



**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

November 21, 2011  
3:00 - 4:30 p.m.  
Champ Hall

**Agenda**

---

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Glenn McEvoy  
Approval of Minutes October 17, 2011
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Glenn McEvoy
- Next Brown Bag Lunch w/President Wednesday, December 8th noon Champ Hall
- There will be no University Business as both the President and Provost are out of town.**
- 3:10 Information Items**
1. ASUSU Report.....Erik Mikkelsen
  2. Retention and Student Success Report.....John Mortensen
- 3:30 New Business**
1. EPC Items.....Larry Smith
  2. PRPC Section 402.3.2 and 402.3.4 Vacancies.....Terry Peak
  3. Presidential Task Force on Curriculum.....Norm Jones
  4. External Review Letters.....Glenn McEvoy
  5. Open Access.....Glenn McEvoy
  6. Discuss Results of Faculty Forum.....Glenn McEvoy
- 4:30 Adjournment**

**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**OCTOBER 17, 2011 3:00 P.M.**  
**Champ Hall Conference Room**

---

**Present:** Glenn McEvoy (Chair), Alan Blackstock, Richard Clement, Doug Jackson-Smith, Yanghee Kim, Pam Miller, Mike Parent, Robert Schmidt, Blake Tullis, Flora Shrode, Dave Wallace, Ralph Whitesides, President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio) excused, Provost Ray Coward (Ex-Officio) excused, Vincent Wickwar (Past President), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Bloxham (Assistant).

**Guests:** Pamela Martin, Terry Peak, Larry Smith, Ken White.

---

Glenn McEvoy called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of September 19, 2011. The motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt and passed unanimously.

### **Announcements**

**Brown Bag Lunch with the President & Provost.** The next Brown Bag Lunch will be Wednesday, November 9<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 noon in Champ Hall.

**Faculty Forum Planning Meeting.** Faculty Forum Planning Meeting will follow directly after adjournment of the FSEC meeting today.

**Faculty Forum.** Faculty Forum will be November 7, 2011 from 3:00 – 4:30 in the TSC Auditorium.

**University Business – President Albrecht and Provost Coward.** Both the President and Provost were out of town this week, so no University Business was presented.

### **Information Items**

**Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report – Pamela Martin.** The committee has several goals for Spring Semester including evaluating data from the Fall Semester implementation of the IDEA Course Evaluation System and collecting feedback from instructors. A senator asked about student participation in the evaluations, especially concurrent enrollment students. These evaluations are being handled through the AAA and RCDE offices. Instructors will receive an HTML address they can provide the students and can use the sites computer labs to conduct the survey during their class time if they so choose. Robert Schmidt asked about the Faculty Advisor and Teacher of the Year selection process. Colleges widely vary on how they select candidates, and he asked if the committee would add this to their agenda and look at the process to make it fair and transparent university wide.

A motion to place the report on the consent agenda was made by Robert Schmidt and seconded by Vince Wickwar. The motion passed unanimously.

**Athletic Council Report – Ken White.** USU's Athletic Department was recognized nationally for excellence in management. Student athletes are doing very well academically compared to peers. The women's cross country team received an NCAA award for academics. The Athletic Department also finished FY 2011 \$400,000 in the positive, having eliminated its long-running deficit. Senators asked for explanation of some of the budget lines including the one-time revenue line. This reported revenue was recovered when the new Budget and Finance officer conducted a reconciliation of their books and found unreported or under reported revenues.

Vince Wickwar made a motion to place the report on the consent agenda, Ralph Whitesides seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

### **New Business**

**EPC Items – Larry Smith.** The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 64 course actions in October. There was no Academic Standards Subcommittee report. The General Education Subcommittee approved several syllabi as well as an R401 proposal from the Department of Art to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree in Art History. There were

also some restructuring proposals from the College of Agriculture and the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department. The Aviation Technology program will transfer to the School of Applied Sciences in the College of Agriculture and the department will be changed to the Engineering Education Department.

Vince Wickwar made a motion to place the report on the consent agenda. Ralph Whitesides seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**PRPC Section 405.7.2, 405.8.3, 405.11.4 and 403.3.2 (Second Reading) – Terry Peak.**

A motion was made by Doug Jackson-Smith to put these changes on the agenda as an Action Item for a second reading. A seconded was received by Ralph Whitesides and the motion passed unanimously.

**Old Business**

**Follow-up on Faculty Senate Communication with the Faculty – Glenn McEvoy.** Glenn updated the committee on the efforts that have been made to improve methods of communication with faculty members. Joan Kleinke has made email lists available to Executive Committee members so they may in turn make them available to each senator in their college. Faculty Senate information will be placed in Utah State Today every month in the edition preceding the Faculty Senate Meeting. The Faculty Forum is in November and is a direct way for faculty to be involved with the senate. Each Executive Committee member is to engage senators from their colleges in discussions about communication issues. Glenn will provide bulleted highlights of each Faculty Senate meeting to Executive Committee members to distribute to senators and faculty.

