FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

November 7, 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, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Kevin Stein, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: Scott Hansen

Proxies:

Guests: **Mindy** Benson, **Jake** Johnson, **Camille** Thomas, Shalina Kesar, Jill Mallek, Dr. Gretchen Ellefson, John Lisonbee, John Karpel

1. Call to order (4:04)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests(4:04)
    a. President Benson
    b. Interim Provost Mendini
    c. Associate Provost James Sage
    d. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
    e. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
    f. IT Project Manager and Staff Association Past President, John Lisonbee
    g. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
    h. WAFSEC Interim Chair, Dr. Gretchen Ellefson
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:05)
    a. October 31, 2024 Minutes
    b. Motion to approve was made and seconded. Minutes approved 26/26.
4. Events and Announcements: (4:07)

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. Giving Wings to T-Bird Dreams Campaign: Campaign Website, T-Shirt Design Vote
d. Student Alumni Association Finals Survival Kits (cost $20.00). Can be purchased for any student using this link Finals Survival Kits.
e. Faculty and Staff Tailgate Harris Pavilion, Nov. 9th @ 11:30am.
    i. Faculty and staff get their two free tickets, but a 20% discount on any additional tickets.
    ii. RSVP using this form: Tailgate & Game RSVP Form

5. Action Items: (4:09)
    a. Policy 6.28 Revision - Amendments from Deans Council (Kelly Goonan/Scott Knowles)

Kelly: The deans council did vote on 6.28 this week and the changes they made were in section C2b of the policy under, “prepare for and meet classes as scheduled, including final examinations.” The Deans requested adding, “in accordance with policy 6.46”, which is the SUU academic scout scheduling and calendar policy.

So that was just a clarification in the second sentence of that same section, “when that is not possible. By virtue of circumstances”, the Deans added, “inform the supervisor and arrange for alternative activities or instruction” This version of the policy should be available in the link in the agenda. It changes, “prepare for and meet classes as scheduled, including final examinations in accordance with policy, 6.4 6. When that is not possible, by virtue of circumstances, inform the supervisor, and arrange for alternative activities or instruction that enable progress towards course objectives.”

That was the largest change. The second change that was made was in section C.2d. That is, the one that instructs faculty to instruct students in a manner and modality that corresponds to the delivery method specified. Katya brought up the catalog that was included in that sentence and course. Modalities are not prescribed in the course catalog, so that was changed. That was removed and just changed to schedule.

And then in sections D and E. There was a question about the difference between dismissal and termination. The original language was dismissal comma or termination. In looking through

other USHE policies, Jake Johnson clarified that dismissal and termination are used interchangeably, and don't necessarily mean different things. The Deans requested to remove the comma or to put in a slash. So those are the changes that the Deans made to policy 6.28, and then approved.

Scott: Here is the new language: “IV.C.2.b: Prepare for and meet classes as scheduled, including final examinations in accordance with Policy 6.46. When that is not possible by virtue of circumstances, Inform the supervisor and arrange for alternative activities or instruction that enable progress towards course objectives.”

IV.C.2.d: Instruct students in a manner and modality that corresponds to the delivery method specified in the course schedule.

Any discussion? Any motions

John Benedict and Rachel Parker motioned for approval. Policy 6.28 was approved by 25/25 voting members.

b. Policy 6.1 Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure - Revision (Kelly Goonan)

Kelly: Most of the changes are clarifications or cleaning up the pre-existing language. There are very few changes that actually change our process under 6.1

I have listed out all of the changes, and I can share that with folks: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eCZaF3AOxLxRT1-XwWpvRKPYwMIEwP2fZZGDlkzK8L4/edit?usp=sharing

The main substantive changes that were made were adding provisions for people who are serving as academic administrators who may or may not seek promotion during that assignment that was added in specifically for Associate Deans in Section G4 under faculty responsibilities to give Deans Associate Deans the option to either be evaluated according to policy 6.2 or they could opt to be evaluated following 6.1 if they were serving as an associate professor and potentially looking to promote up to full professor the other substantive change was related to midpoint reviews. We removed reference of midpoint reviews for NTT faculty that was causing some confusion because NTT faculty have an AIM and complete an FEC report every year up until the point that they are promoted.

