FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

October 3, 2024

4:00-5:30pm

APPROVED

Attending: Scott Knowles, Kelly Goonan, Chris Monson, John Karpel, Grant Shimer, Chris Graves, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Jacob Dean, David Hatch, Derek Hein, Maren Hirschi, Jon Karpel, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Jon Lee, John Meisner, R. Alexander Nichols, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy,, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: Kevin Stein

Proxies: Kevan LaFrance for Bryan Koenig, Scott Lanning for Chris Youkin, Shubhashrita Basu for Eli Neilson

Guests: Shauna Mendini, James Sage, Camille Johnson, Jake Johnson, Om Mehta, Shalina Kesar, Matt Mckenzie, Ashleigh Zimmerman, Blair Bentley, Dr. Cody Bremner, Meagan Beesley

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:01)
    a. Interim Provost Mendini
    b. Associate Provost James Sage
    c. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
    d. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
    e. Senior Director of CTI and Staff Association President, Matt McKenzie
    f. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
    g. Executive Director, Belonging and Engagement, Ashleigh Zimmerman
    h. Assistant Registrar, Blair Bentley
    i. KOR Department Chair, Dr. Cody Bremner
    j. Compensation Manager, Meagan Beesley
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:02)
    a. September 19, 2024 Minutes

i. Approved

4. Events and Announcements: (4:04)

    a. The Writing Across the Curriculum group is partnering with CTI to host a workshop series focused on how to improve writing in all disciplines. You can find out more information on CTI's Writing Across the Curriculum page. You do not need to commit to all of the sessions. It is designed to pick the sessions that interest you.
    b. Faculty can submit Caught Red Handed awards to other faculty, staff, and student employees. Staff Association will deliver these awards monthly (if not more frequently).
    c. Partnering with the Leavitt Center for Politics on a conversations series titled **Engage and Exchange**. Sept. 26th, Oct. 3rd, Oct. 10th, Oct. 24th. Noon on Thursdays in Sharwan Living Room. https://www.suu.edu/leavittcenter/

    d. Meet the T-Birds - Get to know the 24-25 Women's Basketball Team (October 22nd 6-8pm) Meet The T-Birds.

    e. Homecoming, Saturday October 12, 2024. 9am - Pancake Breakfast, 10am - Homecoming Parade, 12pm - Homecoming Tailgate, 2pm - Homecoming Football Game, 7pm - Volleyball vs GCU. Parade Entry Form.

5. Information Items: (4:05)

    a. Giving Wings to T-Bird Dreams Campaign (Scott Knowles)

        i. Campaign Website

        ii. T-Shirt Design Vote

6. Action Items: (4:07)

    a. Masters of Athletic Training Discontinuance Proposal (Cody Bremner)

Elise: Remind me, was there a danger of losing faculty?

Scott: No. Motion to approve?

Marin: Motioned to approve.

Chris Graves: 2nd motion.

Motion was carried. 23/24. 1 abstained.

b. WAFSEC - Request to change WAFSEC Charge (Chris Monson and Gretchen Ellefson)

i. Proposed By-laws Change (pg 10, marked with a note)

ii. Proposed WAFSEC Detailed Charge Change (Pg 2, Marked with a note)

Ryan Seimers: Motion to approve.

Elise Leahey: 2nd motion to approve.

Motion was carried: 23/23

7. Discussion Items: (4:14)

a. Faculty Job Descriptions (Meagan Beesley)

i. Faculty Job Descriptions

Meagan: Effort began last year to get job descriptions. We have finished the staff descriptions. We are now focusing on faculty. We do have a lot of policy in place that helps guide what the expectations are for positions right now. But one of the main reasons that we are wanting to create job descriptions is because it gives us some clarity on the positions and protects both legal interests for the employees and the university. This really helps us as we're going through the accommodation process, having a clearly defined job description can provide clear expectations for both the employees and the supervisors. As we move forward with evaluations, disciplinary actions, things like that provide additional detail beyond policy. See in the link in the agenda, there are eight job descriptions so far. We will be considering additional positions. PLease give us feedback on these positions so we have these descriptions correct.

Grant: In the Supervision or Direct Exercise section: Change the student TA mention to CA (Classroom Assistants).