**Proposed Code Change Wording on Faculty Senate Vacancies – Glenn McEvoy.** Glenn asked for the committee's help in drafting language to send to PRPC to clarify Section 402.3.2 of the code regarding senate vacancies. Suggestions included adding the language "for the academic year" and that senators make a "good faith effort" to find alternates to attend in their absence.

Doug Jackson-Smith moved to refer this section of code to PRPC. The motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt and passed unanimously.

**Adjournment**

Glenn McEvoy asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

---

Minutes Submitted by: Joan Kleinke, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, 797-1776

# 2010-2011 Annual Report

# **ASUSU**

Compiled by: Erik Mikkelsen, President

## Membership

President:	Erik Mikkelsen
Executive VP:	Kirsten Frank
Student Advocate VP:	Jason Russell
Athletics VP:	Ryan Baylis
Programming VP:	Zach Larsen
Diversity VP:	Brooke Evans
Service VP:	Maddie Busteed
Academic Senate President:	Tanner Wright
Ag Senator:	Jarvis T. Pace
Art Senator	Mary Jacobson
Business Senator:	Scot Marsden
Engineering Senator:	Riley Bradshaw
Education Senator:	Becky Checketts
HASS Senator	Erika Norton
Natural Resources Senator:	Blake Thomas
Science Senator:	Joe Watson
Grad. Student VP:	Cami Jones
Administrative Assistant:	Jordan Hunt
Public Relations Director:	Hannah Blackburn
Activities Director:	Kellen Hansen
Traditions Director:	Kylie Martinez
Arts & Lectures Director:	Marie Squyres
RCDE Representative:	Justin Watkins

## Vision

To create more opportunities for more students to get FROM college

## Purpose

The Associated students of Utah State university (ASUSU) is an organization that enhances the quality of student life and acts as the liaison with the University staff, faculty, and administration. In order to make this possible ASUSU is organized into three main bodies; Executive council, Academic Senate and Student Traditions Activities and Arts Board (STAB).

## Meetings

Executive Council	Tuesdays @ 5:00 PM	TSC Senate Chambers
Academic Senate	Mondays @ 5:00 PM	TSC Senate Chambers
STAB	Wednesdays @ 5:00 PM	TSC Fireplace Room

## Initiatives

### Executive Council:

#### Aggie Recreation Center (ARC) & Student Legacy Park:

- ARC
  - Plans for the ARC having been moving forward smoothly. An architectural firm (CRSA) was chosen to complete a feasibility study for the project at the end of the spring 2011 semester. The feasibility study is now completed with digital renderings of the building sitting on the playing field directly west of the HPER building. These plans will be put to a student vote during the ASUSU elections at the end of February 2012.
- Student Legacy Park
  - Student Legacy Park is an arm of the development of the ARC plan. The park will include 250,000 square feet of artificial turf playing fields directly north of the ARC. The project will include one full size soccer field, two flag football fields, and softball fields in the north west and south east corners of the fields. The project will also include an automated lighting system allowing the fields to be used into the night. Around the fields will be other amenities including a running track, outdoor basketball court, and outdoor sand volleyball courts. This project will also be put to a student vote along with the ARC at the end of February 2012.
- Both of these projects will improve the overall experience/retention of students at Utah State.

#### Leadership Development Course

- In an effort to help students get more out of their involvement experience ASUSU has established a team to start a leadership development lecture series to supplement and give direction to the involvement opportunities that we offer. Students will have the opportunity to listen to professional leadership development lectures 6-10 times per semester as well as track their service hours to receive internship credit. A pilot program has been developed and is running very smoothly with great feedback.

#### Education First Petition Drive

- ASUSU participated in a state wide petition drive to support higher education legislatively at the state level. USU was in a competition with the institutions throughout the state and we are proud to say that we were able to collect more petitions per student than any other campus. The final count of petitions from USU was 7,300 which accounts for about 40% of campus.

#### Academic Senate:

## Fund Allocations

- Classroom Improvement Fund: \$74,000
- Sophomore Scholarship: \$10,000
- Academic Opportunity Fund: \$31,000

## STAB

This year STAB programs have been bigger than ever. We have seen record attendance at almost every event that has been held. Along with increased attendance there has been a very large increase in demand for involvement opportunities. The STAB board has worked hard to create more positions and delegate more responsibility and are reporting much higher involvement rates

- Activities:
  - Howl:
    - This year the Howl was capped at 6,000 participants and sold out long before the night was over. With some reconfigurations of way finding and line functions the night ran much smoother.
  - Aggie Event Series
    - In an effort to provide more opportunities for students to get involved and a larger diversity of events the activities programmers developed the Aggie Events Series. The Event series has one event every month giving students a lot more to chose from.
  - Aggie Cinema Series
    - The Cinema Series was developed for the same purpose as the event series and has now had two packed out showings in the ballroom.
- Arts and Lectures:
  - Event list:
    - Thriller
    - Zombie Lecturer
    - Tom Kreiglestein; "Dance Floor Theory"
    - Poetry and a beverage
    - International Free Hugs Day