Promotion is optional for NTT faculty to pursue, and because it is optional, there is no fixed midpoint in an NTT’s timeline when they may or may not seek promotion. So we decided to remove that. It had originally been included because the Academic Affairs Committee had thought a couple years ago that the WAFSEC group was looking toward linking compensation with a midpoint review. But since WAFSEC has moved in a different direction, it made more sense to remove reference of a midpoint review to NTT. Faculty can absolutely still pursue

promotion. There is language in the policy that notes the deadline for NTT faculty seeking promotion. That's in Section G8, point a. Under promotion.

The final substantive change is reflecting the requirement of tenured faculty to complete an annual evaluation that is required by a new state law that went into effect with Hb438, which was passed at the last legislative session, and so we removed post promotion annual FEC report for NTT faculty only, as all faculty are now required to complete an annual report.

We added language to the sections related to FEC reports and AIMs that specifically address tenured faculty going through that process. And we also updated Section G15 year review to note that in between five year reviews, tenured faculty will complete an FEC report and an AIM.

We also clarified the language. There was some confusion. We heard this year that folks were submitting a midpoint, or they were submitting a tenure application, and then the dashboard was also prompting them to submit an FEC report. We clarified that you only submit one document per year. It's either an FEC report or a midpoint review application or a tenure application, a promotion application, or a five year review. You do not have to submit an FEC report when you are also submitting those larger documents – that has been clarified to state that you do not have to submit multiple documents. However, when you are submitting one of those larger applications, you should make sure that that application is accounting for the previous year.

i. Draft Revised Appendix A - Table of Required Documents

In addition to the changes to the actual policy. We have proposed revisions to a few of the appendices. Appendix A is the table of required documents that was updated to reflect that all faculty now complete an annual FEC report at the appropriate time. We clarified promotion and tenure for tenure track faculty applying for tenure and then we updated the post promotion and post tenure annual report to reflect that it goes to the department chair.

ii. Draft Revised Appendix B - Faculty Dashboard Deadline Schedule

In Appendix B, the deadlines. Again, we removed reference to a midpoint review for NTT faculty, and based on feedback from the provost's office, we were able to give most of the committees and evaluative entities more time to review various documents, the only one that we were not able to change was the Midpoint review. There was a question about the time needed to notify faculty that they will not be renewed. Midpoint review is the 1st time that a tenure track faculty could be recommended for non-reappointment, outside of other egregious kinds of behavioral issues that notification has to be given to the faculty in December to give them appropriate time to plan for the next year, and that is required by law.

If a faculty member applies for tenure and is not awarded tenure, they are given a terminal year at SUU, and so we were able to build extra time into the deadlines for tenure reviews, because faculty do have that terminal year, and we were not required to meet that December/January deadline. I did want to to point that out, because that was a question that came up.

The change deadlines was largely due to feedback that we received from folks serving on department P&T committees. In order to have the most thorough review, 10 working days was not enough time for them to turn around all of the materials they were working with. It is the same thing for department chairs. They had a pretty tight timeline, and so we are grateful to the provost and the deans for agreeing to shorten their timeline, and also to spread it out a little bit to give those other evaluative levels more time to review applications.

iii. Draft addition to Appendix D - NTT Promotion Schedule Table

The final change that we're recommending is just adding some tables to Appendix D. Currently appendix D only presents a timetable for tenure. It does not present a timetable for promotion for NTT faculty, and to clean up the actual policy. We thought that it was better to remove the tables from the policy document and put them in the appropriate appendix. And so appendix D would just add these timetables for promotion for non tenure track faculty to that appendix. This is the minimum time requirements needed to apply for promotion, and that applying for promotion is optional for NTT faculty.