Elise Leahy: I'm still looking at the tenure track, and it says all positions are responsible for creating course material and submitting them on time and following professional responsibilities as outlined. I wonder whether it should just say, following professional responsibilities just because what does this mean? Submitting them to whom and on what timeline? That doesn't apply to everyone or it's kind of vague. Would we just want to say, follow professional responsibilities.

Meagan: We can do that. I'm trying to pull up the policy right now to see if I grab some of that verbiage, because that's what it was expressing in policy. It says – all positions are responsible for creating course material and submitting them on time following professional responsibilities as outlined in policy 6.2 8

Scott Knowles (he/him): It's a question of whether that is supposed to encompass all of 6.2 8 and professional responsibilities or if you're really only trying to say that one particular responsibility is necessary.

Elise Leahy: I guess, because it said submitting them. I thought it was supposed to be about curriculum but it's just creating course materials in order to teach with them. Then maybe it's just the word submitting.

Meagan Beesley: Do we just need to make this: All positions are responsible for creating course material and follow professional responsibilities as outlined.

Elise Leahy: Sure follow other professional responsibilities as outlined.

The doc will be shared and comments turned on. Share the link with your departments.

b. Faculty Senate Scholarship - Proposal (Jon Karpel)

Jon: See in the attached document. We would like to change the definition of nontraditional student to the University's definition. I think that would open it up a little bit more and it would, at least to my understanding, to both undergraduate and graduate students. I reduced the number of questions down to just a couple. The first one would be a narrative on the current situation for the student – what they are doing, what their academic interest is, how the scholarship would help them. The second question asks applicants to highlight a faculty member who told them about the scholarship or showed a lot of support for the student, and has gone above and beyond. The other idea was how to endow this Share your feedback.

Scott Knowles: The only question I really have is whether changing the definition of nontraditional student does, in fact, open it up to up to graduate students as well as undergraduates. Is that the intention?

Jon Karpel: That's the intention. If they meet the other requirements, I don't see why that would exclude graduate students from applying.

Rachel Parke: In the criteria document that you shared last week, just make sure that it just says student and not undergrad undergraduate students.

Scott Knowles: All right, so we'll bring that back to our next Faculty Senate meeting for a vote. Please talk to your departments and get some feedback.

Please get feedback from your departments.

c. Policy 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility & Due Process Revision (Kelly Goonan)

i. Memo on Revisions for 6.28 and 6.22

Kelly: The Economic Affairs Committee has been working the last several weeks on revisions to policies 6.2 8 which is currently the faculty, professional responsibility policy. We are proposing that change to faculty professional responsibility and due process. A little bit about the need for these revisions, with Hb. 438, the Higher education revisions that were passed last legislative session, there were some new requirements for due process, and procedures for tenured and tenure track faculty. a temporary revision of policy, 6.28, as well as policy, 6.22 went into effect on July 1st to make sure that we were in compliance with that law. Currently due process is actually addressed in policy 6.2 2. and so with the revision of the proposed revision of policy 6.28, we are hoping to take due process and have that in a single policy rather than having professional responsibilities and due process split into two separate policies.

The Academic Affairs Committee had a substantial conversation around section 4.B.3 of the policy about non-employment conduct and made changes so that a faculty member's personal conduct could not be used against them unless it met very specific criteria. We also discussed the procedures for when suspension/dismissal are unlikely – those more minor disciplinary sanctions. And then there are procedures for those more major disciplinary sanctions, like suspension, dismissal, or termination. Right now those procedures are different for tenured or tenure track faculty and term faculty, which include non-tenure track faculty. We did discuss whether, so I will say that the procedures outlined for tenured and tenure track faculty are required by State law. That was one of the big changes with passing. Hb. 4, 38. We did discuss having the same procedures for non tenure track faculty and ultimately the committee opted to proposed the different procedures, mostly due to the kind of contract that non tenure track faculty are on we we hope that the procedures outlined in the proposed revisions to 6.2 8 are still really robust and provide for adequate due process for all faculty, regardless of their contract type. We did discuss having the same procedures for NTT faculty.

Jake: Much of the content was new and so we felt a clean version was needed.

Ryan: Thank you for the NTT stuff. 4.C.2.F & G about presentation of course material. Do we need to get into the weeds in the policy on this? Concerned about opening this up to complaints from students that would lead to neglect of our professional responsibilities.