## Traditions:

- Homecoming Week:
  - Mr. USU competition: Winner, Kaho Fiefia
  - Battle of the bands
  - Paint dance
  - Street painting
  - Homecoming Dance

## **Abstract**

This report is prepared on an annual basis for the Faculty Senate at Utah State University in an effort to provide basic student cohort and retention data, and to explicate processes, initiatives, and programs central to student retention efforts at Utah State. Following a summary depiction of current and recent available cohort and retention data, this report will annotate previous, on-going, and future initiatives representing a broad collaboration amongst faculty and staff. The report concludes with a statement emphasizing the critical nature of collaboration among faculty, staff, and administrators in efforts to meaningfully engage students in their Utah State University experience.

## **Administrative Oversight for Retention and Student Success**

The Office of Retention and Student Success was re-engineered in July of 2011. John Mortensen, University Registrar, was promoted to a new position within Student Services as an Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services and Retention. Jenn Twiss was promoted to an Executive Director for Enrollment Services, and Donna Crow was promoted to an Executive Director for Student Success. The Retention Leadership Team has been charged with the mission of comprehensively approaching the processes of student transition, integration, and persistence through programs, initiatives, and research. Together, this new Retention Leadership Team oversees the following offices:

- Academic Resource Center
- Admissions
- Career Services
- Financial Aid
- New Student Orientation
- Registration
- Student Support Services
- University Advising

All of the programmatic functions previously administered by the Office of Retention and Student Success have been reassigned as follows:

- New student enrollment confirmation - New Student Orientation and Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services and Retention
- Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) - New Student Orientation
- University Connections course (USU 1010) - New Student Orientation
- Aggie Passport Experience – New Student Orientation
- Early Academic Alert – partnership between University Advising and Academic Resource Center
- Leave of absence advising – University Advising
- University Parent & Family Programs - Executive Director for Enrollment Services
- Readmission of at-risk students – Admissions
- Change of enrollment – Registration
- Research and analysis of student and institutional retention data – Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services and Retention
- University Retention and Student Success Committee – Retention Leadership Team

Beyond the scope of these programs, the Retention Leadership Team collaborates extensively with departments, offices, and individuals from across the University to identify and implement programs and initiatives designed to contribute to student success and mitigate student attrition.

## Enrollment and Program Participation Figures

### Cohort Enrollment Numbers (provided by Office of Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Logan Campus (Initial Cohort)	2,617	2,549	2,639	2,914	2,937 <sup>i</sup>
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Total USU (Including Regional Campuses)	2,744	2,665	2,796	3,069	3,455 <sup>ii</sup>

### Program Participation Figures (provided by New Student Orientation)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Number of Students Enrolled in Traditional, Pre-Semester Connections	1,495	1,597	1,557	1,694	1,672
Number of Students Enrolled in All Sections of Connections	1,654	1,737	1,710	1,811	1,781
Number of Students Participating in SOAR	2,915	3,021	3,084	3,318	3,334
Number of Parents Attending Orientation on Campus	1,051	1,123	1,345	1,607	1,655

## Student Retention Performance and Future Goals

### First-to-Second-Year Retention for Initial First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students

Cohort Year	Logan Campus	Official Retention Rate (one year later)
2005	1,906 <sup>iii</sup>	72.4%
2006	2,375	73.6%
2007	2,617	73.4%
2008	2,549	73.7%
2009	2,639	71.7%
2010	2,914	Not yet available <sup>iv</sup>

The Retention Leadership Team and the Vice President for Student Services have established the following first-to-second-year retention goals for Utah State University:

### First-to-Second-Year Retention Goals

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Students in 4-Year Programs	72.0%	73.0%	74.0%	75.0%	75.5%	76.0%
Students in 2-Year Programs	49.0%	50.0%	52.0%	53.0%	54.0%	55.0%

*The year 2011 represents the first-year retention for 2010 cohort students.*

## Six-Year Graduation Performance and Future Goals

### Six-Year Graduation Performance for Initial First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students

Cohort Year	Logan Campus	Official Six-Year Graduation Rate
2000	2,038 <sup>v</sup>	47.9%
2001	2,328	44.8%
2002	1,883	53.2%
2003	2,358	55.7%
2004	2,028	55.7%
2005	1,906	Not yet available <sup>vi</sup>

The Official four-year average (2001-2004) used in the U.S. News rankings formula was 52.4%. The Retention Leadership Team and the Vice President for Student Services have established the following six-year graduation goals for Utah State University:

### Graduation Goals – Students Who Graduate Within Six Years of Cohort Term

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Students in 4-Year Programs</b>	52.0%	53.0%	55.0%	56.0%	57.0%	58.0%
<b>Students in 2-Year Programs</b>	31.5%	32.0%	32.5%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%

*The year 2011 represents the sixth-year graduation for 2005 cohort students.*

Retention and graduation goals will be met through the following initiatives.

