FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

Agenda

3:00  Call to Order
      Approval of Minutes February 22, 2011

3:05  Announcements
      • Next Brown Bag Lunch with the President Wednesday, March 23, 2011

3:10  University Business

3:30  Information Items
      1. PRPC Annual Report
      2. Honorary Degrees and Awards Report

3:45  New Business
      1. EPC Items
      2. Calendar Committee Annual Report and Proposal
      3. FDDE Proposal To Develop Comprehensive Strategic Visionary Diversity Office at USU
      4. Ad Hoc Committee for USU-CEU Code Changes

4:30  Adjournment
Vincent Wickwar called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Ed Heath made a motion to approve the minutes of January 18, 2011. The motion was seconded by Byron Burnham and passed unanimously.

Announcements

The next Brown Bag Lunch with the President is March 23, 2011 at 12:00 pm in Champ Hall.

University Business – Provost Coward.

The budget numbers from the state legislature are due out later today. The feeling is optimistic and the 7% cuts will probably be backfilled. The search committee is meeting to review the pool of candidates for the Vice President for Research/Dean of the School of Graduate Studies position. Provost Coward believes there are some very attractive candidates. The search for the director of the Swaner Center is also moving forward. The Ecology Center position is currently in negotiations. Glenn McEvoy asked about the legislative bill regarding tenure for professors. It is scheduled to be heard on Friday, it is widely believed it will not get out of committee. President Albrecht is taking the position that losing tenure would put USU at a competitive disadvantage with our peer institutions elsewhere in the country. The president is taking an educational approach to dispel the misconceptions that many have about tenure.

Information Items

Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Annual Report – Rhonda Miller. The committee has been focusing on getting more representation for health care benefits and has made remarkable progress with the implementation of the Benefits Advisory Committee. BFW has completed a survey of faculty regarding their opinions about USU’s benefits and compensation in order to become aware of any other issues that faculty would like to have addressed.

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Annual Report – Richard Jenson. Richard Jenson was not in attendance at the meeting, but his report was in the agenda packet. (He was at the AFT monthly meeting!)

There was a motion made to place the BFW and AFT items on the consent agenda. The motion passed.

BFW Survey – Doug Jackson-Smith. A survey was conducted, referred to in BFW report, to provide systematic feedback from faculty on benefits and compensation. Seventy-five percent of tenured or tenure track faculty in the system replied, the exception was in RCDE which had a lower response rate, about 20%. Nathan Straight asked if the distribution of the survey was thorough and said that he would be willing to remind RCDE faculty, at their upcoming meeting,
that this survey is available to them. Doug believes the survey provided good feedback in several areas. In general faculty are very satisfied with the health care benefits and more than satisfied with the retirement benefits. Compensation is the area of immediate concern as is merit and salary compression. There were no questions on the survey regarding rank. The survey results will be posted on the Faculty Senate website when they are completed. Faculty will be notified of the results of this study via college-by-college distribution lists.

A motion to place this item on the Faculty Senate Agenda as Information Items was made by Steve Burr and seconded by Ed Heath. The motion passed.

New Business

**EPC Items – Larry Smith.** There was no January meeting of the Academic Standards subcommittee. The General Education subcommittee had only a few actions. The Curriculum subcommittee reported three program proposals. First, a 12-credit certificate proposal in Design Thinking for Innovation which is interdisciplinary in nature, involving business and art students on a study abroad program in Europe. The second proposal considered was an 18-credit certificate in Rehabilitation Counseling. This would primarily be for professionals in related fields. Finally, HPER proposed a masters Plan B option for three specializations. All proposals were approved.

Glenn McEvoy moved to place the report on the consent agenda. Ed Heath seconded and the motion passed.

**PRPC Items – Bob Parson. Section 402.10 - 402.12 “The Faculty Senate and Its Committees (Second Reading).** Additional changes will be incorporated from the review of the ad hoc committee for this section.