Kelly: There was a lot of discussion on this as well. F&G were initially combined but we decided to separate them as they were different. the example that I can share with Point F, where you may have a reasonable range of opinion and perspective. The example that I gave is we talked about climate change in one of my classes. When I present information on climate change to my students, we are not looking at a range of opinions on the science of climate change. And I explained very clearly how I've made that determination, the scientific consensus on the topic. What I do bring a range into is how do we respond? What are our options for adaptation, mitigation, things like that. This is also where faculty academic freedom comes in. You are the

expert in your discipline, and you have the best understanding of the consensus within your discipline and there may be areas where presenting a range of opinion, so to speak, especially when when it is subjective, is not appropriate, because the that body of knowledge may be based on objective facts to which we can point to a scientific consensus. In other areas, that's where the reasonable range of opinion would come in with the offering context for challenging course content. We had a good discussion about trigger warnings or content warnings. The policy does not say that faculty need to or should provide content warnings, just that they should adequately prepare students for challenging discussions and acknowledge that the content may be challenging for any number of reasons. Acknowledge that it's okay for students to maybe feel a little bit uncomfortable but reinforce that a classroom hopefully is a safe place for faculty and students to wrestle with some of these challenging ideas. This was just an area where we wanted to make it clear what the expectations of faculty are without making it so prescriptive that faculty feel constrained in what they're able to do in their classroom.

Grant: Who adjudicates?

Kelly: It starts with the department chair making a record of it. If there is a finding of a violation of professional responsibilities, the sanction really depends on the severity of that violation. For a minor infraction that would result in discipline like a reprimand, a reassignment, or another kind of more minor form of discipline. That written determination would be made by the department chair, it would be delivered to the faculty member. The faculty member has an opportunity to respond, and the final determination also gets filed with the Dean. So it would stop there. That's more to just make sure that if there is a record that we know who is responsible for keeping those materials.

If it is a serious violation and the department chair feels that it warrants suspension, termination, or dismissal that is where, for a tenured or tenure track faculty, it goes through those multiple layers that includes a hearing with the Faculty Review Board. It includes the provost's office, and it's a much more thorough process because we don't want to terminate a tenured or tenure track faculty or any faculty, for that matter unless there is cause, and we want to make sure that there is a preponderance of evidence to support that that is, in fact, the appropriate sanction. It's kind of a case by case but for minor sanctions it would stop with the dean for those more major ones, it would go through those additional layers of review.

Grant: Okay, another follow up on that, if someone's getting repeated complaints, or however these get registered, how does that play into the process? I can see this both as someone continually violating students safety/comfort in ways that are negative, but also maybe students just being offended by someone's existence as a faculty member and that being a recurring harassment from student complaints. How would that affect this process?

Kelly: There is a separate policy that students can follow if a faculty member is acting inappropriately. Policy 11.4 addresses student complaints and outlines the procedure they can follow.

I would hope that the procedures outlined in the revised version of policies 6.2 8 would protect faculty from these kinds of arbitrary actions. We don't want faculty to get to be singled out. We spent a lot of time discussing this in the Academic Affairs Committee, and we actually removed certain language that we felt might not be clear enough to identify an objective violation of faculty professional responsibility. Whereas something might just be a difference of opinion or just a conflict of personalities. If somebody is getting repeated complaints from students, I would hope that it could be handled at the department, or possibly the Dean level, and that the faculty member would either take that feedback from their students to heart and look at how they're presenting certain things or what they're presenting, or if it really is necessary for students learning and development and for achieving those learning objectives that the department chair and the Dean would back them up and say, yes, this might be challenging, but it's also essential to your learning. I would hope that we wouldn't get caught up in a situation where a faculty member would be subjected to multiple complaints from students or others, alleging that they're violating this policy when they are, in fact, not

Jake: The point of due process is to give the accused individual, in this case a faculty member, the opportunity to offer a defense of what it is that they're doing. And this is in front of other faculty, deans and department chairs are faculty members, and I hope, have a good sense of how every discipline might have a little bit different approach to what is sound pedagogy, and what a reasonable expectation of behaviors in a classroom with a particular topic. The Faculty Review Board is composed of faculty who have a pretty good sense of what's reasonable and what's unreasonable, right? And so in those circumstances, We rely on the decision makers. In this case department chairs, deans, and the faculty review board members to exercise that kind of judgment when it comes down to those accusations about course content or something that a student might be upset about. The other thing to always think about is, students also have their own student code of conduct and if it were demonstrated through a process like ours that maybe those complaints aren't being made in good faith, or they're harassing, or they're unfactual, or they're untethered to any sort of reality, they could be routed through the student code of conduct. If we thought a student was really engaged in abusive sort of reporting we would have the ability to use the student code of conduct to try and hold that student accountable for behavior that's not acceptable.

