

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

October 17, 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, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Jon Lee, John Meisner, Elijah Neilson, R. Alexander Nichols, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Nate Slaughter, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: Scott Hansen, Kevin Stein

Proxies: Scott Lanning for Chris Younkin, Julie McCown for Ryan Seimers

Guests: Mindy Benson, Camille Johnson, James Sage, Jake Johnson, Om Mehta, Shalini Kesar, Matt Mckenzie, Ashleigh Zimmerman, Valeena Wood, Trekker Burt, Jill Mallek

1. Call to order (4:03)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
 - a. President Benson
 - b. Associate Provost James Sage
 - c. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
 - d. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
 - e. Executive Director of Belonging and Engagement and Staff Association President-Elect, Ashleigh Zimmerman
 - f. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
 - g. Compensation Manager, Meagan Beesley
 - h. Interim Registrar, Valeena Wood
 - i. Alumni Relations Coordinator, Trekker Burt
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:04)
 - a. [October 3, 2024 Minutes](#)
 - b. Motion approved.

4. Events and Announcements:(4:09)

- 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. Giving Wings to T-Bird Dreams Campaign: [Campaign Website](#), [T-Shirt Design Vote](#)
- f. Student Involvement and Leadership is looking for Faculty and Staff volunteers for The Scream on October 26th, 8pm - 1am: **SCREAM VOLUNTEER FORM.** Contact Bayli Alexander (baylialexander@suu.edu) with questions.

5. Information Items: (4:09)

- a. [Faculty Regalia Fair](#) - Monday October 28 - Friday, November 1 (Trekker Burt)

Open House to purchase regalia in the Hunter Alumni Center between 8:30AM and 5PM 10/28-11/1.

6. Action Items: (4:11)

- a. Faculty Job Descriptions (Shalini Kesar)
 - i. [Faculty Job Descriptions](#)

Shalini: We are in touch with Meagan Beesley about fine tuning the graduate directors and program directors job descriptions, and probably bring it to this space, either in the November or December meeting.

Scott: Can I get a motion to approve the faculty job descriptions. With the exception of the Program Director description which the Graduate Council is working on with Meagan.

Kelly: There are very few undergraduate program directors and so we may want to take that into consideration with the program director job description. If that's something that they feel strongly should be included. We may need to clearly differentiate between graduate program director and undergraduate program director. I used to be one, and I wrote that job description because I never had one. But I was not responsible for recruiting. I have some correspondence from the Provost. That kind of clarified what some of the expectations were for program directors, and how they differed between undergraduate programs and graduate programs. Again, there aren't very many, but there are a few and whether that is handled by HR as a faculty job description or by the individual departments that have undergraduate program directors it would be nice to have a clear list of responsibilities for people functioning in that position.

Scott: Absolutely. I'll follow up with Meagan on the need for both undergraduate and graduate program director descriptions. Perhaps they just need to be two separate ones, especially if the graduate council is going to work with HR to formulate the program director specific to the graduate program director.

Maren: I want to comment that my department has an undergraduate program director.

Scott: Excellent. If you could email me their name, I would love to get them engaged in the conversation.

Rachel: Kelly and I were on grad council together. So I'm a former grad program director. But they're very different throughout. I know that some of my faculty in my department have been in conversation. I don't know if we should vote on it just yet, until Meagan can be here to talk about some of those conversations that she's been having with faculty that I have sent to her.

Grant: I had mentioned an edit for the tenure track and non tenure track job descriptions under the supervision part since we've now been told that a lot of our TAs are instructional assistants. That should be spelled out instead of just abbreviated, TA. This is like a minor thing but since it hasn't changed, there may be other things.

John Benedict made a motion to postpone indefinitely until Meagan Beesley is able to attend.

Maren Herschi seconded the motion.

Motion was made and seconded to postpone indefinitely until Meagan Beesley is able to attend the meeting.

b. Faculty Senate Scholarship - [Proposal](#) (Jon Karpel)

Jon: We are proposing to change the definition of non-traditional students. And requiring only two questions on the application. We also want to endow the scholarship.

Motion was made by Elise Leahy and seconded by Jacob Dean to approve these changes.

