

## Meeting Minutes

February 11, 2026 @ 3:30pm

---

### I. Call to Order & Review of Minutes

#### A. Assembly & Attendance

The Senate meeting began at 3:30 pm.

**Present:** Trent Fawcett (Pres), Dennis Schugk (VP), Steve Hart, Heather Holland, Rachel Keller, Adam Larsen, Liz Lee, Jay. Moosman\*, Kade Parry, Jason West\*, Klarissa Wilkinson

**Absent:** K. Carter

**Guests:** Jacob L. Thomas (Parliamentarian), Stacey McIff (College President), Michael Austin (Provost), Mike Brenchley (Dean), Hilary Withers (former senator), Dyson Winsor (SBO Senate), Andrea Cabria (SBO), Robert Holt (Advising)\*

*\*Indicates online participation over Microsoft Teams.*

#### B. Review of Minutes

Senators reviewed the minutes from the **January 28** meeting. A. Larsen had previously sent Parliamentarian Thomas some small corrections to the 1/28 minutes. **MOTION** by K. Parry to approve the January 28 minutes as amended. **2nd:** A. Larsen. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously of senators present.

### II. Senate Membership

#### A. Spring 2026 Elections

##### 1. Upcoming Division/School Elections

J. Thomas reported on division senator elections so far, as described in the following table.

Current Senator	Term	Eligible for Reelection?	New Senator (July 1)
<b>Karen Carter</b> Business & Tech	2020–2026 (2nd)	No	
<b>Adam Larsen</b> Fine Arts	2023–2026 (1st)	Yes	*No updates.
<b>Steve Hart</b> Science & Math	2024–2026 (filling term)	Yes	*Process going forward.
<b>Dennis Schugk</b> Social Science	2021–2027 (retiring)	No	David Rodriguez (filling term, 2026–2027)

## 2. Senate-Administered Elections

J. Thomas also reported on recent campuswide Senate-administered elections: **(1)** Adjunct Representative to the Faculty Senate and **(2)** At-Large College Council Representative from the Richfield campus. The results were as follows.

Election	Candidate A	Candidate B	Abstentions	Participation
<b>Adjunct Representative</b>	<b>Liz Lee ✓</b> Math 30 votes (73%)	<b>Mike Lewellen</b> Software Engineering 10 votes (24%)	1 (3%)	40/~180 22%
<b>College Council–Richfield</b>	<b>Denny Dennis</b> Welding 20 votes (25%)	<b>Amanda Wood ✓</b> Cosmetology 54 votes (67%)	7 (9%)	81/~174 47%

**a. Certification of Results.** Senator Parry asked J. Thomas about the rationale of making the vote tallies public, expressing concern that some losing candidates, when seeing the total, may be hesitant to run for office again. Thomas responded that he had batted the decision around for some time, but ultimately decided to publish the results because of some controversies with other recent elections, expressing a desire for transparency. The most recent election before these had three candidates, which allowed the second and third-place finishers' names to be withheld. But with only two candidates per election here, such anonymity was impossible. Thomas further expressed willingness to follow the guidance of the Senate in publishing full election results, and requested that the Senate certify the election results as shown to ensure faculty confidence.

**MOTION** by K. Parry to certify the election results as shown. **2nd:** R. Keller. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously by all senators present.

**b. Election Decorum.** J. Thomas reported to senators that he had heard from one faculty member who was concerned about feeling pressured to vote. He invited senators to remind their divisions to remember that all faculty members are encouraged to vote but none are required. President Fawcett agreed, adding that abstention is an essential component of a free and fair election process.

### **3. Senate Leadership Elections**

J. Thomas indicated that since only one senator put their name forward for President and one other for Vice-President for the 2026–2027 term, the Senate will hold a “vote of confidence” as follows:

**Question 1:** Do you support retaining Senator TRENT FAWCETT (Science & Math) as Faculty Senate President for the 2026–2027 term? YEA or NAY

**Question 2:** Do you support Senator ADAM LARSEN (Fine Arts) as Faculty Senate Vice-President for the 2026–2027 term (beginning July 1)? YEA or NAY

President Fawcett directed Parliamentarian Thomas to set up an online election within the next week so all senators could vote by secret ballot.

## **III. Administrative Updates**

### **A. Office of the College President**

#### **1. 2026 Utah Legislative Session Updates**

College President Stacey McIff visited to provide an update on the current Utah legislative session. She reported that the legislature had reached roughly the midpoint of the session and that the higher education executive appropriations meeting had concluded that day. She noted that Snow College has one joint request with Salt Lake Community College related to skills-based general education; while she was unsure how it would ultimately fare, she said it ranked better than expected among the system’s priorities. The request includes a one-time \$150,000 allocation to be split between the two institutions to help launch the initiative through expert support and new materials.