Scott: I kind of had a question along those same lines, like when I think about faculty responsibilities and what their purpose is in policy, I see two purposes generally. One purpose is to inform faculty about expectations, and then the secondary purpose is to operationalize these in order to discipline and manage faculty. That's where I'm in agreement with Ryan on F and G. That feels like good conversations that people should be having in their department about what kind of content we're providing to students but not necessarily something I want to see operationalized in a policy about disciplining faculty. If I use myself as an example, I haven't taught this class for a number of years, but I teach a very controversial play in a freshman level dramatic literature script analysis class. It's deeply embedded in my research and I use it, and students are often very upset about it. It would only take a department chair to simply decide that it wasn't appropriate for me to be disciplined about it. I could have several smaller complaints that would only go to the chair and dean. Then I only need two people who disagree

with me about presenting a play that has really really controversial material in it and I'm being repeatedly disciplined over and over again for this and that. That's where I think the question or concern about content as well as how do we make decisions about pedagogy comes in? Because when I read a reasonable range of opinions or perspectives in the minimal standard. That's just the department chair and the dean doing that. They are the only ones deciding what is reasonable and a range of opinion or perspective or what good pedagogy is, or what good evaluation is and that concerns me a bit about those that they'll be operationalized to single out faculty that we might not like. And so we're going to say, Hey, we don't like this specific thing that you teach. Another thing, as cited in the AUP's ethical guidelines, says that controversial issues are their primary responsibility, i.e. professors to their subjects seek and state the truth as they see it. So, according to AUP, we are actually supposed to present the truth as we see it on controversial issues, not necessarily make sure that we're representing diverse opinions and perspectives.

Kelly: We also have policies protecting academic freedom. if a faculty member can articulate a reasonable pedagogical reason for the material that they select they should be protected by academic freedom.

Grant: In section 3.H1-5 there is some language in there – 4&5 Content that shocks the conscious of the community.

Jake: The question is what is serious misconduct or unethical behavior, right? The legislature doesn't provide us any sort of definition of that term. And so in an attempt to try and identify a set of standards from the legal world. This is language that you see around the concept of moral turpitude. Courts have interpreted that in various places it usually applies to professional standards. So like professions governing themselves doctors, lawyers, those sorts of folks often have moral turpitude standards for their profession. And so these are just examples of the way courts have interpreted that concept.

Kelly: If serious forms of misconduct and if I can add, we did take out morals in number one to keep that to justice or honesty, because the committee felt that morals was maybe a little too broad and ambiguous.

Jake: The way I'd sum that up is, it was our attempt to try and provide some guidance on what serious misconduct would be and this was our best attempt to do that.

Grant: Because it's so subjective does it make it better or worse?

Ryan: We are worried about an instance where an ideological student is recording and publishing it out of context and with that kind of context and the tension between the Academy and certain elements of the state, we're worried about opening doors to malicious actors. That's why F and G. are concerned. I don't know if it should be grounds for disciplinary action to fail to properly contextualize something for a student. I could see that as a productive conversation around student evaluations or effect or the aim, other avenues for discussing teaching effectiveness.might want to balance it by quoting that business about our primary responsibility

according to AUP. In other words, the essence of the best scholarly and ethical standards are to seek and state the truth as we see it. And so, if that language would be in there that might balance out this language about having to couch things in such a way that it doesn't offend students in the way that we present it.

Elise: I was just going to say, relative to the depraved and unethical, that it shocks the conscience of the community, which is that number 4. Jake was saying that another possible sort of group that may or may not be shocked, would be the profession. Can we refer to the profession as opposed to the community in this context.

John Benedict: We also have online communities. I do agree that we should maybe change it to the academic community as opposed to just the community.

Scott: I have a procedural question, I'm just a little confused. So there's the lower offense procedure that goes from department chair to dean, and then it can be appealed basically up to the provost. However, it also stated in that section that the dean and or provost could decide that the infraction, in fact, raises to the level of termination, suspension, or dismissal. But it then doesn't go to the full process. It seems like the provost makes a determination on that, and that felt like a bit of a loophole. So instead of going to the Provost to make a final decision on termination/dismissal as soon as a Dean determines this is actually a more serious infraction, or as soon as a provost says, this is actually a more serious infraction. Shouldn't it start the full process where it goes through the faculty review board and everything else?

