



Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 10, 2018

I. Call to order

Larry Smith called to order the regular meeting of the Snow College Faculty Senate at 3:30 p.m. on October 10, 2018 in Noyes, Academy Room.

II. Roll call

The following persons were present: Kent Bean, Jonathan Bodrero, Shawna Cole, Erick Faatz, Matthew Gowans, Danni Larsen, Vance Larsen, Nick Marsing, Jay Olsen, Larry Smith, Allan Stevens, Milinda Weeks, Carolee Woolley, Steve Hood, Brad Olsen, Diane Gardner, Malynda Bjerregaard, Mitch Jenkins, Garth Sorensen, Andrew Nogasky, Kellyanne Ure

III. Opening

A. Larry welcomed all to the meeting including those who are not senators but interested in important agenda items.

IV. Approval of minutes

A. Final minutes approved for September 19, 2018 and September 26, 2018 with a motion by Danni and a second by Jonathan. Unanimous vote of approval.

V. Good News

A. Jay mentioned the success of the forty-sixth FFA Field Day. Eighty high schools attended with 1936 registered students. Thanks for allowing agricultural studies Snow students to miss classes and help with the Field Day. Involved Snow students were asked to directly contact instructors about missing class. Jay prepared a letter for individual students who were involved.

B. Diane Gardner announced receiving a \$40,000.00 grant for the summer program to help rural students become involved in STEM.

C. Jonathan announced that Jeff Wallace was chosen as the faculty-at-large representative on the Budget Task Force.

VI. Committee Reports

A. A & T Committee: This will be a major agenda item. See notes below.

B. Curriculum Committee: Vance and Kellyanne reported that the committee is working on a constitution and bylaws. Larry mentioned that it might be a good idea to have committee chairs visit the Faculty Senate and report on a rotating basis. The Curriculum Committee will be talking about the internship syllabus in the next meeting. Interested faculty members are invited to attend. They meet

Mondays at 4:00 p.m. The co-op syllabus and program will be replaced by the internship syllabus and program.

C. Faculty Development Committee: Jonathan and Nick indicated that they are working on UQI requests. UQI funds have been used almost exclusively for travel and books and the committee is encouraging faculty members to think more creatively about use of the funds. Take this idea back to your divisions.

D. Global Engagement Committee: Danni reported that the Global Engagement Committee has not met but that they are looking for a time to meet.

E. Honors Committee: Jonathan reported that the field trip to the Shakespeare Festival was a great success.

F. Library Committee: Milinda announced that the Library Committee met and talked about instructors placing texts on reserve so that students without texts could use them when needed. The library will spend up to \$1,000.00 per division to buy texts to place on reserve.

G. Professional Track Committee: No report

H. Service Learning Committee: This will be a major agenda item. See notes below.

I. Teaching and Technology Committee: Jay mentioned a new tool that can be used with Canvas to review ADA compliance. Many courses have been identified as being out of compliance. Work closely with Chase Mitchell on any new courses to make sure that they are ADA compliant. Chase will run reports for instructors who request them. Many images are not in compliance.

J. Faculty Association: Allan indicated no report.

K. Adjunct Information: Shawna indicated no report.

L. Student Information: Carolee indicated no report.

M. Ad Hoc/Other:

1. Danni reported that the Budget Task Force is meeting next week. They are trying to find a time when all members of the task force can meet.

VII. Senate Business

A. Larry welcomed those attending with an interest in the Service Learning agenda item. Steve Hood and Mitch Jenkins asked the Senate to help make decisions about the structure of the Service Learning Committee (SLC).

1. Mitch requested that there be an official standing committee with elected members from each division as opposed to an ad hoc structure. Larry explained that similar to the Honors Committee, if an individual wanted to serve on the SLC, he or she has been allowed to attend and serve. There has been a Senate representative to the SLC: Milinda served most recently and Matt has been given the assignment for this academic year. Mitch mentioned the following key elements of his request:

- a. Faculty members who serve would receive A & T credit if officially serving.
- b. There is a need to set up bylaws, standards, and best practices which might be facilitated by a professional committee.
- c. All committee members would be given the opportunity to read literature about current SL practices and philosophy.
- d. There is a need to make sure that the academic elements of SL are followed.
- e. There is the need to develop a rubric for all SL proposals for courses and field work.
- f. Assessment of the impacts of SL is needed.
- g. SL as a high impact practice needs review and implementation.
- h. Recruitment and retention related to SL would be analyzed through assessment and review.

Hopefully a standing committee would be able to more professionally help with these items.