So that's a summary of the recommended revisions to Policy 6.1 and its supporting documentation.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eCZaF3AOxLxRT1-XwWpvRKPYwMIEwP2fZZGDlkzK8L4/edit?usp=sharing

Scott: Any conversation discussion/questions. Is there a motion to approve.

Elise Leahy and Nathan Slaughter motioned to approve the revisions to policy 6.1 Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. The motion carried 25/25.

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

Kelly: This is a reminder that this policy is required by the Department of Education to determine where students are enrolled when they are in a degree program.

Scott: Any discussion. Any motion?

Maren Hirchi and Elise Leahy motioned to approve policy 6.4. Yay: 23 Nay: 2.

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

Kelly: These revisions have been proposed by the IRB to clean up the language and make sure it was updated. Major changes were in IRB membership to change some of the references to diversity and gender, and to say that the IRB shall be staffed by sufficiently qualified members

through experience, expertise, and sensitivity to such issues as community attitudes and the selection to the IRB should not be made based on gender.

Bryan: I have chaired the IRB Some observations about this policy. One is that the federal regulations got updated in 2018, and our IRB policy incorporates the actual language of the policy. We have the outdated policy, the pre 2018 policy, here. For example, it doesn't include the current exemption categories. So there's various ways this policy should be updated that are not updated to comply with federal regulations.

The other thing I would mention is that the suggested changes, the removal of language about selection and diversity, that language is actually literally still in the federal policy. So we're taking things out that federal policy requires us to do.

The Federal Policy:
(https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/revised-common-rule-reg-text-unofficial-2018-requirements.pdf).

We may want to note the language used in the federal regulation and consider whether we want to remove that from our policy as they are required to by Federal law.

Jake: We've got to make more significant revisions. But given House Bill 261, they wanted to just move those through. Our hope is to significantly adjust the policy based on the common rule but we haven't been able to get to that space. And that's largely a reflection of just my own bandwidth at this point.

Bryan: The changes related to diversity. I'm not sure how we'd handle those with regards to the Federal regulations differing from the state ones, and which takes priority.

Jake: Our emphasis will be to continue to follow the law.

bryan: The federal one you mean.

Jake: Yes.

Bryan: So then we wouldn't want to scratch all that language about diversity because that is in the federal law.

Jake: Our overall plan for that revision is to not replicate language in the law but just say we're following the common rule in the policy. Because the law is going to change, and we don't want to have to change our policy every time the law changes, we're just gonna say we're going to follow the most current version of the common rule and hopefully that eliminates any language to references that are in the law in our policy. It will just be done by reference. We won't replicate the language of the law. Does that make sense?

Bryan: Yes, I agree. I think that's definitely what we should do. But the current changes that we're proposing either differ from the federal regulations, or are contradictory to them. It

seems like we don’t need to make any changes because it doesn’t improve our position with regards to the federal regulations.

Elise: We may need more time if we are not in compliance with federal policy? Regarding community attitudes… Last time we changed that to specifically the academic community (on another policy).

Derek: Perhaps we should table it, instead of passing it in an incomplete form.

Michele: I agree with Elise and Derek

Chris: The policy says it's temporary. So does that change anything? If we're voting on a temporary policy?

Kelly: The goal is to make the temporary changes that were approved in June. I do want to respond to Elisa's comment with the community attitudes. The way the text reads, the IRB shall be sufficiently qualified through the experience and expertise of its members, and sensitive to such issues as community attitudes, to promote respect for its advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human participants. So that's where the community attitudes piece comes in.

Maren: There is a contradiction between our policy and state and federal law which seems beyond our paygrade. Maybe we should table it.

Elise: Is there some reason why we would have to rush, especially given the conflict between the federal law, which seems important, and the state?