So the respondent in H, it says, or the Dean can decide. The respondent did violate this policy with recommended sanctions of suspension, dismissal, or termination, and then it goes on to say that the decision is final with no opportunity for further repeal, which seems like a loophole we don't want. Once that's determined from my perspective, it should go back into the full process and go to the longer process immediately. At that point.

Kelly Goonan: So it's point 3 that would then initiate the other procedures listed in point and section E.

Jake: I would be comfortable making that sort of an addition, just to say that at that point it would route to the Faculty Review Board.

Grant: Under definitions – Cornell law definition. It would be nice to have a link/reference. Could faculty bring a witness/third party before a department chair? It can be really intimidating to be in a meeting with the department chair, or with provost or a dean and whatever comes out of that meeting is just their word versus yours. It seems like a pretty dangerous situation. So I wondered if there's a mechanism for making sure that there's a 3rd party kind of involved on either end of it. Maybe the faculty member has committed some gross violation, and they misrepresent the meeting with the Dean. That kind of thing.

Scott: Should we create a word document to share and compile feedback in a word document?

Kelly: That would be helpful.

d. Policy 6.22 Bona Fide Program Discontinuance Procedures Revision (Kelly Goonan)

    i. Memo on Revisions for 6.28 and 6.22

Kelly: Due Process Policy – at the end of the policy it addresses program discontinuance. We are hoping to move the policies into 6.2 8. We would like to keep a separate program discontinuance policy. So that should an academic program be subject to a review for potential discontinuance, that we have very specific procedures there. Part of the reason for doing this, again, is moving the due process into the same policy as the faculty professional responsibility and potentially an unofficial motivation. For this is the reason we're talking about the MAT program now, and not last year. We found this part of the policy when we were looking for something else last year, and we did it a little bit backwards, and so making it very clear what the policy and the procedure is, and that it's not buried under a due process so the process is more clear and provides that adequate protection for faculty. At the bottom of this policy, you'll see the current policy. 6.2 2 struck through. Most of the actual procedures for program discontinuation are the same but they have been made a bit more robust. That procedure includes the Academic Affairs Committee articulating educational and academic considerations on which to base the decision of a program discontinuance. It includes review by multiple layers, including the Faculty Senate and then there is language there about what would happen with faculty who are impacted by those programs. And so again, the Academic Affairs Committee felt that this provided good protection for faculty, that it provided multiple layers of review. We did have a good bit of discussion about small programs. And again, that concern that we didn't want a small program to be unfairly targeted for discontinuance and we feel that the procedure outlined adequately protects faculty in any program to be subject to a review for potential discontinuance and have very specific procedures there.

The reason that we're presenting these at the same time is because the due process is currently in 6.2 2. It makes sense to send them up together so that we can have it very clear where those different elements are being addressed in policy and should 6.2 8 and 6 2 2 be approved, we would actually remove the reference to 6.2 2 in that 1st section of 6.2 8, since it would no longer really be relevant.

Scott: I don't know if there's a better solution when we're talking about the procedures to terminate or change the status of faculty impacted by discontinuance. It's the idea of the tenured and tenure track faculty members. So this is b, 1 b, the tenured and tenure track faculty of a receiving department may displace a non tenured or a non tenure track faculty member to install a tenured faculty member in a position for which they are qualified. If this does not compromise the integrity of the program and is deemed to be in the best interest of the program, but immediately under that. It also says that a tenured faculty member who has been recommended for termination may not displace another faculty or staff member. And I assume, with the exception of the person above, which just means we've created a world in which there's one specific group of people on campus that can have their job terminated because

another tenure track position needs their job, and that one job is a non tenured faculty member or a non tenure track faculty member. I don't know how I feel about that.

Elise: Back to “controversial issues,” is this actually sufficiently covered elsewhere in policy already? I am sorry I do not know.

