



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

December 8, 2008

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Stan Albrecht, Byron Burnham, Steven Burr, Maria Cordero, Raymond Coward, Renee Galliher, Jake Gunther, Ed Heath, Kelly Kopp, Glen McEvoy, Mike Parent, Flora Shrode, Nathan Straight, Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Bloxham (Assistant).

Guests: Francine Johnson, Patti Kohler, Ed Reeve.

Mike Parent called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Byron Burnham moved to approve the minutes of November 17, 2008, Flora Shrode seconded, minutes approved.

University Business

President Stan Albrecht updated the committee on the student drinking death. It has been anticipated that there would be indictments, but there have been none to date. The executive leadership of both Sigma Nu and Chi Omega have been on campus and have followed the course of action that USU took which is to suspend the fraternity and sorority. The students will still live in the houses but the Chapters are not recognized and there are no activities. USU is continuing its own internal investigation and will take action appropriate to the Student Code and University policy, but that is trumped by any legal action to be taken by the County Attorney's Office.

There were also two recent accidents that that seriously affected two of our students. These have been some very difficult circumstances for us and for our students.

The Budget Reduction Review Committee has completed their work. The President is in the process of completing a letter that will go out the University community. The letter will describe the work and recommendations of the committee, the recommendations that are being accepted, the implementation of the reductions imposed by the special session of the Legislature, and possible future scenarios. The first round of cuts will not be the most difficult round for us. Current scenarios are in response to the legislative fiscal analyst, with another 5% reduction out of this years' fiscal budget, and a 10% reduction out the of 2010 fiscal year budget. The governor is trying to cushion the impact by proposing a 1.5% reduction out of the '09 fiscal year and a 7% reduction out of the next fiscal year with 3.5% of that coming back to us as back fill with one time monies, hoping that the third leg of that will not have to be imposed if the economy were to turn around.

In answer to the question as to whether this information has been communicated to the Deans and Department Heads, there is a meeting scheduled for Wednesday morning with the Vice Presidents and the Deans go the information over the weekend. As the Provost discussed with

the Deans, this is going to be a roller coaster ride for the next few months. We need to be careful about being too optimistic when the roller coaster is at the top or too pessimistic when the roller coaster is at the bottom. The Governor's cuts are 12.5 % when you take the 4% that we currently have and add all of his additions. The Legislative cuts are 19% when you take the 4% plus the 15% that the President just described. We will likely to be someplace in the middle.

The President said "these are huge numbers and it will require the hard work on the part of all of us to find our way through this while we maintain momentum and keep this great university moving forward. There is little solace in the fact that there are bigger numbers in other states right now. We are hearing figures as high as 33% in one of our neighboring states." A question was asked if a similar process will continue if more cuts are required. The committee will continue its strategic planning. There was another question about what was being done about working on the revenue side of the issue, such as an adjustment to tuition. We are running numbers on Tier 2 tuition. The up side to that is that as Tuition 1 numbers go down it gives us more flexibility of using Tuition 2 monies on campus. The more immediate revenue option for us is tuition increase. But, combining revenue needs with our strategic mission of access and opportunity is going to be a challenge.

The letter to the university will be out tomorrow. Extra time will be given in the Faculty Senate meeting for President Albrecht to answer faculty questions on these issues.

The Provost announced that Gary Straquadine was named Dean and Executive Director of the Tooele Regional Campus. He starts May 1, 2009.

Announcements

Next Brown Bag Lunch w/President & Provost is Thursday, January 15, 2009.
The next FSEC meeting is Tuesday, January 20, 2009.

Information Items

Council on Teacher Education

Francine Johnson presented the report. There were two program changes approved: 1) an addition of a teaching minor in Latin, and 2) the Department of History modified their history teaching minor in light of the challenge that the history students were experiencing on the Praxis II content test which is a required test for licensing and for meeting the No Child Left Behind requirement. The Utah State Office of Education no longer requires a teaching minor for secondary licensing but the Council voted to maintain the requirement of a teaching minor for USU in light of the feedback received from superintendents indicating the flexibility that a minor provides for them when they staff their schools. The State Office of Education approved the issuance of a Non-renewable Level 1 License for students who graduate but have not yet passed the Praxis II exam. USU requires students to pass the exam prior to being placed in student teaching. The Council voted to retain the policy that students pass the exam prior to student teaching. They must also complete either Math 1050 or Stat 1040, no substitutions are accepted in order to meet the requirements for national accreditation.

Student profile: there was an increase of 8% in admissions, composite ACT scores are above university admission levels, there is a 14% increase in graduates recommended for licensing, our placement rate for last year was 82%, and our Praxis II exam passing rate is about 93%.

Ed Heath moved to place the report on the consent agenda, seconded by Jake Gunther, motion passed.