A motion was made by Glenn McEvoy to place this item on the Faculty Senate Agenda as an action item. Doug Jackson-Smith seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**Section 401.4.2 (1) – Proposed change to Lecturer Ranks.** The Code Compliance Committee suggested changes to this section and PRPC adjusted the language to read “collectively agree”. Provost Coward indicated that the Deans are concerned with that wording, and that “collectively agree” is too undefined and infers that everyone agrees rather than the authority resting with the department head. It is the responsibility of the department head to make teaching assignments. Bob clarified that the intent of the language was to imply that the department head and faculty would meet together not individually, and that it would preclude the removal of a full professor and replacing him or her with a lecturer. Byron Burnham suggested the section read, “in the case of graduate level courses...lecturers may by assignment teach courses 5000 and above after a full consultation between the department head and faculty”.

Bob will take the section back to PRPC for further word smithing and present it to either the Faculty Senate Executive Committee again or include it in the code modifications that the ad hoc committee will propose.

**Section 405.11.4(1) – Vince Wickwar.** Mike Parent made a motion at the previous Faculty Senate meeting to send this section back to PRPC through the Executive Committee with the following language, “external peer review (required of core faculty ranks only)” and that the last sentence be reconsidered. External letters are needed for research faculty but not for Federal Cooperators/Collaborators, even though they are given full rights of faculty members but do not have a USU role statement. After some discussion it was determined that the ad hoc committee will address this issue.

**One-Year Renewal of USU-CEU Faculty Senate Apportionment - Vince Wickwar.** Last year there was approval for the participation of USU-CEU faculty on the Faculty Senate, three to be members of the Senate with one of those members being a member of the Faculty Senate
Executive Committee. This approved motion was for a one-year period, but could be renewed if needed. As the faculty code has not yet been updated to include USU-CEU a one-year renewal is needed. In addition, it is proposed that a USU-CEU representative be elected to each of the Faculty Senate standing committees. The logic for this is the same as already followed for RCDE representatives.

A motion to put this on the agenda as an action item was made by Glenn McEvoy and seconded by Doug Jackson-Smith. The motion passed unanimously.

How to proceed with code changes to integrate USU-CEU? - Vince Wickwar. An ad hoc committee was formed, and has been meeting regularly since October to review the code for necessary changes to incorporate USU-CEU. The normal code change procedure would be to take the proposed changes to the PRPC committee. However, while PRPC has served us extremely well, it will be unable to process the volume of changes that are expected from this review in a timely manner, as evidenced by their still working on the changes proposed by the Kras committee three years ago. Taking several years would greatly exceed the time line within the charge made by President Albrecht. In addition, that time line is very important to our colleagues at USU-CEU. Vince is requesting that two special Faculty Senate meetings be held to discuss and review the proposed changes. Members of the ad hoc committee and PRPC will be invited to these meetings. They are scheduled for March 17, 5:00-6:30 in the CHaSS Deans Conference Room, Main 340 and March 18, 3:00-4:30 in Library 154. The reservations are such that discussion could continue well beyond the nominal adjournment time. Proposed changes, updated after these special meetings, would be presented for votes in the following, regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meetings.

A motion was made by Ed Heath and seconded by Steve Burr to place the adoption of the proposed schedule and additional meetings as an action item on the Faculty Senate Agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

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

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC)

Submitted by

Bob Parson, Chair

March 21, 2011

PRPC scheduled meetings on the following dates:

   September 14, 2010
   October 12, 2010
   November 9, 2010 (no quorum)
   December 7, 2010
   February 14, 2011
   February 28, 2011
   March 15, 2011
   April 5, 2011

PRPC advises the Faculty Senate regarding the “composition, interpretation and revision of Section 400 in University Policies and Procedures,” commonly referred to as the Faculty Code. Members of PRPC for the academic year 2010-2011 include:

Jeff Broadbent, Agriculture
Randy Simmons, Business
Chris Gauthier, CCA
Terry Peak, CHaSS
Susan Turner, Education & Human Services
Paul Wheeler, Engineering
Layne Coppock (alternate), Natural Resources
Ian Anderson, Science
Bob Parson, Libraries (chair)
Margie Memmott, Extension
Karen Woolstenhulme, RCDE
Steven Folkman, Senate
Shane Graham, Senate
Dorothy Dobson, Senate

At its August meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) charged PRPC with considering changes proposed by the Code Revision Committee (aka the Kras Committee) to Section 402.4 through 402.13, *The Faculty Senate and Its Committees*, as well as to Section 405.11.4(1), *Events During the Year in which a Promotion Decision is to be Made, External Peer Reviews*.