Kelly: A lot of folks expressed that it was pretty depressing to be working on these two policies. At the same time. In 6.2 2, we actually changed some wording to make things sound less horrible, even though they are still a little bit unpleasant. The question was raised, are those two things actually incompatible? The receiving department may be downsizing but it wouldn't necessarily automatically result in the termination of a tenured faculty member but that should the decision be that the best thing to do is terminate that faculty member, they're not entitled to a new position being made for them. The intent behind this policy is to prepare for hard decisions and have a process in place. I will personally concur that itis hard to say that tenured or tenure track faculty could displace a non-tenure track faculty. But again, I think that those decisions would be made after a significant amount of consideration by multiple parties. There may also be some contractual reasons for that, which I am not well versed in. I'm not sure if Jake or anybody has any more knowledge or insight. But what we're hoping to do is adequately protect faculty who may be impacted by discontinuance and not just tell them at the end of spring, sorry you don't have a job next year.

Scott: We will create a document to share with your faculty.

e. GE Feedback on two items (Ryan Seimers)

    i. Recommendations for Faculty Senate Feedback

f. Resolution on Administrative Drop (Ryan Seimers)

Ryan: If students miss the one to three classes they will be administratively dropped. I am proposing that we reinstate administrative drop policies to free up seats and align with federal guidelines, and help students avoid unintentional costs. Captured the policy from Utah Tech. If a student hasn’t communicated before class and doesn’t show up for the first day or two then they may be dropped.

John: I like #2 as well. I get 180 students and there will be five of them that float and don’t do anything. A cut off time if they are not participating in class or responding to emails would be helpful.

Shalini: We were having a discussion at the Graduate Council just informally. And I've experienced this. We clearly don't have a face to face modality anymore on campus. We have hybrid, we have AP, we have accelerated pro the various modalities. Yy personal question is, and I'm sure some of the directors would ask, that when they are 7 weeks programs, and they take the quiz but they don't turn up and like what John said in week 5, they'll say, Hey, can you open

this up? Because I need a C. There might be a student who's doing the 14 weeks course and suddenly they're also doing a AP course, which is 7 weeks, and they don't realize that oops it's already done. So if we do go ahead. I just wanted to kind of give a heads up that we look at the different modalities because the accelerated programs are different in nature in the sense if students just don't turn up for three weeks, and then that's midterm for them. I like this idea to consider, because I think it impacts the faculty feedback a lot because obviously, if you say no, then it's anonymous. The feedback will not be happy. So that's a very good way for them to get back to us, because we are saying no. So I like that idea. I would love to reconsider and prop. I'm going to share that with the Graduate Council Committee on the 9th when we have a meeting to see what their input is.

Matt: Sharing an article from WTET. The department of education (online course) has a new regulation that has been out for comment. Now closed. There is a requirement that students interact in the course every 14 days. If there is no activity the institutions must effectively withdraw a student and document that withdrawal date. All indications from all the areas and colleagues that I communicate with about online education have clearly stated that they do not believe the Department of Education is going to budge on this topic. So I just wanted to make you aware that with online education that is a topic that is likely coming and depending on when they officially approve it will likely either be next July or the following January.

https://wcet.wiche.edu/frontiers/2024/07/22/buckle-up-ed-is-off-to-the-races-with-its-nprm/

Shauna: This puts the responsibility, in the minds of the students, on the faculty. The students would then complain. If it was the responsibility of the student there were less challenges. We should make sure that it's not all on the shoulders of the faculty, because students will expect to be withdrawn, because that way I get a W instead of an unofficial withdrawal or something that transfers into a F. So there's some things that could need to be considered on those.

Scott: We do have Blair Bentley here with us from the registrar's office. They've been sharing a lot of information about this particular topic with me, which is why I invited them to come and attend and hopefully share some information with us.

Blair: We take the students' responsibility seriously. We are pretty set on getting registered. it's a big issue, especially during the 1-3 weeks of a student's attendance. We've reached out to different offices in the division of Student Affair, Division of Enrollment and both of our divisions are pretty set on getting the student registered. We spend a lot of time asking why that student isn't there. We have well over a thousand course requests processed just in the initial first three days. A couple of considerations to always think about in those first two weeks is Federal Financial aid is not based on one course, but a student's total enrollment. The commenced attendance drop that we do is part of that title for funding for financial aid. We have handled it a little bit differently almost every year, as we keep adjusting on how to best implement that policy. They have commenced attendance in 9 out of 12 credits. Are we gonna drop a single class, remove federal financial aid for the student, have them scramble two weeks in to get another course to stay enrolled or do we keep emailing the student. So if we're talking about undue financial hardship on students, that's a huge consideration. Any change in enrollment can

have big ramifications. Their housing stipend could be pulled, tuition adjusted, and they owe that money back to the VA.