**Audits & Governance.** President McIff also summarized legislative activity prompted by the recent unfavorable Utah State University presidential spending audit, explaining that lawmakers are considering bills that would strengthen governance expectations and

oversight for trustees and the state higher education system. She cautioned that a more centralized “system approach” could shift loyalties upward rather than locally. She then addressed state budget discussions, including the possibility of across-the-board cuts to state agencies, noting that while Snow College has prepared accordingly, current indications suggest higher education may not ultimately face the full reduction.

## **2. Tuition & Fees**

Finally, President McIff discussed tuition and fees. She explained that the student review process is recommending moving the student insurance fee into tuition, which would have implications for tuition waivers. She reported that the trustees approved a 0–4% tuition increase per semester (up to \$80) to help fund employee compensation, including the state-recommended cost-of-living adjustment. In response to questions, she clarified that the compensation increase applies to full-time benefited employees, not adjunct faculty. President McIff concluded by noting that some proposed legislation—such as a bill creating religious or conscience exemptions for assignments—did not appear likely to advance, while other initiatives (including civics-related proposals) continue to develop, and the college is monitoring how best to respond proactively.

## **B. Faculty Senate President**

### **1. Upcoming UCSFL Meeting**

President Fawcett first noted that the Utah Council of Faculty Senate Leaders (UCSFL) meeting is approaching and that much of the agenda will focus on current legislation and higher education developments across the region. He explained that the group is typically composed of the Faculty Senate president from each institution, though some institutions (notably the University of Utah) send multiple representatives. He added that a member of the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) Board is usually invited to attend and answer questions. President Fawcett asked senators to share any issues they would like raised so he can represent Snow College effectively.

### **2. Tech Ed Representation**

**a. Tech Ed on the Senate.** President Fawcett reported ongoing conversations about Senate representation concerns following the division of the Schools of Professional Studies and Technical Education. Senator Moosman reported that recent division discussion focused mostly on other committee service (including mixed interest in continuing GE roles), with little specific attention to the Senate seat. President Fawcett said he plans to visit the Richfield campus to meet directly with Tech Ed faculty, asked Senator Moosman to continue listening for concerns, and requested a brief follow-up report at the next meeting.

**b. Proposed Solutions.** The Senate emphasized that Tech Ed representation should be determined by faculty choice rather than appointment. Senator Keller urged direct consultation with Tech Ed faculty to ensure they can select a representative who speaks for them, while senators also acknowledged practical constraints such as availability to attend meetings and the possibility of using substitutes or a nonvoting observer if a voting seat cannot be filled. Provost Austin noted that faculty cannot be compelled to serve, and Senator Hart stressed the importance of clearly explaining the difference between elected representation and being “chosen” by supervisors. President Fawcett said he will gather more input and bring recommendations back as needed, including possible bylaw and committee structure adjustments.

### **3. Professional Track Committee and “Vested” Language**

President Fawcett noted the need to revisit PTC language, including “vested” terminology, and noted this would likely be part of the broader set of governance revisions under review.

### **4. Updating the Faculty Senate Web Page**

President Fawcett reported that a beta version of an updated Faculty Senate web page is now available and is essentially the same version previously reviewed. He explained that committee links now route directly to their respective pages and that the site will include a central location where documents under Senate discussion can be posted, reducing the need for email attachments. Access to those materials will require a Snow College sign-in in order to keep draft materials private while they are still in development. He also noted that a feedback submission feature, suggested previously, is also planned to go live.

## **B. Deans Council**

### **1. Class Scheduling**

Dean Brenchley reported that the most relevant topic to the Senate from the most recent Deans Council meeting regarded course start times and adherence to the established class schedule. He explained that Deans Council reviews occasional requests for off-schedule class times, though such approvals are rare. Requests to schedule classes at unusual times in the middle of the day, particularly between 9:30 am and 2:30 pm, are seldom approved unless there is a strong justification, because off-schedule offerings create broader scheduling conflicts. He emphasized that this issue is discussed every semester and urged faculty to remain on the established schedule whenever possible, noting that past deviations have caused problems.

President Fawcett asked whether there were any academic freedom concerns connected to when courses are offered. Dean Brenchley clarified that while terminology like “bell schedule” may be debated, the underlying schedule governs class timing. Provost Austin added that between 8:00 am and 2:30 pm, deviations from the standard schedule require approval at the dean level rather than by department chairs.

## **2. Cross-Divisional GE Classes**

**a. Overview of Concerns.** President Fawcett reported that, following Deans Council, additional discussion took place regarding how General Education (GE) courses are handled when they are taught outside their traditional division. He said he plans to bring the matter to Michael Olson, the GE Committee chair. President Fawcett indicated that the deans’ emerging preference is that when a GE course is offered outside its customary division, both the “home” dean and the dean overseeing the offering division would need to sign off. He also noted that the GE Committee is seeking clearer dean input regarding an appeals process.