Scott: The rush for most of these policies, and I mean we've been going through it fairly meticulously, so I hesitate to use the word rush, but the reason we're going through these policies is because we had to put in several policies in an emergency form over the summer. That's where the temporary policy comes from, which was approved by the Board of Trustees, and there is a time limit on how long that will be. The Board of Trustees, at their last meeting in October, did give us additional time and they also indicated they did not want to see all of these policies all at once. But the prioritization of how that's getting organized, to trickle them all into the Board of Trustees is not something that's really our job – that's kind of the job of the provost as well as the president's office – to manage how much is going to the Board of Trustees and when. I imagine that we could say we should wait on this policy and make sure that we change the language as Jake suggested, saying, we follow the procedures of the common law, and then we don't replicate any of the legal language in the policy. And then, whatever the Federal law is, is what the Federal law is, and that would be what guides us from that point on. I'm not sure how feasible or not feasible that is. Jake, do you want to weigh in?

Jake: We can work to get the language adapted to the whole thing we have. We are working towards that. I feel alright given that we've gotten an extension from the trustees. I think maybe

we can confirm a full board of changes with the IRB and bring it back. It would be easier to just say, we're following the common rule and stop replicating language in the law.

Scott: Absolutely. If that is the case, I just want to remind people of the kinds of motions that we can make specifically in this case, I might recommend a postponement. And what this motion would mean is that we would put off the question until such a time as Jake in Academic Affairs is able to revise the policy more fully and bring it back to Faculty Senate. That's what that would mean when we say table. It literally means that we would have to come back in the same meeting and adjust it, and it is often sometimes colloquially, means that we would come back in the next meeting. But if we postpone definitely for when Academic Affairs and Jake is ready to bring this policy back in its complete form. Then we are ready for it to happen.

Jake: You should probably plan to see it in January.

Scott: Postpone indefinitely is a little bit different. Postpone indefinitely means that we're basically killing the entire motion, and we have no desire to ever bring it back up. There are still ways to bring it back up. But postponing definitely based on a circumstance actually gets us there faster and easier.

Elise: Is there some reason why we would have to rush given the conflit?

Scott: The rush for most of these policies is because we had to put in several policies in emergency form and there is a time limit. We have been given additional time though they've asked not to be overloaded with these. I imagine this could be one we wait on.

Jake: We can continue to work to get the language. Because of our extensions we can take more time on this one.

John: It does sound like present wording wishes to follow Utah law as opposed to federal regulations. It seems ambiguous. I believe we should seek legal opinions

John: I would like to make a motion to postpone definitely.

Mike: I second this.

Scott. Is there any more discussion? Hearing none lets vote.

Yay: 22 votes and the motion has passed.

e. Policy 6.38 Faculty Hiring - Revision (Kelly Goonan)

Two areas have changed in section C. It removes the sentence, SUU promotes hiring practices that enhance faculty diversity in all its forms. That is a result of HB 261 similar in E. The search committee will be composed of at least three faculty members, and it removes, including members of each gender and representation from the program. The other proposed changes are just spelling fixes.

David Hatch and John Benedict motion to approve Policy 6.38 Faculty Hiring. The motion was passed Yay: 24 Abstain: 2 The motion has passed.

6. Discussion Items: (4:45)

    a. 6.60 Graduate Studies: Personnel and Curriculum Revision (Shalini Kesar and Jake Johnson)

Shalini: Sure. I'm going to share the screen with the edits that you can see. If you go to the website, we've crossed out the university graduate curriculum committee because the graduate council does not support or advise the Curriculum Committee anymore Number 2 says, the dean of graduate studies will chair, etc. We've removed that because logistically, that doesn't exist. Following that the number 3 follows the same, that the appointment of the graduate council and the graduate committee, etcetera. Those roles don't exist so we are cleaning up wherever it says deans of graduate studies.

We added one sentence here, and we've actually received feedback from Katya, Jake, and the Graduate Council Committee members that has been approved.

We wrote: we are a resource to faculty and departments who are developing new graduate degrees. That was a better wording rather than saying that we are actually taking control of the whole graduate curriculum. The Graduate Council does not propose graduate programs. Only the directors and the college departments.

Jake: Well, I just wanna check in with Katya on some dates that were in the policy. The dates approved and amended. Those still need to stay there. We just add that there's an additional amendment. We just want to indicate. Every date in which a change was made. We'll just add, after February 18th 2016, that it was amended again.