## Previous and Ongoing Retention and Graduation Initiatives

### 1. Enrollment Confirmation and Course Requests

A website is available for incoming freshmen to request a cluster of courses, based on their major, interests, previous academic background, and advisor recommendations. The process allows the students to be preregistered into a set of courses prior to participating in SOAR.

### 2. Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR)

All incoming freshmen are required to participate in this program. Additional options of SOAR have been created, including an evening session for nontraditional students and veterans, as well as a session for students who earned a New Century Scholarship prior to attendance. Online SOAR has been revised and improved and alternative versions of it are being used by the regional campuses.

### 3. University Connections Course (USU 1010)

Connections is an optional first-year experience course for incoming freshmen. Over 50 percent of the incoming freshman class take this course.

### 4. Weekly E-mail to Students

Students may sign up to have an e-mail sent to them weekly. The e-mail includes important campus dates and deadlines, highlights one of the campus resources available, highlights a campus club or organization, shares a variety of tips from the A-Team, and provides a calendar of events on campus and in the community.

### 5. Provisional Admission Committee

To encourage the retention and success of provisionally admitted students, representatives from across campus are engaged in developing and implementing high-touch programming for this population. This programming begins with a mandatory and customized SOAR orientation, early alert, timely communication and services from advisors and academic support program offices, mid-term progress reports, and peer advising.

### 6. Early Academic Alert

Faculty members have the option to fill out an online form for any of their students for which they are concerned. The information is sent to the Office of University Advising (UA). UA offers to meet with these students and, in many instances, refers them to the campus resources that can best address their needs.

### 7. Registration reminders and assistance

E-mails are sent to currently enrolled students to inform them of priority registration for an upcoming semester. In addition, a follow-up e-mail is sent to students and offers assistance to those who did not take advantage of preregistration.

### 8. Access to Student Progress and Retention Data

A range of reports have now been created and are both available and customizable through the USU Reporting Warehouse. Departments can now access specific report templates and track aggregate and individual student data longitudinally using varied sets of criteria. Access to this information now puts into

the hands of these offices and departments the capability to better monitor the students they serve and determine appropriate courses of action on the basis of this analysis.

### **9. Leave of Absence**

USU has a significant number of students who take a leave of absence for a variety of reasons. A website was created to assist students in their transition away from and back to USU. The processes that are in place have led to a high return rate of those who have left. Students who leave for church service or military service may be excluded when retention or graduation rates are calculated. Students who return and graduate within six years of their initial start date may be included in the calculation of graduation rates.

### **10. Retention Committee**

The Retention Committee and its subcommittees meet regularly to plan and discuss initiatives that may have a positive impact on student retention. Subcommittees include Academic Experience, Provisional Admission, and Student Engagement.

### **11. Readmission of students who left USU on warning, probation, or suspension**

A new readmission process was initiated in 2004. Of the students who were readmitted and enrolled, a high percentage of students have attained good standing and many have graduated, or are on track to graduate.

## **Future Retention and Graduation Initiatives**

### **1. Retention Scholarships**

Approximately \$30,000 per year will be devoted to scholarships for student retention.

### **2. DegreeWorks**

The University has had DegreeWorks for a few years, but it was not implemented fully across campus. The Council of Associate Deans has made a commitment to have all academic programs built and tested by Fall 2012. DegreeWorks will automate a lot of the course planning and what-if scenarios, giving students instant access to this information without the assistance of an advisor.

### **3. Summer School Calendar, Offerings, and Bell Times**

Beginning Summer 2012, the summer school calendar, offerings, and bell times have been modified to better meet student needs. The calendar is more attractive to students and faculty, the offerings are based more on student demand, and the bell times are more conducive to assembling a full-time schedule. It is anticipated that summer school will help alleviate some of the current bottlenecks associated with fall and spring semesters.

### **4. Advisor Assignments in Banner**

Approximately 35 percent of students currently do not have an advisor assigned in Banner. An initiative is being explored that would automatically assign advisors in Banner. Advisor assignments would include academic advisors, financial aid counselors, and career coaches. The goal is to make these assignments very visible to students so they know who to go to when questions arise.

### **5. Student Tracker**

Student Tracker is a free service available to USU through the National Student Clearinghouse. This service will be beneficial in identifying and following-up with students who transfer to other colleges or universities.

### **6. Retention Reports by Subpopulations**

Retention reports will be prepared that will provide comparison data between students who belong to a specific group versus those who do not. Comparison data will look at academic indicators (e.g., ACT math scores, admission index, etc.) and student engagement indicators (e.g., students who live on-campus, students who belong to a fraternity or sorority, students who participate in Connections, etc.).

## **7. Retention Workshops**

A retention workshop will be rolled out to various University constituencies. Based on their feedback, modified workshops will be prepared for other audiences, including students and their parents.

