



Matthew Gowans, President  
Jed Rasmussen, Vice-President  
Jacob L. Thomas, Parliamentarian

## Meeting Minutes

September 27, 2023, 3:30 p.m.

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

The Senate was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

**Senators Present:** Matthew Gowans (Pres.), Jed Rasmussen (VP), Karen Carter, Sandra Cox, Trent Fawcett, Wes Jamison, Adam Larsen, Rachel Keller, Dennis Schugk, Jeff Wallace, Hilary Withers

**Senators Absent:** Alan Christensen

**Guests:** Jacob Thomas (Parliamentarian), David Allred (Assoc. Provost), Mike Brenchley (Deans)

### II. Minutes from Previous Meeting

**A. Review of minutes from September 13, 2023**

**B. Vote to approve or amend minutes**

**Motion to Approve:** T. Fawcett **2nd:** J. Rasmussen

**Approval** by all senators present

### **III. Informational Items**

#### **A. Updates from the Faculty Senate President**

The UCSFL President, who is from UVU, has informed us about the meeting scheduled for October 26-27 with a focus on GE (General Education). We are planning to host a UCSFL meeting during this conference, which is primarily intended for Senate leadership but is open to anyone, including all senators. The meeting will take place in Midway.

Regarding attendance, most of the GE committee members will be present. D. Allred from Academic Affairs has generously offered to cover the conference fees for attendees from this committee. Due to the conference's nature, we anticipate around 20 Snow College attendees. Moving forward, MG will share registration information for anyone interested in attending.

Additionally, there have been discussions among administration, staff, and faculty about designating Fridays as “School Pride” days, encouraging everyone to wear our school colors, blue and orange. Senators were encouraged to send out this information to their divisions so that faculty members can participate and show their support.

#### **B. Updates from Deans Council**

M. Brenchley announced that the Physical Education department intends to rebrand itself as “Exercise Science” to better align with academic and USHE standards. They will adjust the curriculum and keep some PE-designated classes. M. Brenchley, as Dean of Social & Behavioral Science, approved this change, and it's now pending approval from the Board of Trustees and faculty committees.

Discussion arose regarding issues with certain part-time faculty-led classes. Efforts are being made to improve their effectiveness, and those adjunct instructors not meeting evaluation standards will not be rehired. This includes the evaluation of coaches who teach PE classes.

J. Rasmussen reported that institutional goals were discussed at the most recent Deans Council meeting. He will share these goals with the Senate for input when they are further developed.

#### IV. Senate Discussions

**A. Faculty Composition on the College Council.** The reorganization and composition of the College Council, specifically the inclusion of a dean, was discussed at length, with the Senators expressing various opinions.

The following table shows how the faculty are represented on the five seats allotted to us on College Council as presently constituted.

##### College Council

The Senate President and Faculty Association President serve on the College Council as voting members. Three at-large faculty representatives also serve as voting members on the College Council; they are elected to three-year terms, renewable once. The Faculty Senate administers the elections of these at-large representatives.

Name	Division / Office	Service Record	Committees & Assignments
Matthew Gowans	Humanities	2022-2024	Faculty Senate President
Heidi Johnson	Science & Math	2022-2025	Faculty Association President
Janalee Jeffrey	Science & Math	2019-2025 (2nd term)	College Council At-Large Representative
Chad Price	Business & Tech	2021-2024 (1st term)	College Council At-Large Representative
Jessica Jones	Social Science	2023-2025 (filling vacancy)	College Council At-Large Representative

##### B. College Council Composition Discussion

Several faculty members discussed the composition of the College Council. M. Brenchley reported on the Deans Council discussion of Senate proposals and raised questions about whether a dean should be considered faculty or administration for purposes of the College Council’s makeup. Other deans had expressed the importance of having a dean’s voice on the College Council, as it has been a longstanding practice.

J. Rasmussen emphasized that having a dean present can provide valuable context and understanding, although it might introduce bias. W. Jamison

questioned the spirit of the change in composition in general, which he believed was meant to put more authority in the hands of non-dean faculty (among the other stakeholders).

D. Allred proffered his opinion that deans are not solely administrative, and highlighted the need to distinguish between “Cabinet” and “administration.” The spirit of the proposed changes, he suggested, is to distance the President’s Cabinet, not the deans specifically. M. Brenchley and J. Rasmussen further emphasized that deans bring a needed perspective to the Council’s discussions.