David: I have a question from one of our faculty. "A few thoughts on Policy 6.60: qualifications to teach graduate courses mention staff. It might be a good idea to ask if this is referring to exempt staff. There are a few factors to consider now for overtime pay and eligibility to teach for staff members."

Shalini: In that meeting we did discuss this. We are also trying to add the roles and responsibilities of graduate directors. Someone in the graduate council said that we might add that there rather than here.

David: There might be people in other programs who might have an issue

Shalini: That’s a good point.

Jake: I think, with the word “may”, I wouldn't go anywhere beyond that may be permissive. And so departments in practice need to think about some of those restrictions. And so I go back to this, the faculty member, we think this is permissive, they would have the ability to take that into consideration in their practice of selecting folks.

Scott: Any more discussion on this? Hearing none, let's move this to an action item to the next meeting. Please share this with your faculty.

b. Faculty Scholarship and the Non-traditional Student Office (Jon Karpel)

Jon: The non-traditional student office got back to me and just wondered, since the primary condition for our scholarship is being a non-traditional student, they wondered if we could have the non-traditional office administer the scholarship for us. They have the criteria to go through the people who apply, and then they would send us a short list and have the Faculty Senate approve the selections to approve for the scholarship. Do we need to vote on this? What are the next steps?

Scott: This meeting we will discuss and next meeting we could vote. Any discussion?

Chris: In the past, we've had people apply for the scholarship. Would there be an extension – some of the issues seemed to be that some people weren't getting it in time.

Scott: My understanding was that we were getting a low number of applications because the application itself was arduous. So we've made changes to mitigate that. We're also going to try to hit this pretty hard in our February meetings, just to remind faculty to reach out to non-traditional students who would be eligible for this scholarship and encourage them to apply for it. So the goal is to have more applicants. And when we actually have the applicants, it's a simple matter of communicating to the Executive Council, and then giving it to the Senate to approve them. This question specifically is, whether or not we should allow the non-trad office to administer it, or if we should continue the way that we've done it before, with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee administering it, ie.. going through the applications and making a selection. Please take this back to your faculty and departments, request their feedback on this issue, and we will have it as an action item at our next Faculty Senate meeting

c. WAFSEC Budget Request (Chris Monson and Gretchen Ellefson)

Gretchen: We have put together a proposal as a part of WAFSEC for a budget request, as you may remember from earlier this semester, WAFSEC is now being asked to collaborate with the Staff Association to put together joint requests, or at least collaborated requests for faculty and staff compensation.

This is supposed to be a yearly task and you all kindly updated our charge to include budget requests. We're now at the point where we're not quite ready to put together the joint request, but we, on the faculty side, have a request put together, which is linked now in the agenda. I also want to offer a fair amount of context here as we're working and collaborating with the Staff Association under the umbrella of what we're calling the Compensation Council or Compensation Committee. We're also trying, of course, to work with you all in the Faculty Senate. And so there are a couple of different elements of the proposal you'll end up seeing. And some of this is coming from the Compensation Council, and some of this is just the WAFSEC proposal. So that's the first element to keep in mind.

The second element to keep in mind is, you may also remember that over the summer we put together a request for funds to bring all faculty up to at least their CUPA median. I have been asked to lump that proposal in with this present proposal, so what we ended up doing is creating a proposal to distribute COLA funds. So cost of living adjustments as a combined percentage and flat rate increase. So the 1.5% increase and then plus $1,200, which would be under the umbrella of cost of living. This is supposed to be uniform across all faculty and staff.

When the Compensation Council sends the proposal, the idea is going to be that everybody just gets this as our proposed COLA. Of course it is possible that the legislature is going to mandate a particular thing under COLA, so that might not end up being possible for us. But we're asking if we have the latitude there for a unified proposal for COLA. Over and above that amount, the faculty will put together a proposal and staff will put together a proposal. So the second element here is the faculty side of this, which is the CUPA median proposal. So the updated numbers for what it's going to take to bring all faculty up to CUPA median will be the additional proposal for faculty over and above COLA. So that's the plan.