## **8. Improved Early Alert System**

Automated early alert systems from various vendors are being evaluated. The goal is to implement an automated early alert system by Fall 2012.

## **9. Best Practices**

It is proposed that the Retention website become a clearinghouse for listing all retention-related activities. It is intended that the website will serve as a resource for campus units to replicate successful retention efforts.

## **10. Collaboration with Regional Campuses and Distance Education (RCDE)**

Collaboration efforts with RCDE are already underway to determine how to best provide services and meet the needs of RCDE students.

## **11. Respond to Scannell & Kurz Recommendations**

In Fall 2010, Scannell & Kurz, Inc. completed a rigorous and extensive external analysis of USU student data, information, programs, and policies and rendered a series of recommendations to assist Utah State University in enhancing student retention efforts. Many of these recommendations are addressed above, and others may be addressed in future years.

## **12. Student Portal**

A committee is currently in place to review options for a student portal. A student portal will provide a better way for students to navigate the University's system of support offerings and engagement activities.

## **A Concluding Note on Faculty and Collaboration**

According to Kinzie and Kuh (2004), "Sharing responsibility for educational quality and student success is woven into the tapestry of educationally effective institutions." A review of the student success and retention-focused accomplishments noted in this report reveals the significance of effective and efficient collaboration among faculty, staff, and administration in developing effectual initiatives and engendering positive outcomes for students and the institution. While each of the aforementioned initiatives certainly demand the contributions of multiple constituents, it is important to note the central role played by faculty members not only in these initiatives taken individually, but perhaps most critically, in the comprehensive effort to provide for student success and retain students at this institution. The proximity between faculty members and students on a daily basis in teaching, research, and advising capacities allows for members of the faculty to have unparalleled influence on the lives of students, an influence that Richard Light (2001) claims many faculty members often underestimate. Faculty members' efforts, both in their individual work with students on a daily basis, and their participation in centrally-sponsored programs and initiatives such as those outlined in this report, are fundamentally critical to the Utah State University's student retention endeavors and accomplishments, and should be emphatically noted as the basis for the accomplishments listed in this report, and the foundation for the successes to be achieved in the future.

## **References**

Kinzie, J., & Kuh, G.D. (2004). Going DEEP: Learning from Campuses that Share Responsibility for Student Success. *About Campus*, 9(5), 2-8.

Light, R. (2001). *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 104.

---

<sup>i</sup> All 2011 cohort figures are still designated as preliminary by AAA.

<sup>ii</sup> All 2011 cohort figures are still designated as preliminary by AAA. 2011 Number includes students from USU Eastern.

<sup>iii</sup> Each initial cohort figure represents the number of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking, Logan campus students in an entering fall semester cohort prior to adjustments for all allowed reporting exclusions used in calculating the University's retention rate. For more information on these adjustments, see <http://aaa.usu.edu/factsfigures/RetentionGraduation.htm>.

<sup>iv</sup> All adjusted cohort totals and corresponding first- to second- year retention figures are prepared each spring by Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation for the previous academic year's cohort of entering students. Correspondingly, the retention rate for the official 2010 entering cohort will be available from AAA in spring 2012.

<sup>v</sup> Each initial cohort figure represents the number of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking, Logan campus students in an entering fall semester cohort prior to adjustments for all allowed reporting exclusions used in calculating the University's retention rate. For more information on these adjustments, see <http://aaa.usu.edu/factsfigures/RetentionGraduation.htm>.

<sup>vi</sup> All adjusted cohort totals and corresponding six-year graduation figures are prepared each spring by Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation. Correspondingly, the six-year graduation rate for the official 2005 entering cohort will be available from AAA in spring 2012.

**Report from the Educational Policies Committee  
November 3, 2011**

The Educational Policies Committee met on November 3, 2011. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page<sup>1</sup> and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the November 3 meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of November 3, 2011 which included the following notable actions:
  - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 30 requests for course actions.
2. There was no report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee (Meeting to be held on November 11).
3. Approval of the report of the General Education Subcommittee meeting of September 20, 2011. Of note:
  - The following General Education courses were approved:  
  
ARTH 2730 (BHU)  
HIST 3530 (DHA)  
HIST 4650 (DHA)
4. Other EPC Business:
  - The request from the Department of Watershed Sciences to remove the Aquatic Ecology specialization from the MS and PhD degrees in Fisheries Biology was approved.
  - The request from the Department of Languages, Philosophy and Speech Communication to change the name to the Department of Languages, Philosophy and Communication Studies AND to change the name of the Speech Communication major to Communication Studies was approved.
  - The request from the Department of English to remove the Plan B and replace it with a Plan C in the English master's degree specialization in Technical Writing was approved.
  - The request from the Department of Nutrition, Dietetics and Food Sciences to add a Plan C option to the Master of Dietetics Administration degree was approved.