Scholarship Advisory Board

Patti Kohler reported. There was a 25% increase in dollars spent on all scholarships. 2007-08 was the first year that USU moved to a full tuition and student body fees waiver as opposed to a dollar amount figure for our incoming freshmen. This is our first year for business differential tuition waivers, which is included in full tuition waivers. There was a tuition increase of 7% from the 2006-07 year which increased the amount of waivers available. A large group from the sponsored programs came this year; 156 Dominican Republic students and 13 students from Armenian. This group received a lot of scholarship money. Athletics scholarship changes were made to compensate for the increased tuition costs, and to cover online courses. The percentage of increase over prior years stayed same for most colleges. But two colleges had a decrease from the prior year (Natural Resources and HASS). There was a 15% increase in the number of students helped.

There was a question about where the money came from for this financial aid. In dollar amounts our 10% waivers, is the 10% that we get from tuition; our revenue tuition increased about 24%. There was a huge jump in the sponsored programs (international programs) and that money comes from the Dominican Republic government, we matched a portion of that. We had a 38% increase in the amount of students receiving private scholarships from outside sources. We did have a decrease in students receiving non-resident portion waivers. The 2007-08 year was our highest enrollment year, so the more students we have the more scholarship money we give out. Mike mentioned that USU students have a lower debt burden than any other public institution.

Ed heath moved to place the report on the consent agenda, Jake Gunther seconded and the motion passed.

Old Business

Code Review Committee Report

The FSEC voted to place the Level One changes as consent item on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting. There was a request from the Senate to remove two items from the consent agenda and bring them back under Key Issues and Action items or New Business: 401.3.2(3) and 405.11.4. After a lengthy discussion on section 401.3.2(3) it was decided that it probably required a substantive change and needed further review. Ed heath moved to make section 401.3.2(3) a Level Two code change and send it PRPC. Glenn McEvoy seconded the motion, motion carried.

405.11.4 - External peer reviews. This section deals with term appointments: general procedures for promotion. The only change is striking the last sentence of the paragraph. After considerable discussion it was determined that this section change is probably a substantive change. Procedurally this could be sent back to the Code Review Committee or go to PRPC. There was a concern that the PRPC would probably be confused by it and that it needed to go back to the Code Review Committee for clarification. Ed Heath moved to refer section 405.11.4 back to the Code Review Committee for clarification. Motion seconded by Jake Gunther. Motion carried.

The concern arose over a number of Level One changes that were presented in the form of questions; how will they be clarified and finished on the consent agenda? After reviewing some of these proposed questions it was decided that they could not really be voted on as is. It was suggested that Code Review Committee provide specific proposals for these items for the next Faculty Senate meeting. If this is not possible there could be a motion from the Senate to remove these items that are questions from the consent package. The committee would have 2 weeks to meet. There was a motion to refer these issues to Code Review Committee for revision. Motion was seconded. There was more discussion on why the committee did not make those changes to begin with. Clarification was made that the charge of the committee was to identify the needs/inconsistencies and not make the changes. After further discussion Mike Parent clarified

the motion, that the Executive Committee is empowering the Code Review Committee to make the Level 1 changes that they see fit, and redefine others that are more substantive to Level 2 changes, in order to have an edited version of the consent package to arrive at the Senate in January. Motion voted on and passed.

At the last Senate meeting the motion to change Definition of Days (Code 407.1.2 and 407.6) was tabled so that it could be brought back in January. The tabled motion will be brought off the table as a Key Issues and Action item because that is where it was at the last meeting. The motion will be the same as it was once it comes off the table. That means there will be discussion on the motion. The committee was reminded that in the spring Diane Calloway-Graham made a presentation of issues that AFT found regarding definition of days. The AFT looked at the process with respect to grievances and found that sometimes it could take over 300 days for a grievance to move through the process when using the academic calendar. Examples were given in the report that provided significant information. When the proposed code language was finally brought before the Senate, this year, a third of the Senate members were new. Other Senate members were not fully engaged in the discussion. A question was raised as to whether the rights of faculty were being impeded by moving from the academic calendar to a regular calendar for the purpose of filing grievances. The FSEC was reminded that we have already moved to calendar days for sanctions. Mike then asked if there were things that needed to be considered as this was brought back off the table as a Key Issues and Action item.

After lengthy discussion of the issues it was stated that the tabled item will automatically come off the table so the Senate can debate the issue as the Executive Committee just has. There was concern that Diane's presentation was given over seven months ago, and a suggestion was made that the presentation be given again. More debate on the issue ensued. A statement was made reminding us that the original issue was over confusion about the calendar and what process went under what calendar. It was decided that we need, at least, the outline of the presentation given again so that the context of the issue can be understood. A comment was made that maybe Diane is on sabbatical. If Diane is not available Pat, who will take over as chair of AFT, can give the presentation. Mike will talk to Diane.

New Business

EPC Items

Ed Reeve presented the report. The Curriculum Sub-committee approved 158 requests. Due to the restructuring of the Economics Department and Elementary Education Department, 500 course changes will be needed. They are working to get those changes into Banner. The respective departments will send emails to affected students so that they know the courses may not be listed but the changes will be put in. The Provost takes these changes to the Board of Trustees.