Scott: All right. So this will move to an action item for our next Faculty Senate meeting. Thank you so much, Gretchen and WAFSEC for all your work on that proposal. I look forward to more conversation in a couple of weeks.

d. SUU Volleyball and Institutional Neutrality (Scott Knowles, 10 minutes)

Scott: A faculty senator asked me to anonymously bring up this discussion item, which is SUU volleyball and institutional neutrality for those who may or may not be aware of this incident, I'm gonna throw an article in the chat from the Deseret News. That sort of outlines what happened, and when it happened:

https://www.deseret.com/politics/2024/10/02/utah-state-san-jose-state-university-transgender-womens-volleyball/

SUU athletics, just so everyone is aware, did make a statement at the time that the volleyball match was canceled and it reads:

“The Southern Utah University volleyball team opted to compete in just two non-conference games at the Santa Clara Tournament. Southern Utah informed the tournament directors and opposing teams of the decision, and we wish them well with the remainder of their respective seasons.”

There have been questions about what this means with regards to institutional neutrality, and whether the volleyball team's decision to not compete is a political statement. So the narrative that's going around, as you'll see in the article, is that there was a rumor of a transgender student on the San Jose State team, and that this is the rumor or alleged to be the reason why SUU volleyball canceled their match against them. I will once again refer you to the statement

that athletics has given us on that front. This became more political when various political figures in Utah, including Governor Spencer. Cox, came out – as you'll see in the article – in support. Specifically, he said. “I stand with the students, coaches, and leadership at SUU t-birds and at USU aggies.” Utah State University made a similar move in their decision to forego their women's volleyball match against San Jose State. “It is essential that we preserve a space for women to compete fairly and safely. Our female athletes are left grappling with the difficult issue, because the NCAA has failed in its responsibility to protect female athletes and women's sports. It's time for the NCAA to take this seriously and protect our female student athletes.”

The question being raised is how does this jive with institutional neutrality? What works there? What doesn't. If a volleyball team makes a decision not to play against another team that has a trans athlete. Is that a political statement? Is it an unsettled issue that SUU is then taking a position on.

Questions or discussion on this? We would like to ask the administration for more clarity on this position.

Elise: Is it the SUU players that opted out?

Scott: You know, it's not a hundred percent clear who made the ultimate decision. Again, their statement came from, I believe, SUU athletics.They said the SUU volleyball university team opted to compete in just two conference games. To me, that would read as the team/the coaches, some combination there.

John: This is BS and I want to be on record that this is very much a political position.

Scott: Just to be clear. The faculty senator who wanted me to bring this up is very interested in this being pushed forward to ask upper administration for more clarity on how institutional neutrality operates in a situation like this, as well as in other situations.

Elise: there was a peaceful student protest. Our Student Rep reported on this last meeting. I am interested in how this fits in with political neutrality. If we have to get rid of all kinds of inclusive language and not be political. Then let's not be political. This seems like they are making a political statement.

Maren: This doesn't feel neutral.

Mike: Can we get administration's opinion?

Scott: We could put this in writing and ask administration. If she would like to respond now she is welcome to.

Mindy: The decision was made in athletics and the coach has the right to decide when and how her team can play and if they are ready to play. Those decisions don't come up to a presidential level. So this was decided within the volleyball coaches realm.

Scott: Do you have any thoughts on the role of institutional neutrality?

Mindy: Of course, I do. And we're trying to figure out what that means and looks like for us. There are some important pieces to this that I'm not sure I can share. The athlete has not come out as trans, so it's not up to us to be discussing if the athlete is or is not, or if that is why it was or was not.

There is so much more there that is not our business or oversight. So the coach made a decision on what she knew at the time.

John: I'd just like to get a little clarification: we decided not to play based on a rumor that this person was transgender.