- c. [Policy 6.22 Bona Fide Program Discontinuance Procedures Revision](#) (Kelly Goonan)
 - i. [Memo on Revisions for 6.28 and 6.22](#)
 - ii. [Faculty Feedback on 6.22](#)

Kelly: This was introduced and discussed at our last Faculty Senate meeting. A feedback document was provided and shared by Scott with all senators and there was only one comment from the Education Department. The other comments weren't specific enough for the committee to take action.

I wanted to mention that the educational and academic considerations will be articulated by the Academic Affairs Committee. I want to propose that the report Cody Bremner provided for the Masters of Athletic Training program discontinuance be the model we look to for data regarding student enrollment, cost of running the program, and not only in the number of faculty but also in the number of ICH that need to be offered, also resources, other things like looking at national trends and programs within the State. We want to make sure that we are not only considering faculty involved in program discontinuance, but all stakeholders and that was something that Cody did really well as his college came to their discontinuance decision.

We would like to put forward the revision of policy 6.2 2, so that it focuses on bona fide program discontinuance procedures.

Nathan Slaughter made a motion to approve and Chris Graves seconded. The motion was approved.

- d. [Resolution on Administrative Drop](#) (Ryan Seimers)

Scott: Ryan Seimers wasn't able to be here today. The Administrative Drop policy would allow faculty to do a few things, (1) it would free up additional seats for students to take required courses and (2) it would help in quicker compliance with the Federal guidelines, although we do have a fairly robust system to handle that, (3) it would help with unintended financial obligations. Ryan is proposing that students who fail to attend the first scheduled class meeting can be dropped by the instructor and then students who fail to attend any class meetings during the 1st two weeks of class may be administratively dropped from the course. Are there any faculty who have feelings, concerns, or thoughts about this, either for or against? We also have Valina Wood and Ashley Zimmerman here to kind of help us walk through what that process looks like from their end, and what they do to try to help students.

Dr. Nichols: How will veterans be affected – we should add something about this.

Nathan: This doesn't mean it becomes an expectation for faculty? Only if they're in a situation where it could be beneficial for all parties involved, then it may be done/considered.

Scott: This policy would allow faculty to take these actions, if they desired. The process is after we vote to pass this resolution today, it will be delivered to the President's Cabinet and then it would be handed off to the cabinet member most likely to be involved in such a decision, and then they would decide whether it would go forward with a policy revision. As I mentioned, Ashley and Valina both have a lot of good reasons for why we do things, the way that we are currently doing them, which are processes within financial aid as well as processes within the registrar's office. Do either of you want to speak to that?

Scott Lanning: Can students have until the day after the first day of class to contact the professor? Sometimes stuff happens.

Ashleigh Zimmerman: Veterans are certifying their time. We're certifying financial aid. And a lot happens the first 3 weeks. I think we shared last time that about 1,500 students could potentially be affected by this. When we look at commenced attendance, that's how many students don't have it in those first 2 weeks. With the new financial aid regulations that have been passed, the Pell Grant is now tied to each credit that a student takes. So every time a student is dropping a class, their financial circumstances are changing. And that's actually, when we see that sometimes students have those issues with keeping up with their financial responsibilities. It might actually end up creating more financial concerns for students rather than alleviating them. The other quick update I will give is we did meet as a community with financial aid, registrars, international financial wellness, withdrawal support, and the student outreach and support office to try and think of what we can do to have more integrity around this enrollment. And we're creating a working group which we'd love to potentially have a faculty senate membership or a representative on. But we are trying to figure out ways where we can streamline some of the process of getting students who we know aren't here out of those classes earlier to increase utilization, but also not potentially have negative consequences on all students who are trying to figure out what their schedules are going to be those first 3 weeks, and get their financial aid and all their certifications in for international, etc.

Valeena: I know that one of the faculty members mentioned veteran students. That's one population of students that we need to be mindful of. We also have international students that if their classes are dropped on the first day there might have been some delays for them to get here and get everything going. And so that's another population that we would need to be very mindful of. They could absolutely be asked to leave if they got dropped, you know. So there's many subsets of students that we need to watch out for. There's other scenarios that could be happening for students. And Blair, the assistant registrar, looked at two schools, Utah Tech and another school, who have this administrative drop. I think we should take a more holistic approach and take all these things into consideration as this process is happening.

Mike: I'm wondering how many students would benefit from this new policy. How would this balance out? Or are we making it hard for students to drop out? I'd like to know why most schools aren't doing this.