- The request from the Department of Nutrition, Dietetics and Food Sciences to change the name of the Master of Food Microbiology and Safety to Master of Food Quality and Safety and that the Plan B degree be replaced with a professional Plan C degree was approved.
- The request from the Department of Applied Economics to offer a Master of Science in International Food and Agribusiness was approved.
- The request from Department of Applied Economics to offer a Bachelor of Science in Environmental and Natural Resource Economics was approved.

1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/archives/index.html>



Number 402

Subject: The Faculty Senate and Its Committees

Effective Date: July 1, 1997

Revision Dates: November 16, 2001, April 29, 2002, January 12, 2007, April 30, 2007, March 6, 2009, August 13, 2010

Date of Last Revision: July 8, 2011

---

## 402.3 MEMBERSHIP; ALTERNATES; TERM; VACANCIES

### 3.2 Alternates for Elected Members

Senate members are expected to attend its meetings regularly. In cases of unavoidable absence, including sabbatical leave, professional development leave, and unpaid leaves of absence, Senators will arrange for an elected alternate senator to attend in their place (see policy 402.10.2). The alternate shall have full voting rights.

Senators must notify the Executive Secretary of the Senate in writing (email is acceptable) whenever alternates will replace them. If ~~an absent~~ a senator fails twice to make a documented effort to arrange for ~~a substitute more than once~~ an alternate during an academic year, then that senator's position will be considered vacant (see policy 402.3.4). ~~Senators are considered absent whenever they are replaced by designated alternates (see policy 402.3.4).~~

### 3.4 Vacancies

A senate seat shall be declared vacant if a senator (1) resigns, ~~(2) is terminated, (3) goes on extended medical leave, (4) will otherwise be unavailable for more than half of the academic year, (2) is no longer a member of the faculty of the academic unit from which he or she was elected, or (5)~~ (3) misses two regularly scheduled senate meetings during an academic year without making a documented effort to arrange arranging for an alternate and keeping the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate informed in writing (email is acceptable), or (6) misses four regularly scheduled senate meetings during any one academic year even if he or she has arranged for alternates, or (7) is no longer a member of the faculty of the academic unit from which he or she was elected. The Executive Secretary of the Senate reports all vacancies to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees will then contact For vacancies an alternate elected senator will be appointed by the affected academic dean or vice president, who will appoint an alternate elected senator to fill the seat within 30 days in accordance with policies (see policy 402.3.2). Colleges whose alternates are not responsive to requests to fill in for senators with planned absences or which do not have sufficient alternates will be required to run a replacement election (see policy 402.3.1). The Faculty Senate Presidency will address

other vacancies on a case-by-case basis. For vacancies among Presidential appointees, the president shall appoint a new Senator within 30 days (see policy 402.3.1).

## Recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on the Curriculum

10/11/2011

Norm Jones, Chair; James MacMahon, John Allen, Charlie Huenemann, Charles Torre, Michael Torrens, Mary Leavitt, Richard Mueller

Given:

The need to staff more efficiently

The benefit of a tighter fit between General Education and majors

The pedagogical value of a more directive curriculum

The pressure for higher retention and completion rates

The disconnect between staffing (faculty and advising) and student demand

The need to ensure and advance a quality curriculum

Therefore, in order to shorten the time to graduation, increase retention and improve the academic experience, we propose the following

1. Incentives should be created in admissions for students who have the appropriate math, English and foreign language skills before enrolling. These may include a mixture of scholarships, credit for competency, and other mechanisms that will reduce demand in entry level courses. This should:
  - a. Create clear pathways into degrees, with explanations for why certain subjects are core to degree entry, reducing time to graduation and improving retention.
  - b. Address remediation needs in math and composition by spelling out preparation for success in college and by doing math placement earlier. In turn, it will relieve pressure on staffing.
  
2. Because General Education is to build the foundation for more advanced learning, the completion of General Education, demonstrated by the completion of an associate's degree, or a pre-major that includes General

Education, or a college specific core which includes General Education, shall be required for admission to upper division work. Such requirements will demand an aggressive advising structure.

All USU students who have completed 60 hours in a specified track that included General Education will be eligible to be awarded an AA or AS degrees.

All majors will provide a Degree Qualification Profile [DQP] showing the linkage between their lower division and upper division requirements. For each degree there will be specified learning outcomes and assessments of progress.

Funding mechanisms for the support of core courses should be systematized using tracking and predicting of student demand to ensure that resources are available to enable all students to finish the required core in a timely fashion.

Ensuring that foundational learning occurs in a predictable sequence with clear linkages to the majors will:

- a. Reduce time to graduation by ensuring that courses are available as they are needed.
- b. Make curricular demand and staffing more predictable and efficient.
- c. Improve retention. In particular, students who stop out before earning a bachelor's degree will, by taking the AA or AS, be counted as having completed a qualification.
- d. Make evaluation and assessment easier when clear outcomes and linkages are established across the curriculum.
- f. Improve articulation between all the USU campuses and with feeders schools.