The conversation also touched on the complexity of the College Council’s role and the need for trust among faculty members. There was a discussion about representation, including adjuncts and part-time staff, and the logistics of adding more than the five allotted seats. Some faculty reportedly feel that since adjuncts are not permanent employees, and they would be making decisions that affect full-time employees, that having an adjunct senator is sufficient and that a seat does not need to be reserved for adjuncts on College Council.

M. Gowans suggested exploring different options, such as conducting a survey among faculty to gauge their preferences. R. Keller emphasized the importance of clarity regarding the survey’s purpose and potential outcomes. J. Rasmussen highlighted the need to involve all parties in the decision-making process and maintain transparency. W. Jamison expressed his support for democratic decision-making.

Ultimately, it was agreed that a dialogue with all relevant parties, including the President and the Faculty Association, would be necessary to determine the best way forward and to ensure that the faculty's interests are considered.

The discussion also included questions about staff involvement and the coordination between various faculty groups in making recommendations for the College Council’s composition. D. Allred advocated for a collaborative approach involving Deans Council, the Senate, and the Faculty Association.

M. Gowans agreed to initiate conversations with all parties involved to explore possible solutions and gather input on the College Council’s makeup. The idea

of narrowing down options to three possible compositions was proposed for further discussion.

Overall, the meeting centered on the complex issue of College Council composition and the desire to involve all stakeholders in the decision-making process while maintaining transparency and trust among faculty members.

### **C. Academic Integrity Policy**

Subcommittee: J. Wallace (chair), T. Fawcett, A. Larsen, and W. Jamison

J. Wallace on behalf of the subcommittee presented proposed revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy regarding students' use of generative A.I. He explained that they had clarified the definition of "generative A.I." to refer to the use of computer algorithms and models to autonomously create academic content, such as texts and images, without instructor authorization. Students would need to request approval from their instructor, outlining the purpose and nature of their A.I. tools' involvement. Instructors would have discretion to approve or deny these requests, and using generative A.I. without approval would be considered a violation of academic integrity.

MG asked that the draft clarify that even if a faculty member did not explicitly address the use of generative A.I. verbally in class or in a syllabus, then this policy would still apply.

A. Larsen raised concerns about the impact of this language on the art department, particularly regarding "appropriation," which is distinct from plagiarism. He explained that appropriation is a common practice in art, where artists draw from popular culture and recontextualize elements in their work. R. Keller pointed out similar issues in music with "sampling," which is currently the subject of high-profile litigation. A. Larsen emphasized the need for more inclusive language and input from the fine and performing arts.

M. Gowans acknowledged the importance of autonomy granted to teachers and students in the policy but agreed that more insight and language from the art and music departments was needed, recognizing that generative A.I. would become increasingly relevant in these disciplines. He suggested that they

proceed with the existing document and requested A. Larsen to gather feedback from colleagues in his division for further refinements.

M. Gowans also mentioned the need for input from every discipline and proposed additional considerations for Level I, II, and III infractions. J. Wallace agreed to this, with particular emphasis on using A.I. without approval.

## **VI. Division & Committee Reports**

**A. Professional Track:** K. Carter mentioned that the Professional Track Committee would be meeting to select a new chair.

**B. Academic Standards:** R. Keller expressed unease about how the Academic Standards committee handles infractions. She raised questions about the consistency of applying the policy and suggested that it should align with catalog policies.

A. Larsen and others noted the presence of terms like “may” in the policy and discussed the need for more clarity and uniformity in handling violations. The senators considered the faculty's role in reporting violations and the need for transparency in the process.

R. Keller expressed concerns about reporting infractions blindly and recommended revising the policy for better clarity. M. Gowans shared insights from her experience at another institution, emphasizing the importance of following policy.

The meeting ended with the intention to review and potentially revise the Academic Integrity Policy and improve transparency in its implementation.

## VII. Adjournment

**A. Closing Remarks.** Before the meeting adjourned, W. Jamison extended his gratitude to Associate Provost David Allred for all he's done as interim head of Academic Affairs these past few months. The Senate concurred with his sentiment.

**B. Motion to Adjourn:** J. Rasmussen; **2nd:** W. Jamison

**Approval:** of all senators present

The Senate adjourned at \_\_\_\_\_ p.m.

The next Senate meeting will be held on **Wednesday, October 11** from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Academy Room, Noyes Building.

## Attachments

Meeting Minutes, September 13, 2023

Academic Integrity Policy Revision - Proposed Changes

---

Minutes taken by Jacob L. Thomas

Minutes approved October 11, 2023