2. Larry brought up several questions and concerns that have surfaced:
- a. Is SL a direct subcommittee of the Senate, or is it (should it be) a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee like the GE Committee?
 - b. Mitch is a staff employee. To whom does he report? Does he report to the SLC, or to the VPAA, or to both? These questions can create a very difficult situation for Mitch.
 - c. It was clarified that the SLC is officially listed in the Faculty Senate bylaws as a standing subcommittee and thus has an assigned Senate representative. Milinda reported that the SLC was supposed to have division representatives, but that some divisions were not regularly represented in SLC meetings. It has for the most part been the practice that there are division representatives on sponsored Senate subcommittees. The Honors program is an exception.
 - d. Jonathan argued that interested people should be allowed to participate even if there were only one voting member from each division.

e. Mitch mentioned that he would like to have staff involvement as well as faculty involvement. Service projects need to be separated from academic SL.

f. Larry mentioned that there is a draft of bylaws that the SLC had been working on. Civic Engagement was added as an element to SL at some point in time. The draft bylaws indicate that the SLC would be a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and that there would be one voting member from each division excluding senators and deans. The bylaws never came up for a vote but could serve as a draft for new bylaws.

g. Kellyanne mentioned that there needs to be a close relationship between the Curriculum Committee and the SLC. If it is not a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, there should probably be a representative(s). The draft bylaws indicate that there would be a member appointed by the Curriculum Committee and two at-large committee members. Steve commented that this model is probably most similar to the regional and national organizations.

h. Steve commented about how the Campus Compact was killed because it was being used for activism and not necessarily for course work. This set up the possibility of legal action. Snow needs to make sure that solid curriculum is part of an SL designated course. The mission and goals of academic SL need to be clearly defined.

i. Nick mentioned that it already seems like there is a structure in place, but that it somehow fell apart. He wondered how a divisional voting structure would help the program improve. Kellyanne asked if the SLC were a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee would the Curriculum Committee need to oversee a structural model? If so, it would probably be similar to the GE Committee model.

j. Mitch's role as coordinator was discussed. He was tasked with creating a program. He could not reconcile some things that were going on with the program and what he found in the literature regarding SL. It was unclear in some cases how courses and/or activities aligned with academic credit. He was assigned to help instructors find and carry out activities that met academic standards for SL.

k. Steve addressed the reporting structure of Mitch's position as being controversial and Mitch was often in a difficult position because of the controversy. Some faculty members wanted to

indicate what kind of program they wanted and have Mitch do what they asked of him. Steve indicated that it was difficult for him to evaluate Mitch's performance and run a budget with that type of structure. How does Mitch know what to do if there is a conflict between the committee and Steve's philosophy regarding purposeful, academic outcomes as related to SL?

l. Based on talking with various involved persons, Larry gave a brief history of the SLC up to the point when Mitch was hired. The job of coordinating the SLC became more than the chair could do. Students were hired but it was still too much work, so the SLC asked for a paid coordinator. The committee set the job description and eventually hired Mitch. Some committee members felt like the committee would oversee the coordinator even if she or he was paid from the VPAA's budget.

m. Malynda requested that the Senate hear from English Brooks and/or Renee Faatz (former chairs of the SLC) before making any decisions. She expressed that she does not see some of the issues raised in the Senate meeting in the same way as Steve and Mitch see them. Until recently, she felt like the SLC had run well as a committee with open membership like the Honors committee. Academic standards, pedagogy, and curriculum were taken seriously. She felt like this is a serious governance issue that might have repercussions for other committees like Honors.

n. Jonathan would like the Senate to look at the SL coordinator's job description and help the committee with the drafting of bylaws process. Other senators also expressed a desire for more information before proceeding.

o. Allan mentioned the need for a clearer demarcation of Steve's vision vs. the previous committee's vision. How does a coordinator fit into committee/administrative structure? This needs to be clearly defined. Mitch is at this Senate meeting to find help to clarify his position and to ask for a standing committee.

p. Nick feels like the Senate needs to act as quickly as possible so that SL can be up and running as soon as possible. What is the best way to provide the necessary information for the Senate to make an informed decision and to move forward in a timely manner? It was decided to invite English and/or Renee and hopefully make a decision in the next Senate meeting (Wednesday, October 24, 2018). The Curriculum Committee could talk about it in their next meeting and provide their feedback.

q. Larry will invite English and Renee, and summarize what he has learned. The Senate requested statements from English, Renee, and Steve. The SLC met for the last time about one year ago.

r. Steve mentioned that the draft bylaws were not sent to all members of the SLC for review. Renee felt slighted and resigned as chair. He questioned whether rehashing the past will be productive or if we should just look at the structure, but admitted that it might be necessary to review the past. Larry and other senators felt like it was important to have some context from which to make decisions.

s. Erick asked if it was accurate to say that there are three competing models. 1. The most recent model was an open committee that anyone could attend as an active participant similar to the Honors Committee. 2. The SLC would be a Senate subcommittee that is already in place, with elected, voting members from each division, a representative from the Senate, and anyone could attend as a non-voting participant. 3. The SLC would be a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee rather than a direct subcommittee of the Senate. Nick mentioned that the reporting structure might be more important than the committee structure. So, what would the reporting structure be for each of the three models? Would three outlines of the models help the Senate move forward?

B. Larry welcomed Sheryl Bodrero to a discussion of the latest draft of the Snow College Advancement and Tenure Policy (A&T document).

1. Sheryl was invited to specifically address concerns about the transition to the new document. All senators received a copy of the latest draft and were asked to carefully review it in preparation for this meeting. Suggestions should be sent to Steve at this point in time because all changes have to be reviewed by legal counsel. Steve Hood will take careful notes on all recommendations and will make changes and run them by legal counsel. The Senate is the sponsoring body for the new document. Steve supported delaying a vote in the College Council to allow for Senate review.