Scott: The only information that we have on how the decision was made is the statement from the athletics department. I don't know why the decision was made. What I know is that Governor Cox, as well as a lot of other people on campus as well as other political figures, have come out and stated that they believe that that is what it was about. And that there is a distinction to be had. The coach or athletics have never said we canceled this game because we believe the other team had a trans athlete. But other political figures in Utah have said that.

Maren: For whatever it's worth on this note – I have read news reports that there is a lawsuit that one of the San Jose State volleyball players has made due to her suspicions that there's a trans player on the team without confirmation, because that player has never disclosed.

Scott: The question we are trying to ask is really about SUU's institutional neutrality. As President Benson wisely pointed out, we really shouldn't be adjudicating whether there was or wasn't a trans student on the team. It's a question of whether SUU made a political statement through a volleyball team act that is viewed by state lawmakers as a political statement, but one that they clearly support.

Kevin: How about, "The views of the volleyball team and/or the athletic department don't necessarily represent the view of the SUU administration, faculty, and the staff."

Chris: I know faculty can't make public statements representing SUU. They didn't say anything direct but it has been interpreted by those outside the institution. So It seems more of an outside perspective. No representative of the institution said that was what they were doing. So this seems like it's more an issue of how things are being interpreted from the outside. The other thing is that the administration of our institution isn't making a statement. So if a coach in athletics does something, do they have academic freedom, or some equivalent of that, where they can decide for the situation that they're in. As an institution, we're taking heat for this but no one officially said anything to indicate what the rumors are. It seems like there's really nothing else to talk about. Because our institution isn't making a political statement. We should be clear about what actually happened. Everything going on outside of us is a separate thing.

Scott: Please take this back to your faculty and see if we have more discussion about this next meeting.

Mindy: We can look into this regarding institutional neutrality and what it looks like when others bring it into a political realm on the outside. What does institutional neutrality look like? And how far does that go?

e. Dual Career Assistance Program (Kelly Goonan)

   i. Example from Utah State University: https://www.usu.edu/provost/faculty-recruitment/dual-career-assistance

   ii. Policy: https://www.usu.edu/policies/385/

Kelly: This conversation is more to gauge interest. I have heard over the years that sometimes when faculty move to Cedar City it is difficult for partners to find jobs here. USU has an assistance program through HR to facilitate qualified spouses find employment at the university. If both partners can find gainful/meaningful employment they are likely to stay here. I reached out to Scott and Matt Mckenzie to ask if this might be something that SUU would be interested in looking into. I know that we have had some faculty leave over the years that I've been here because their spouses had difficulty finding employment in the community.

I'm happy to share Utah State's policy as an example.

Marin: I would appreciate

Scott: We will get those linked into the agenda so you could bring it back to your faculty and see what they think about that kind of a policy.

Procedurally, what this would mean is, we might make a resolution saying, we'd really love it if SUU wanted to create a dual career assistance program similar to Utah State University.

It would then go to the Cabinet and, if they wanted to move forward with that, would send it to the governing body of a policy, in this case it would probably be HR. The HR might reach out to us and have someone like Kelly or other faculty senators who want to join in the conversation of the creation of such a policy.

Kelly: I will say Academic Affairs has had our hands full, so I have not looked yet to see if other USHE institutions have a similar policy, but I did come across Utah State's policy and read it.

Scott: Please take this information about a dual career assistance program back to your departments.

f. Call for New Business / Faculty Input

Ryan: I am working with Ashley Zimmerman on the administrative drop policies.

7. Standing Committee Updates: (5:21)

    a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)

    b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)

Yes, so we received 40 appeals last month, and we only declined two of them. We received 36, and reduced the rest of them.

    c. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)

Tailgate for football game starts at 6:30pm. Come out and enjoy!