3. USU should have an overall Degree Qualification Profile [DQP] within which departmental DQPs can operate, and which can form part of the IDEA student evaluation process. The DQP's will be used to ensure that students have mastered their fundamental learning and will guarantee competencies.

Common assessment questions should be used within degrees to assess outcomes, and there should be portions of examinations that are in common in multiple section classes.

These steps will:

- a. Situate USU as a leader in the national movement toward degree qualifications and "tuned" disciplines.
- b. Allow USU to demonstrate that its graduates have met the Essential Learning Outcomes established in the Regents' policy R470.
- c. Improve assessment and accreditation.
- d. Ensure a quality educational experience across all forms of deliver and tighter links between lower and upper division courses because of known and predictable course content.

4. A "curricular impact" group should be formed to advise on the effects of changing patterns of enrollment, changing major requirements, and changing infrastructure needs to promote strategic planning and budgeting.

This will:

- a. Enable the University to respond to changing needs and demands for staffing, lab space, and sections.
- b. Make enrollment planning better match curricular planning.

c. Ensure that departmental and collegiate curricular decisions are taken in the larger context of the University's ability to supply courses needed to support those decisions.

## External Peer Review Letters

Draft 11/7/11, GM

For discussion with FSEC on 11/21/11

The problem: Current Code refers only to research when discussing external review letters. How can we accommodate the increasingly large number of USU faculty for whom research is a relatively minor part of their role statement?

405.7.2(1)

### Current wording

*Each reviewer should be asked to state, at the very least, the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate, and to evaluate the candidate's published work and/or creative endeavors and recognition and standing among his or her peers.*

### Change recommended by provost and deans

*Each reviewer should be asked to state the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate. In addition, external reviewers will be asked to evaluate the performance, record and accomplishments of the candidate in both the major area of emphasis in his or her role statement, and, where appropriate, a second professional domain. Performance in the primary area of emphasis must reach or exceed the standard of excellence; while performance in the second domain must reach or exceed the standard of effectiveness (as required in Section 405.2.2). Finally, the external reviewers will be asked to evaluate the recognition and standing of the candidate among his or her peers.*

Added notes:

The provost notes that Service cannot be in the top two for consideration for promotion or tenure, so, by default, we are talking about Research and Teaching, I think.

How can external reviewers evaluate teaching? The provost suggests that the same dossier materials on teaching that go to the internal review committees can be sent to the external reviewers.

Note: similar changes will need to be made in 405.8.3(1) External Peer Reviews (for promotion) and 405.11.4(1) External Peer Reviews (for promotion for term faculty).

**USU FACULTY FORUM  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 7, 2011  
Taggart Student Center Auditorium**

The Faculty Forum is convened in lieu of the regularly scheduled November meeting of the Senate. This annual scheduled meeting of the Faculty Forum is open to all faculty members to attend and speak, with the exception of the President of the University, the Provost, the presidential appointees, deans and department heads, or the student members of the Senate, unless specifically requested by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum... Participants may discuss subjects of current interest, question and debate any policies and procedures, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate...The Faculty Forum Executive Committee sets the agenda for the November meeting...The agenda includes all items raised by the petition(s) of faculty, together with items deemed pertinent by the Executive Committee. (Code Section: 402.9.1 & .9.2)

**The forum was called to order by Faculty Senate President Glenn McEvoy at 3:01 pm**

**Welcome and review of the outcomes of last year's forum discussion - Glenn McEvoy**

Follow-up from Faculty Forum 2010:

- A Benefits Advisory Committee has been established to work with Dave Cowley and BrandE Faupell to obtain faculty input into benefits processes. It was important to have faculty involved at the beginning of the process rather than after discussions had already been held.
- Faculty Salaries. BFW produced a survey and published it in March of last year relating to faculty preferences for salary increases when and if any salary money became available. This information can be found on the faculty senate webpage.
- Dealing fairly with Promotion and Tenure at Regional campuses and USU-CEU. The concern is primarily from faculty who do not have role statements that are predominantly research. Much of last year's efforts in the Faculty Senate were devoted to revising the Code so that we could merge with our colleagues at USU-CEU. In that process we tried to change the Code related to external review letters, but that particular part of the change was set aside because it was controversial and needed more careful consideration. Work is currently being undertaken to redraft that part of the Code. Such a change will most likely have external reviewers look at teaching in addition to--or instead of--research for faculty whose role statements are predominantly teaching.