Scott: To your point, there are 1,500 students that would be impacted by this and bring that number drastically down to about 80 students who end up being dropped, and the rest get help to stay in school. Which is a different sort of thing. I'm not sure exactly how we would figure out how many students it benefits. It would take time to determine that.

Lee: I think the first day is too soon.

Elise: There is a lot of concern how this could hurt students. If we could take out the first and leave in the second.

Ashleigh: That is correct. We actually at one point, did actually do a drop for nonpayments as an institution to try and increase class utilization, and decided against doing it because of all the issues that we mentioned with veterans getting non-certified, international students and visa needs, and extra time like that. I will say one of the ideas that the committee is working on is trying to create a criteria for being able to drop students earlier. So instead of it being based on a date. It's being based on a confluence of variables that we can track with a student and say, Have they done their commenced attendance? Are there early alerts on this student? Have they made a payment to make sure that the students that we're dropping are indeed not here and opening up those classes

for other students earlier. So I think there is something we're going to see, some positive movement coming soon.

Grant: It's hard to add students as late as the third week.

Scott: Perhaps the best approach is to vote down this resolution. And ask a faculty Senate representative to consult with Ashleigh and Valeena.

Motion was given to reject the resolution on administrative drop. Motion was seconded and carried.

7. Discussion Items: (4:43)

- a. [Policy 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility & Due Process Revision](#) (Kelly Goonan)
 - i. [Memo on Revisions for 6.28 and 6.22](#)
 - ii. [Faculty Feedback on 6.28](#)

We received a lot of feedback. I think it is too soon to put this up for a vote today, with it being right before fall break. The Academic Affairs Committee has been meeting on Tuesday mornings, and I did not feel that it was appropriate for us to put this up to a vote today without having the full Academic Affairs Committee go through the feedback that was provided by faculty. So I just wanted to share that I did receive a question from a faculty member about the timing of these policies.

We currently have temporary approval for numerous policies. Basically all of the policies that are coming up today. That temporary approval from the Board of Trustees was granted in June, so that we could be in compliance with the July 1st effective date of the laws that are the primary motivators behind modifying several. The temporary approval for all of these policies from when it was initially granted expires on November 27th. Because we wanted these policies to go through the full shared governance process and have sufficient time to complete the 21 day campus review, Jake Johnson did ask for an extension at the most recent Board of Trustees meeting. I'm assuming it was passed because I haven't heard otherwise, which then means that the Board of Trustees will vote on the final versions of these policies at their December meeting in order to meet that deadline. These policies have to be discussed at the President's Leadership Council in November, so that we have time for the full 21 day campus review of that final policy. So we don't have a lot of time and the Academic Affairs Committee was trying to essentially pace these policies and take the really big priority ones first and try to get them through sooner. Rather than introducing 6 or 7 policies all in one meeting without much time. What we have decided is to take the feedback that faculty have given on 6.28, sit down as a committee, go through that feedback, go through the policy, and then reintroduce a draft at the next Faculty Senate meeting. But to meet that policy deadline, we will need to vote on it to move it up to the President's Leadership Council in November. So that's why I wanted to explain the timeline that we were working with, because I know there was some concern and anxiety over feeling like faculty were not given a lot of time to review these policies. My personal read on this is that we are not likely going to get an extension into 2025. When the laws that affected these policies went into effect July of 2024. So the Academic Affairs Committee is working hard to get these policies to a place where we feel comfortable with them. We know that we're going to miss things as we're only 8 or so people on that committee, and we really do value the feedback from faculty. But we're also respectfully asking senators and your colleagues to review these policies and give us constructive feedback that we can incorporate into the policy, e.g. if you say that this section could be worded better, please suggest wording, or tell me exactly which section don't just say this could be worded better. Any kind of constructive feedback that we can get to improve these policies and help faculty feel like these policies are actually protecting them and the university. We're not likely going to be in a position where we can work on these policies for several months to get them perfect.

Scott: The Board of Trustees asked to not see all the policies in one meeting. And will extend the timeline into Spring.

Jake: There isn't unlimited time but we need to be thoughtful.

President Bension: They asked to spread the policies out and prioritize. So plan accordingly.