    d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

        i. GE and R470 Alignment Memo

Ryan: Camille Thomas has kindly put together a memo updating us on the work of the General Education Committee. They are recommending some changes to align us with the new USHE R470 policy. On page two, you can see the core and breadth areas that they're suggesting that we go with. We contemplated adding some things, but Provost Anderson suggested that we not require students to take more time in order to graduate. So, ultimately we didn't do that. We have the usual 12 credits for the core areas and 16 credits for the breadth areas and one credit for Info 1010, which the library offers. They're recommending that we add language to our syllabi to indicate to students that this is a general education course and that it's fulfilling those expectations. We will be doing an additional survey. Students will receive a survey and each question will correspond with one of the learning outcomes that was put together across the state and the faculty member will also receive a survey. Faculty members are asked to encourage students to complete that survey, and we'll keep that data and use it longitudinally. Primarily, so that James Sage can use that, for when the accreditors come to review us, they like to see that we have that data, and that we're tracking it, and that we're implementing it to improve the program.

Camille: Currently our GE requirements are 30-36 credits and this will take it down to 28 and that is as per R470, who now will have GE programs in the USHE Institution from 27 to 30. So we decided to land on 28.

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

Please see this link and take back to your faculty.

    f. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)

    g. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

    h. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)

i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

j. 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)

k. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)

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

The Academic Affairs committee is looking at 6.6 Academic Freedom and also looking to make changes to clarify procedures in 6.15, Faculty Leaves. We've reviewed faculty sabbatical submissions – there were some late submissions so we are reviewing those.

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

So UCFSL will meet on Friday, sSo nothing to report there yet. We have heard earlier in the meeting what they've been doing. We're gonna finish up on faculty pay requests and then move on to workload, etc. Then on the Ad Hoc Committee outside 6. policies. We are just starting to look at those, and I'll let you know when we get updates on that.

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

I did meet with Jake Johnson and Parker Grimes about some of the dashboard changes that were being recommended by department P&T Committees, and we did agree on a number of changes, including giving them power to change committee members and delete submissions within the dashboard to department chairs. So department chairs will have that power.

P&T committee chairs at any level are going to upload additional documents that they might request from faculty applicants. In the past. We were having faculty applicants upload this, which was actually not quite in conjunction with policy. So we're going to make it work so that it goes directly with policy.

We are going to change the order of votes that happen to the following, so the committee chair will put in the written evaluation and the ranking acceptable progress development required and recommendation for non-reappointment. Then committee members will select yes or no to affirm two things at the same time, (1) they are affirming that they are accepting the work of the committee is accurate, and (2) they are affirming that in the case of rank, advancement, or tenure, or another approving action, that they are agreeing to that action.

We're also gonna remove recommendation for non reappointment from the options for the annual FEC reports for tenured faculty so that will no longer come up and we are going to create a system where each individual committee member ranks a FEC report or application for tenure rank advancement within the system. But we are going to emphasize this work in the evaluators training. So we aren't going to do that. That work will still be done, however, the department P&T committee or any of the P&T committees want to move forward with it, but we are going to make sure that there's a lot of training to make that happen.

Department chairs actually do have the power to distribute a list. They can see a list of what the faculty within a department needs to submit for the next year with regard to P&T and faculty evaluation. We're going to have training that helps them to understand that they can download that list and distribute it to the department P&T committee chairs and the college committee chairs so that folks know what to expect as far as what's coming in from what group.

We're also going to create some training for faculty on PDF creation. compiling, creating links, etc. As many of you know, we have to submit a single PDF application when we submit our P&T documents. And this is arduous for a lot of us. So some training to make that happen and help us to make that happen will go a long way.

Finally, we are going to push up the availability of the dashboard to August 1st so that faculty members could submit their documents as early as August 1st while also providing training for faculty so they can work on their documents whenever they'd like during the summer. This comes from a lot of folks wanting to do their application materials early, but not feeling like they can. And there's a lot of different reasons why we don't want to open it up in like May as soon as it's over, but we are committed to opening it by August 1st and then getting people on board to work on that however they'd like.

Maren: Is there a document/memo that I could share with my department?

Scott: Yes – I will put that together. https://forms.gle/9cp1oqAXexrgTM9E9

8. Call for Executive Session (5:34) motion was made by John Benedict and motioned by Ryan Seimers for a session. Motion carried.

9. Adjourn