**b. GE Committee Perspective.** Senator Hart, Senate representative to GE, explained that the issue arises most often when a course does not have an obvious divisional “home,” or when a faculty member seeks to teach a course under a different division than the one typically associated with its GE designation. He said the GE Committee believes there is currently no sufficiently clear procedure for resolving disagreements or managing appeals. Senator Hart reported that he advocated for the Faculty Senate to serve as the final authority in an appeal, framing this as a curricular matter that ultimately belongs to the faculty through the Senate. He added that the issue has been prompted in part by a current dispute involving a faculty member who is dissatisfied with decisions being made and who does not have the support of the relevant deans for a proposed GE course offering.

**c. Logistical Concerns.** Dean Brenchley added that part of the confusion stems from the Argos submission process. He noted that when a course proposal is submitted, the form requires the dean to provide a resource-impact statement, but in cross-divisional situations the impact may fall primarily on a different division than the one submitting the request. In those cases, he argued, the division most affected should have a stronger voice in the approval. Senator Parry asked whether this joint approval expectation is already standard practice; Dean Brenchley said he believed it was, but acknowledged that questions have been raised recently. Senator Hart agreed that concerns have been voiced and that the process is still being developed and is not yet finalized.

**d. Defining Designations.** Dean Brenchley also observed that there are significant differences in philosophy about how broadly GE designations should be applied: for example, whether most courses should qualify as GE and what the consequences would be if nearly any course

could carry GE credit across areas. Senator Hart reiterated that the committee is working through these questions and that no final plan has been adopted.

**e. Procedural Clarity.** President Fawcett noted that GE Committee membership tends to have higher turnover, making this a recurring, cyclical issue, and Senator Hart added that prior committee minutes were not detailed enough to show what procedures had been used in earlier iterations—often noting only that issues were discussed and resolved without documenting the process. Senator Hart emphasized that clearer minutes and written procedures would help future committees maintain continuity, and noted that current chair Michael Olson has been unable to locate a clear historical procedure, though Olson's nomination to serve again as GE Chair may provide some short-term continuity while a formal process is developed. Senator Holland, recalling her own time as GE Chair when the issue was previously discussed, noted that a process had been mapped out (including diagrams) but never written down, and she proposed codifying the procedure somewhere beyond meeting minutes so it can be referenced reliably in the future.

## **C. Office of Academic Affairs**

### **1. Newly Approved Programs**

Provost Austin reported that the Board of Trustees had approved two programs that day: the Architecture Program and the Behavioral Therapy Technician program. He added that the proposed three-year B.S. in Rural Entrepreneurship remains stalled at the state level and is not expected to move forward until after the summer, though AA is continuing to work on it.

### **2. New Library Director**

Provost Austin also announced the selection of a new library director. He noted that the search process and recommendation were conducted through the Senate Library Committee, which unanimously supported its first-choice candidate. Provost Austin shared that this new director is coming from Newark and previously served as the librarian for the City of Alexandria, and that he is scheduled to begin on April 15.

### **3. Search for Dean of Fine Arts**

Finally, Provost Austin stated that the call for applications had been sent to open the search for the next Dean of Fine Arts, as Dr. Huff is concluding his six-year term and has thus reached the term limit. He encouraged faculty—particularly those in Fine Arts departments—to apply and to participate on the search committee, noting the importance of building a robust applicant pool. (He also noted that one of the departments is now titled the Department of Theatre and Dance.)

## **IV. Senate Business**

### **A. IRB Bylaws Update**

#### **1. Latest Bylaws Draft**

President Fawcett thanked senators for their work on bylaw revisions and reported that he has been developing an updated set of bylaws for the Institutional Review Board (IRB). He noted that he has reviewed the draft with Sam Meek, Chief Institutional Research Officer, and will also consult Nick Marsing, Professor Psychology at a later stage. President Fawcett emphasized that the IRB bylaws directly affect student research, since projects involving human subjects, including student research, require IRB approval. He invited feedback on the draft and explained that he had been uncertain whether the document should function as a procedural guide or as a broader institutional policy statement. He said he drafted it as a detailed document, including references to federal law, and that it has grown to approximately seven pages.

#### **2. Procedure for Ratification**

Senator Hart questioned whether a separate college IRB policy is needed beyond federal requirements and an internal procedures guide, and President Fawcett replied that the goal is to create a clear, publicly posted process: after IRB approval, the Senate would ratify the bylaws, legal counsel would review them, and the final version would be posted on the IRB website (and later linked on the new Senate webpage). Senator Holland gave her approval of the draft, and President Fawcett said he would return it to the IRB for a vote.