Scott: We have more feedback for 6.28 and others. We need to make a lot of these changes because it's based on compliance with the law. But I'm not sure we want to proceed with this.

Kelly: Academic Affairs committee will meet next week and they have been working a lot over the last several weeks to try to get these policies updated and to a place where we feel comfortable moving them forward. I think we're going to have additional work with things like

articulating those academic and educational considerations for 6.22 and some other work that is maybe not directly policy revision and creation but creating procedures and other things that complement those policies. I don't wanna rush. I also don't wanna drag it out and I trust whoever makes the decisions for what gets sent up to the Trustees and how to prioritize the policies as they come through, because we're only Academic Affairs and dealing with the 6 point policies, and I know that those are not the only policies going to the Board of Trustees.

So I would like to do our due diligence to get those things through. Certainly, before the end of the semester, so that we can turn our attention to other things that the committee needs to address and maybe give the committee a little bit of breathing room, especially the folks who worked the last two years on that committee with the major overhaul of 6.1. They spent a lot of time, and I don't want to ask them to do that again this year. That's why I'm asking folks to please take some time, share this with your colleagues, ask them to review it, and ask them to provide constructive feedback.

Scott: Let's send out another call to faculty senators for feedback for 6.28 and let's make the deadline for that Monday at 5pm.

- b. [Policy 6.1 Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure](#) - Revision (Keely Goonan)
 - i. [Draft Revised Appendix A - Table of Required Documents](#)
 - ii. [Draft Revised Appendix B - Faculty Dashboard Deadline Schedule](#)

Kelly: Most of the changes are to improve clarity in the wording of what is expected of faculty and when. Our conversations about this were around the submission of FEC reports at the same time that they also submitted an application for midpoint review, etc. So we really tried to clarify. What materials faculty are submitting and when and that you do not also have to submit a FEC report in the same year. We updated this policy to include post promotion FEC reports to comply with the new provisions in the Higher Ed amendments.

We also included a little bit of language about associate deans, so there are not many, but there are a few associate professors who are also serving as associate dean. Academic officers are evaluated according to policy 6.2, but we wanted to include language in 6.1 that gives associate deans the option, if they want to stay on track for application, to apply for promotion to professor. So we included that wording in the revision.

There are two appendices that are affected by the changes, particularly with the annual evaluation of tenured faculty and promoted NTT faculty. We changed the evaluation chain to be the same as tenured faculty. The post promotion will only go to the department chair. The appendix B deadline we tried to make it more clear for the deadline and evaluated entities to pass on to the next step. There wasn't much we could do with the mid-point review, and a lot of that relates to legal requirements to notify faculty if there is going to be a recommendation for

nonrenewal at that point. There are specific deadlines that we have to meet, and so that timeline didn't really change, but we were able to give a lot more time. Particularly to the department P&T Committee and the department chair for most of the other materials that they're reviewing.

So that's a hopeful deadline schedule but that may certainly change when we hear back from the provost and the deans regarding their timelines. But we tried to take the feedback from chairs and the departments, that they needed more time with those materials, especially being that the groups responsible for that most thorough review.

Jake: The provost, and the associate and assistant provost felt good about the timeline. We do want to share it with the deans, since it will shrink some of their timeline just to get their feedback. But preliminary understanding from the deans was that they would be okay truncating their review time. So I suspect that the timeline will be viewed favorably. I just want to confirm that with the deans on Monday when we meet with the Dean's Council.

Kelly: We were able to push several of those deadlines into spring semester based on the deadlines that the provost office is working with. So what we're hoping is that at least there may still be some kind of short turnaround times. But it's not for everything. It's for those midpoint reviews, and then it can kind of stagger them out. Some of the deadlines are the same based on when they need to make it to the departments or to the next level. But they should at least have more time, and not have to get every single evaluation done in as short a time.

Scott: If we don't have any current feedback, is there interest in setting up another Google document to share with folks to add feedback about these policy changes or 6.1 specifically.

Maren: Yes, please.

Scott: Let us move on to policy. 6.4 student location.

c. [Policy 6.4 Student Location](#) - New Policy (Kelly Goonan)

Kelly: This one is a new policy and it's basically required by state law and the board of higher education.

Jake: Actually, the Federal Government.

Kelly: Yes, it's based on laws that we have to comply with. And I will punt any questions to Jake on this one.