2. A transition committee may be set up. Some senators believed that the committee had already been formed. Others remembered talking about a transition committee and asking their divisions about possible members for the committee.

3. Larry invited general comments first. Kent asked about page seven evaluation criteria for rating candidates and asked if we know what the criteria mean. It seems a little vague to him. Nick asked if a form is being

used for the ratings. Sheryl responded that divisions are different and that each division needs to collect criteria for the Advancement and Tenure Committee (ATC) to use in reviews. Some elements are basic to all faculty members especially regarding teaching. Section 6.3 addresses this element. Within a division there needs to be clear consistency. Some specific wording changes were recommended.

4. Allan expressed that all divisions want good teachers. Any language in the document that conflicts with this idea needs careful review. There needs to be consistency in language used for rank advancement as different from tenure.

5. Milinda brought up section 2.1.6. Why is MFA separated from other forms of terminal degree? An MFA is not a terminal degree in all disciplines.

6. Allan asked if all faculty members have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). All do have MOUs but responsibilities change over time and administration is trying to update them as quickly as possible.

7. Service may be defined differently in section 2.13 and in other areas of the document. This needs to be consistently clarified throughout for different types of service.

8. Sabbaticals as described in the document were brought up. The Board of Regents (BOR) document recently changed regarding sabbaticals and Snow College must align with the BOR information. The Faculty Development Committee will eventually take over review of sabbaticals from the ATC.

9. Larry recommended that the discussion step back from a point-by-point discussion and allow Sheryl to specifically address transition to the new A&T document.

10. The current ATC will review the document and possibly vote on it next Tuesday (Sheryl later indicated that with the number of recommendations for changes, the ATC will not vote until it has full Senate feedback).

11. Sheryl mentioned that the transition team would need to consider at a minimum the following items.

a. Current Professional Development Units (PDUs). This might decrease some wait times between advancements.

b. Currently, there is a minimum of four years between advancements. The new document would alter this especially for

people with terminal degrees who might be subject to a five year wait rather than a four year wait.

c. The probationary year after determining tenure eligibility is going away.

d. There will be two interim reviews. More of the review work will go to divisions.

e. Criteria collection from all divisions needs to happen.

f. There are two types of dissatisfactory review designations. One allows for remediation and retention of employment; the other indicates severance from Snow College.

g. There are many people without terminal degrees in line for advancement. Do we have the money to cover pay increases?

h. Brad mentioned 10.2.5 regarding discipline. There is quite vague language with regard to institutional expectations. Steve clarified that this section must be in line with BOR documents about basic expectations for faculty members.

i. Should a Faculty Evaluation Team (FET) only send forward an evaluation or should it make a recommendation as well? Recommended specific language will be provided with training.

j. The A&T document discussion was tabled in order to deal with other pressing business. Send further recommendations to Steve. (See information regarding a Senate work meeting below.)

C. Larry reintroduced the need for the Senate to carry out a College Council representative selection.

1. It seems that there are times when one or two divisions have significantly more representation on the College Council.

2. Garth expressed his concern about faculty members and senators being concerned about too many representatives from one division. He feels that all representatives have fairly represented concerns of the faculty and institution as a whole rather than personal or divisional concerns only. We need to develop campus trust rather than campus divisiveness. He suggests that the Senate continue to select at-large College Council representatives.

3. Larry talked with Heidi Johnson and Mike Brenchley, current College Council representatives, and they unanimously confirmed that an at-large

model for selection continue. Mike did say that people from different disciplines perceive things differently and may provide perspectives that may not come out otherwise. Sheryl confirmed this idea and proposed a different model for voting in which faculty members vote for representatives outside their divisions. Several others thought that this would be a good voting model to follow.

4. Brad mentioned that a request for a diversity of divisional representation is not about a personal or divisional attack, but a hope for full representation. Vance mentioned a need for collaboration, but that is difficult without a representative in the room.

5. Allan proposed the need for a timely vote for a faculty-at-large representative with each faculty member voting for two nominated representatives not from his or her division as soon as possible. This vote would be for the position currently filled by Garth Sorensen: He is eligible for reelection since no term limits are indicated. After extended discussion, Jonathan motioned and Allan seconded that there be a call for nominations with help from Amy Noblett or Becky Hermansen. Nominations would be due by 5:00 p.m., Monday, October 22, 2018 (Erick confirmed that Amy would handle nominations). There will be further discussion in a future Senate meeting regarding voting after nominations are in. Senators voted in favor, except Vance voted against the motion.

D. Milinda proposed, with discussion, that there be a work meeting to continue discussing the A&T document. The meeting was scheduled for 3:30 p.m., Monday, October 15, in the Noyes, Heritage room.

Adjournment

Larry adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m. The next regular meeting will be 3:30 p.m., Wednesday, October 24, 2018.

Minutes submitted by Erick Faatz

Revised 10/22/2018

Final minutes approved 10/24/2018