The Academic Standards Sub-committee reviewed and passed the Academic Integrity Policy. The major revisions included a new Article #6 which necessitated a few modifications in other articles for consistency (see attached ASUSU Student Code). They worked five years on this Academic Integrity Policy. It has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for their consideration. There is no place in the Faculty Code that says the Senate approves changes in the Student Code. Mike asked how we should proceed. It was noted that there were certain actions specified for the faculty in the case of violation of academic integrity policy. The Provost mentioned that the President would not take this to the Board of Trustees without having a sense from the faculty that these were appropriate actions. If it went forward on the Consent Agenda a vote on it would mean that it had been approved by the Senate. If it was an Information Item there would be no vote. The Provost reminded the committee that this policy was discussed at a Faculty Senate meeting last year and that in the spirit of shared governance the students and the administration were saying to the faculty this obviously has an impact on the faculty. A question was asked about the extent of faculty involvement with the students as they

developed this policy. There was extensive involvement through the EPC. It was noted that this item is can be tracked over a number of EPC reports, and EPC was satisfied with the outcome.

Ed Reeve reported that in the General Education Sub-committee there were no action items but they did discuss the status of the CIL exam. The sub-committee wants to get more information and evaluate it. ASUSU passed a recommendation that is in the hands of the President, that the CIL exam be eliminated. Now the President will be asking the EPC to consider the recommendation, and after he has that judgment he will make the final decision. The sub-committee is also looking at the President's sustainability piece. They are looking at how we can get that into the General Education curriculum. There was some more discussion on CIL and there is still concern about information literacy. Students are looking to the internet as the authority without any way of qualifying the information they are finding there. A statement was made that the CIL exam is totally missing that because they have not found a way to make it performance based in its assessment. It was noted that students are paying a fee to take a test that over 90% of them pass in five of six areas. The one area that falls below that 90% is the ethics area. A question was asked about whom to contact if people want to express their concerns? Dick Mueller is chair of the General Education Sub-committee. Ed Reeve reminded the Executive Committee that these are just discussion items that the sub-committee is working on.

Another question arose about the Academic Integrity Policy and whether students had upper administration or other faculty input outside of the members of the EPC. The Provost said Steve Hanks worked as the go between with students and the EPC to fashion something that was acceptable to both. He said the substantive conversations happened last year and the year before, and that this is the end of the process. The question was asked if the Executive Committee were just saying OK? This is an argument for keeping it on the Consent Agenda. It was suggested that it would be useful for EPC to put together a timeline of all the other times that this has been debated and discussed at the Faculty Senate to clarify what has been done and when. It would also be helpful for the sub-committee to document when they dealt with this so that the lengthy work of the sub-committee was not second guessed. It was stated that the Deans have had their chance for feedback as well. Kelly Kopp moved to put this report on the consent agenda, seconded. If someone were to try to pull this from the Consent Agenda it is hoped that Larry Smith or Ed Reeve will be there prepared with information on how frequently this has been visited over the past several years. Motion carried.

Faculty Forum Minutes

There was one more item to announce to faculty members who constitute the faculty forum committee, the Faculty Forum minutes have been revised and passed out. These minutes go on the Faculty Senate webpage. If changes need to be made let Mike or Joan know, we wanted you to be informed before they were posted to the web.

Mike asked if there was any other business. A question was asked about what happened with the meetings with the representative from Black Student Union. Several meetings have taken place between Mike, Christina Mason, the initiating group, officers of the Black Student Union, the President, and the Provost. As a consequence a position paper was prepared on the bases of the minutes of that particular meeting and co-authored Christina and Mike. That paper talks about there being policy in the faculty and student codes that address issues of harassment and discrimination. USU has a no tolerance policy for harassment and discrimination. This particular incident needed to be addressed but did not rise to the level of either harassment or discrimination. Process and procedure became something that was very important. How does a student know how to go about responding to an incident like this in class? We can use Connections for the purpose of having a case or activity that would sensitize students to this particular issue and also inform them of where they could turn to find support if this issue surfaced in a class. There is also support within Student Services in Multicultural Student Services Office. Moises Diaz has been through this and is well trained in and is putting together

a group of individuals who can respond to a variety of issues that might involve race, gender, and harassment. It is recognized that if there is an event that occurs in a classroom, there has to be an equal and important level of response that comes through the Provost's Office. Within the Provost's Office, Ann Austin is the natural connection so that if something is brought to the Multicultural Office it goes to Ann simultaneously or immediately. A teaching approach could be used where the issue was addressed by coming back into the classroom with experts to talk about the nature of the problem. Then it could be communicate more broadly through a brief presentation and appended to course syllabi. Then this could be reported at the Department Heads Conference at the beginning of the year. From there it could find its way into Department meetings that are held with faculty and staff. Once done, if there is curriculum built into the Connections class, there could be a connection to frequently asked questions or to Multicultural Student Services where there could be a PDF file on this kind of an issue where students could access information. Moises is preparing presentations that people can access. Glen and Christina are taking the dimensions of this issue and building a teaching case out of it. The Provost indicated that faculty reached out to the student and it really impressed them. This was a clear reaction by the faculty that said "how can we make this better, and how can we avoid this in the future". The students stated that they were really happy with how the President an listened and really cared about their viewpoint and feelings.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m.