Jake: The essence of it is, we have to have a process for determining or ascertaining a student's location and being able to make certain disclosures based on where they are located. If outside of the State of Utah regarding programs that lead to license. That's not every program at the institution, but a handful of them do lead to licenses and we have to be able to tell students in other states whether or not our curriculum will meet the licensing requirements of the states

where they reside. The Federal government requires that we do that consistently, and their mechanism for ensuring that we do that consistently is to adopt a policy about student location.

Scott: Let's just make sure that you all give it a good read before our next Faculty Senate meeting, when we would be voting on this policy, so that you are aware of all the different changes, and communicate anything that concerns you. Share it with all your faculty as well, but gather any feedback in the more traditional sense as opposed to a Google form for this one.

Thank you so much. Onward and upward surprise. Kelly is next with a policy 6.2 Institutional Review Board and Research on Human Participants, which is a revision.

d. [Policy 6.20 Institutional Review Board and Research on Human Participants - Revision \(Kelly Goonan\)](#)

Kelly: So this one has been revised by the LRB, and so they're the ones that have proposed these changes. Most of them are just cleanup, fixing typos, that kind of thing. Then there are a couple sections that just remove some language related to diversity, and just make it clear that the LRB shall be staffed with people who have expertise in research, if they are lacking expertise for reviewing a particular proposal that they make sure that somebody with that expertise is brought on to review that proposal, and then just that the IRB should be balanced, and there should be efforts made to make sure that selection is non-discriminatory.

So it's a little bit semantics, but mostly cleanup in this policy. And again, the LRB has reviewed this and recommended these changes

Scott: This one is also very straightforward. So please put it through the regular process. Just go ahead and make sure you've read it, and look at all the changes that are there. Absolutely share it with your faculty, and see if anyone raises concerns and we'll bring those forward when we bring it to a vote at our next Faculty Senate meeting

The last one for Kelly today, policy 6.38 faculty hiring another revision policy.

e. [Policy 6.38 Faculty Hiring - Revision \(Kelly Goonan\)](#)

Kelly: So just a couple changes here in Section C, D, and E. Again, just changing some typos, taking out that SUU promotes hiring practices that enhance faculty diversity in all its forms, that is, to put us into better alignment with HB261, which prohibits any kind of diversity statements in faculty hiring and bringing it into better alignment with Hb. 261. Then there used to be a provision that at least one woman had to serve on search committees and things like that, and that actually posed a pretty big burden to a lot of our female faculty. So this is just saying that the search committee will be composed of at least three faculty members from the program that is hiring the new faculty member without specifying the gender makeup of that search committee.

Scott: This one is also pretty straightforward. We're making changes just to be in compliance with the law. Please, again, make sure you've read through the changes. Share them with your faculty, of course, and we'll go through the regular process and be voting on this policy at our next Faculty Senate meeting.

Thank you so much, Kelly, for all the work. This is only a small portion of all the stuff Kelly has had to do because of all of the law changes, and all the policy revisions that need to go on this year. So please, if you see Kelly, thank her profusely.

This has been revised by the IRB – most of the changes are cleanups and fixing typos. There are a couple of language items that have been removed around diversity, and making sure people with expertise are being used.

Take a look at all the changes and share with your faculty. We will vote at the next faculty senate meeting.

- f. Call for New Business/Faculty Input
- 8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:09)
 - a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)
 - b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

We had a meeting and received 19 appeals and accepted most of them.

- 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)

Question about when a new proposal goes through for the syllabi who is responsible for uploading the parent syllabi to the database. Curriculum is in the purview of the faculty. Should it be uploaded?

Camille: USHE lawyers are happy with the information that we are providing. They did remind us that they will be auditing these parent syllabi based on what we have in policy. So you may see the syllabus policy come up with a couple updates to make sure we're all aligned, and that we're protecting faculty the best we can.

- g. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

No new legislation due to Fall Break and the gop week. We have our next meeting next week, and there will be a couple of initiatives, some of those are a reintroduction of the SUUSA Constitution. We've been back and forth this entire year in trying to figure this out but we're moving this to go through the Student Senate, then we'll get the student vote, the PLC, and then the Board of Trustees.

The College of Natural Sciences Senator is pushing a bill for the purchase of community garden benches. So in terms of our mySUU voice submissions, this came via the system that we use to collect student voices. Students also want to see more events happening in the community garden.

