document to each member, and your group gets together to have a casual meeting to go over it. The one that's least fleshed out is section 4. Sections 1 and 2 will be more of review to see if something doesn't sound proper. But the version we went over before is different than Martha's version. Let's get this out. I'll send this to you Monday of next week. Our goal is to have your individual committees come back with a proposed section to present at our next working meeting—a summary of what you've done. The timeline is that if we do that in January, we can get it to Academic Council in February, and then University Council thereafter, and to the Board of Trustees in March or April, and then it will be formally codified. We need to get this done; it protects us as faculty.

CL: You'll send us a copy of the draft?

NS: By Monday of next week, I'll send a Word document to your group with your portion of your document. Watch for that. Any other questions or concerns we need to discuss or bring up? OK—let us know what we need to keep doing. Motion to adjourn? (Moved and seconded.)