Scott: What's happening is. Those red numbers were the numbers that if we just dropped after first day attendance, or if we dropped after two weeks without checking, these offices in the registrar financial wellness when they see a student hasn't met the commence attendance. Then they are rolling out a whole bunch of support for that student in order to get them back on track and back in the class, find out what they need or what have you? And so then they reduce that loss of students by a large amount which is both good for the student as well as good for the university, which is why there's a concern about a faculty member being able to drop after first day attendance, because then they can't roll out that massive amount of support.

John Benedict: Yeah, I guess my biggest issue would be the students that haven't participated right up until midterm and there's like no communication with this student. There should be some sort of a mechanism where we can purge the ranks, if you will, of those students. I don't think at that point in time it's going to be beneficial for the student to hang in there till the end of the semester and receive an F. If we administratively drop them by the time midterm comes around they're going to get a W. So that's going to benefit the student one way at least, partially on their transcript but to let them stay in the class all the way to the end of the semester and then I have to issue an F to them. Nobody wants to issue an F to a student, but I have no choice.

Blair: And that W traditionally is not a faculty assignable grade.: So that W is actually a student grade. We also run outreach and constantly email students about the last day to withdraw when the W is coming up. We usually give 3 to 4 days notice for individual courses. Then we do the full session as well. So the students are pretty informed, and we have pretty good feedback on it. It's hard assigning the W. It doesn't really trigger our academic success metrics.

Scott: I know that time is running very short, so I'm going to go ahead and cut the conversation at this point. We'll probably include this as a conversation item again at our next Faculty Senate meeting, and I'll continue to contact and and converse with the registrar's office and the Financial Aid office, and perhaps with Ryan, who's made the proposal to see what other options exist. If we can't collaborate on something that fulfills the needs that faculty are pointing out, while also serving the needs of students, that the registrar financial wellness is also working very diligently to support.

g. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:30)

a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)

b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

Meeting was held and accepted 40 tickets.

c. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)

d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

e. Honors Council (Maren Hirschi): https://www.suu.edu/honors/

f. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

g. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

Om: This past week we passed one bill to fund the College of Health Sciences Week for $1,200. Our engineering and computational science representative, Mckay Fawcett, passed a resolution discussing a cyber range as an educational opportunity on campus, but he'll be presenting this at PIC in November. Upcoming initiatives: we have more microwaves coming on upper campus – one approved for the science building and we're working on another for the auditorium. In terms of what students are saying, we're not hearing a ton of academic concerns. They're mostly general concerns. The college specific issues have to do a lot with the quality of life. So that's the microwave, the auditorium bathrooms, etc. SUUSA has a program called mySUUvoice. that aims to gather student feedback directly. Last year at this time, we had four submissions. This year, we already have 100 submissions. A lot has to do with parking and the library lights. We are working to handle those and get this covered.

h. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

i. Faculty Awards Committees:

   i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)

   ii. Employee Commitment for Access and Belonging (Kelly Goonan)

   iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)

   iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)

   v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Derek Hein)

j. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

k. Past President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee

We will be looking at policy 6.1 next – if there is any departmental feedback send my way. More time needed to complete the review. An observation was made that this year the deadline for tenured faculties, FEC Reports, was the same as the deadline for the Department P&T Committees to complete their reviews. A request from one college to articulate who needs to submit what in the spring, so that that helps with forming committees. That might be a little bit more procedural. Feedback promoted NTT faculty adjusting their process that they follow so that their reports just go to the chair instead of going through every layer of review. Currently no language addressing associate professors serving as associate deans. Please submit feedback by Monday.

l. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)

UCFSL will start meeting next week.

WAFSEC is working on making salary recommendations – for the future. Most likely for this year we will go for a flat amount and then make it more complicated for future years because we've been hearing rumors that there's probably going to be nothing for this year so it doesn't matter what we asked for this year.

m. President's Report (Scott Knowles) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

We are working on a lot of recommendations for the P&T committee about the dashboard to make those changes and I've been in conversation with Jake Johnson and Parker Grimes and Kelly to work on some of those changes. An ad hoc committee is forming to look at policies outside of 6.0

9. Call for Executive Session: Motion was made. (5:36)

10. Adjourn