Another initiative is my Education Senator, Jacob Schultz, is working on a hope pantry food drive competition. Still working out the details but we want to have a food drive for each of the individual colleges and have a competition between each of the academic colleges and raise food for the whole pantry.

The last thing is students are frustrated about SUU's recent forfeit of a volleyball game with San Jose State University. There has been a lot of talk and students just want to seek understanding. So there will be a peaceful protest happening next week on the library quad. Please support your students and seek to understand them, and the frustrations they have. Thank you.

h. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

Updates and details will be emailed by [Scott Knowles](#) .

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)

Working with scholarship office to put the changes through and that we hope to get a lot more applicants.

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

Academic Affairs Committee will meet next week to look at the feedback that has been provided for 6.28. The University Faculty Leaves Committee will be meeting at the end of October to review the applications for sabbatical, and then pass our recommendations on to the Provost.

- l. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC); Ad Hoc committee on policy outside of 6.0

Met on Friday and discussed all the challenges. WaFSEC did not meet. Ad Hoc is looking at when to meet next. Will meet with Parker Grimes about the dashboard changes.

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

I want to announce that I'm going to join Matt McKenzie's pledge to try to get more of you folks to donate. So the pledge is that I will either get an SUU themed tattoo or I will donate \$300 based on your own vote. If we can reach 300 donors in our Giving Wings to T-bird Dreams fund. Spread that word to raise money for scholarships.

I am meeting with Parker Grimes and Jake Johnson to talk through all the feedback that we've collected about the dashboard operation and the P&T process to see what we can do and I'll report back. The policy on employee privacy which is working to help us figure out how to help faculty and staff respond to the doxing incidents that happened earlier this semester is going to be meeting for the first time on October 22nd.

The Leavitt Center for Politics has worked with Tiger Funk in facilities to get a ballot box installed in the Sharwin Smith Building, in the rotunda. It's going to be right by the ATM there, and this is for the upcoming election, so you'll be able to drop off ballots here on campus and encourage all of our students to get out the vote. This supports our university mission specifically to engage students in civic responsibility. So we're very excited about that.

We had some big milestones hit by our student affairs group who are working on retention and graduation rates. Jared Tippitts and his team managed to hit a 75.5% retention rate, which is the number of freshmen from last year who came back this year. We've never hit that number before. It's an institutional high. And we also hit an institutional high in graduation rate at 60.7%, which is also just amazing. If you see any members of their team, please offer them congratulations and celebrate their great work at getting us all of the great students that we definitely want in all of our classes.

The next item I have has to do with what's happening in conversations about the purpose of higher education more broadly – the value proposition of higher education. I've noticed in the Board of Trustees meetings and meetings at higher USHE levels, that we're spending a lot of

time talking about faculty. We're spending a lot of time talking about job readiness. And we have not actually asked a lot of faculty what it is. If anybody is interested in that conversation and wants to join me in trying to converse about that and provide data, information, and arguments about the value proposition of higher education that goes beyond job readiness beyond career placement and beyond what kind of a salary somebody makes after going to college. Please go ahead and reach out to me. I am probably going to make this a discussion item for our next Faculty Senate meeting, so we'll discuss it there. But take it back to all of your faculty and say, Hey, if this matters to you please contact Scott, my goal is to try to set up a town hall, or some conversations where we can try to get some more perspectives on what the value of higher education is within our state. So watch for more on that.

Finally, I just want to encourage everyone to please go ahead and reach out to me. If you have any concerns, I'm always excited to hear about literally any idea, problem, complaint, or feedback, as Kelly says. Please send them all to Scott. He's ready and willing. So we get that done, and that is my report. Are there any questions?

Shalini: I want to give a Graduate Council update. We are very excited that the policy 6.60. We have approved it and cleaned it up. We hope to send it to Jake for a quick look, and then hopefully, present it in the November Faculty Senate meeting and on to the Dean's Council in December. We are going to have one representative who will reach out to the Festival of Excellence Committee, so that we could have maybe a zoom link as well as in person so that the graduate students have an opportunity to present their capstone or any projects they want in the Festival of Excellence, because the majority of them are online. We are going to have David Hatch represent.

9. Call for Executive Session - move was made and seconded. (4:25)

10. Adjourn