#### **3. No Student Representation**

Discussion turned to whether students should have a voice on the IRB. SBO representative Dyson Winsor asked if the IRB includes a student representative, and Provost Austin cautioned that students are typically not full members due to legal liability and lack of institutional indemnification. Senators discussed the possibility of a nonvoting student role or observer status, and President Fawcett said he would review applicable regulations. Provost Austin added that while Snow College conducts limited research, IRB review still applies in certain areas (including some prison-related coursework and grant-funded projects), with expedited review common for low-risk student studies and full review required for higher-stakes proposals such as NSF-funded work.

## **B. Calendaring Committee & Policy**

### **1. Proposed Restructuring**

President Fawcett asked the Senate to weigh in on restructuring the Calendaring Committee and creating a formal policy that governs both who has input and when calendar changes can be made. He said President McIff has encouraged an official policy to prevent “snap decisions” and ensure calendaring decisions follow a predictable process. He emphasized that the document was a very early draft and that he was seeking feedback on two main questions: who should serve on the committee (and how members should be selected) and what timelines should guide calendaring changes, including whether there should be a clearly defined presidential bypass mechanism for exceptional circumstances.

### **2. Senator Suggestions**

In discussion, senators stressed the need for balanced, informed representation and clearer procedures than currently exist. President Fawcett floated a possible structure (faculty and staff members, plus the Registrar and the vice-president responsible for calendaring), while senators raised questions about whether students should be involved and how staff members are chosen. Dean Brenchley recommended avoiding multiple faculty members from the same division, and Senator Hart urged that the policy include regular, planned data collection on stakeholder preferences as well as clear expectations for communication and timing. Several senators noted that current selection practices appear informal and inconsistent; President Fawcett said he would consult the Staff Association and continue revising the draft with the goal of advancing a finalized policy through College Council and ultimately to the Board of Trustees.

## **C. Service Learning Committee**

### **1. Committee Offloading**

The Senate considered a proposal to remove the Service Learning Committee as a standing Faculty Senate committee, similar to the earlier offloading of the Globalization & Belonging Committee this year.

President Fawcett explained that service learning funding has been cut and that the committee has not met at all during the current academic year. He noted that the Senate had not previously taken a formal vote on restructuring or continuation. President Fawcett reported that he spoke with the Service Learning Director and had previously discussed the possibility of reforming the work into a SPARC committee; however, the director indicated that he believed his involvement had concluded. President Fawcett stated his view that the

committee should be discontinued as a Senate committee for now, with the option to reconstitute it in the future if service learning becomes a renewed institutional priority.

## 2. Motion & Vote

**MOTION** by **R. Keller** to offload the Service Learning Committee. **2nd:** S. Hart. During discussion, Senator Hart emphasized that service learning remains valuable as a pedagogical tool, even if the committee is offloaded. Dean Brenchley noted that he had no specific concerns about the committee's status within the Senate, while also observing that service learning is used frequently within his division. Senator Hart raised a question about whether discontinuing the committee would affect any course designation tied to service learning and suggested that relevant parties be notified. Senators noted that the former service-learning course designation may not currently be in use and should be verified. President Fawcett then called for a vote, and the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

## D. GE Committee Representation

The Senate discussed staffing gaps on the General Education (GE) Committee. Parliamentarian Thomas noted that GE has asked the Faculty Senate to assist with running a nomination and election process for the at-large GE committee representative from the Richfield campus, a position that has been vacant for two years. In addition, the Senate noted an ongoing vacancy in the Fine Arts seat on the GE Committee.

## E. Prerequisite Enforcement

### 1. Automation & the “D” Passing Standard

President Fawcett reported that Academic Affairs is moving toward automating prerequisite enforcement and states his concern about how this will affect both student success and faculty expectations—especially given the revised state policy that a D- counts as passing in GE courses. He noted that many sequences (particularly developmental coursework leading into GE, such as Math 0850 or English 0980) typically require a higher minimum grade to advance, and he questioned how to apply a “D as passing” standard in those contexts without setting students up for failure or creating confusing mixed messages. Senator Lee similarly expressed her concern about students with D's advancing to the next level, as they are unlikely to be prepared.

### 2. Moving Forward

Several senators agreed that clearer standards and communication are needed. Senator Parry and Senator Keller emphasized that many faculty were unaware of the policy and that syllabi and advising practices may still reflect older grade requirements, contributing to student

confusion. Senator Hart suggested grading recalibration as one possible though difficult adjustment. President Fawcett invited senators to email him their perspectives as he considers whether to advocate for changes or clarifications before implementation.

## V. Adjournment

The Senate meeting concluded at 5:05 pm.

**MOTION** by R. Keller to adjourn. **2nd:** K. Wilkinson. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

---

Meeting minutes by Jacob L. Thomas, Parliamentarian

Approved by the Faculty Senate, February 25, 2026