**Forum Discussion Items:**

- 1) How can the quinquennial post-tenure review process be made more effective? What possible rewards or consequences should be used in a revamped process?**

*It was stated that there is a concern as to "What 5-year post-tenure review process?" How do we implement it and make sure it happens? In this particular college, the process has been suspended altogether. The concern is that the process is implemented unevenly around campus.*

- 2) Should there be more faculty involvement in campus design and planning activities (e.g., new student recreation center, road 700 N., parking issues and concerns)?**

*A statement was made in favor of more faculty involvement. There is currently a project to build a student recreation center on the west side of the HPER field. The project is being spearheaded by VP of Student Services and Campus Recreation. It is felt that the field is part of HPER's academic space. HPER would be losing over a quarter of their open space because of this project. Faculty are not opposed to the center, just the process which seemed to ignore faculty input. A question was asked about the nature of the committee and it was stated that it was the ARCC committee organized by the VP for Student Services and only one member was from HPER. It is not the overall Campus Planning Committee.*

**3) Should faculty be able to continue receiving extra compensation for overload teaching? Clarification of Human Resources policy on overload teaching.**

*According to the Provost, there are no new changes in overload policy. It is simply a commitment to implement policy that has been in existence for quite some time. Personnel Policy 376 says that no faculty can make more in overload compensation than 20% additional above the 12 month base, and that overloads should be provided on a temporary basis for things that come up from year to year that are outside the faculty member's primary role assignment.*

*A number of faculty and administrators from RCDE have been told that as of July, 2012 there will be no extra service compensation beyond the annualized salary. Clarification is needed regarding this policy. Can individual units or colleges implement policies that restrict overload pay when it says in Code that overload is possible under certain circumstances (Policies 376 and 404.1.2)?*

*How do we determine what is overload? Is there any way to specify overload? In some parts of the university there are annual role assignments that are more specific in terms of how many credit hours and how many courses individual faculty will teach. Role assignments are negotiated with the department head. But one faculty member said s/he was new this year and taught 13 credits and was told by the department head that all were part of load.*

*There is concern about the timing of more assertive implementation of a policy that has been on the books for a long time. Why now, especially since there have been no raises in three years? Timing of this issue is in question. The Faculty Senate needs to address this.*

*Do role statements need to be reformulated? Role statements are now over five pages long but still lack specificity as to how much teaching is "in role" and how much is "out of role." Colleges may or may not implement an annual work plan. It is disconcerting when we are talking about overload when we don't have a definition of load. With current budget constraints we are limited in the amount extra compensation we can garner, but one of the immediate consequences of a cut back in personnel is that the workloads get spread over less people. We need to define loads and overloads. The Faculty Senate needs to investigate this with the Provost's Office.*

*We need to find out the number of individuals who are on extra compensation. This is going to cause some significant issues with faculty and morale, if we start to take away the only aspect of additional income that faculty has had over the last four years.*

*There is a problem when faculty have been recruited with the promise of overload and get on campus to find a new fervor to implement a policy that has been on the books for a long time and largely ignored.*

*This policy is being implemented in some colleges and departments very strictly and other colleges and departments haven't even heard about it. This policy should be implemented equally across the university.*

**4) How should faculty compensation be approached during hard economic times? How can faculty voice about compensation priorities be more effectively expressed? What is the role of BFW in these processes and are their recommendations followed?**

*No comment*

**5) How can we facilitate more effective integration of faculty on the Eastern campus with their home departments? (Similar issues may exist in parts of RCDE.)**

*It was suggested that faculty in RCDE be listed on the department websites.*

*USU-CEU is getting conflicting direction from department heads in Logan and administration at USU-CEU. For instance, the Logan department head says teach 9 credits and save some time for research, but the local administrators say all faculty at CEU teach 15 credits. And it is expected that the local administrators will be the primary drivers of annual performance evaluations. Faculty members are suffering from this. There needs to be consistent direction between USU-CEU and Logan.*

*Many departments have made great strides toward integration (e.g., broadcasting department meetings). There needs to be more communication between departments and USU-CEU.*

**6) Open forum for the discussion of other topics of your choice (e.g., the use of external review letters in P&T decisions when research is not the predominant faculty role; university wide purchase of important software such as TurnItIn, SPSS; communication between USU faculty and Board of Regents; the reduction in financial support for graduate assistants)**

*What is the role of RCDE broadcast and online classes that originate from the Logan Campus? Why does a broadcast class get paid differently than an online class? Some department heads are not interested in distance education as it is perceived that they do not get anything from it. The person said it was nice of the department head to let him/her teach a distance education class since s/he gets a little more money but the department doesn't get anything. The department head feels like distance education is freeloading since they aren't paying for any basic infrastructure resources (office, phone, computer etc.). How do we integrate the growing online component of classes and broadcast classes into people's role statements? Uniform pay structure was suggested. What benefits might departments receive from allowing faculty to teach distance education?*

*There is confusion that exists with graduate student compensation. It was suggested that we become more deliberate in our planning as to what we want to do, who we want to be and how we want to execute (relative to graduate education). We can't be talking about having international impact and give no break to international students. Many grants don't allow us to write tuition into the grant and some grants have funding caps. As we plan, what do we want from the graduate program, how do we want to do it, and how are we going to fund it? It was suggested that this is a good time to address this with a new person in the role of Dean of the School of Graduate Studies.*

The meeting adjourned at 3:36 pm.