PRPC presented changes to Section 402.4 through 402.9, for its first reading, to the FSEC on September 20, 2010, and to the Faculty Senate on October 4, 2010. The changes passed unanimously.

FSEC approved these changes for its second reading at the FSEC meeting on October 18.

PRPC considered changes to the balance of Section 402, from 402.10 through 402.13 at its October 12 meeting. PRPC also considered changes to Section 405.11.4(1). PRPC presented these changes to FSEC on October 18. FSEC approved Section 405.11.4(1) for its first reading.

PRPC asked for and received direction from FSEC on October 18 for several parts of Section 402.10 through 402.13, which the PRPC Chair took back to PRPC for further consideration.

PRPC failed to make a quorum at its November meeting, and no official business was conducted.

PRPC presented changes to Section 402.4 through 402.10 for its second reading, as well as Section 405.11.4(1), for its first reading at Faculty Senate on December 6. The Senate approved both measures.

PRPC met on December 7 to consider the advice and direction previously provided on Section 402.10 through 402.13 by FSEC in October. PRPC proposed language, and presented theses changes to FSEC on December 13, and after clarification, presented them again to FSEC on January 18, 2011. FSEC passed these changes on a first reading. PRPC subsequently presented these changes to Faculty Senate on February 11, 2011, which approved the first reading.

At its November 15, 2010 meeting, FSEC also directed PRPC to consider a proposed change to the description of Lecturer Ranks found in Section 401.4.2(1). The proposed change was to clarify “two points in the policy: that the defined course levels be consistent with the catalog and that higher level courses being taught by lecturers not be a standard procedure but should only occur under special circumstances and with faculty consultation.” (See FSEC minutes, November 15, 2010).

PRPC discussed and considered this proposal at its December 7 meeting, but took no official action.

At Faculty Senate on January 10, 2011, PRPC presented Section 405.11.4(1), *Events During the Year in which a Promotion Decision is to be Made, External Peer Reviews*, for its second reading. This change, which had been approved by PRPC in October, and which consisted of an inconsequential clerical error, was debated by the Senate (See Faculty Senate Minutes, January 10, 2011), and sent back to FSEC for further action. To date, this section has not been brought back before PRPC.

At its February 14 meeting, PRPC was joined by Senate President, Vince Wickwar; President Elect, Glenn McEvoy; and Past President, Ed Heath; who presented the committee with the reasoning behind the
proposed change to Section 401.4.2(1), initially consider by PRPC at its meeting on December 7, 2010. PRPC discussed this section, and suggested changes to the language from the original version. PRPC approved these changes unanimously.

At the February 14 meeting, Vince Wickwar also apprised PRPC members concerning the progress of the USU-CEU Code Change Review Ad Hoc Committee, which was appointed by the University President to suggest changes to the Code in order to comply with the Memorandum of Understanding between USU and USU-CEU, as well as to accommodate faculty at USU-CEU, and better reflect the needs of the University’s Regional Campuses.

The FSEC approved a second reading of Section 402.10 through 402.12 at its February 22 meeting. The committee also voted to send Section 401.4.2(1) back to PRPC for further consideration.

PRPC met again on February 28 to reconsider section 401.4.2(1). Glenn McEvoy and Vince Wickwar, again, joined the committee in these deliberations, and presented a modified version of the section that included elements of the original Code Compliance Committee proposal, as well as elements of the language previously adopted by PRPC at its February 14 meeting. After discussing this modified version PRPC voted to approve the language.

Discussions at the February 28 PRPC meeting also centered on the FSEC’s decision to seek Senate approval for Code revisions undertaken by the USU-CEU Code Change Review Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee will suggest and seek Senate approval on March 14 that the Senate hold two special Senate meetings in order to discuss and debate changes being proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee for all of Section 400.

Changes proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee were initially intended to come before PRPC by a February 1 deadline, thus the reasoning for the PRPC Chair’s participation on the Ad Hoc Committee. Regardless of whether PRPC is deserving of its reputation for protracted deliberation, the Ad Hoc Committee will not finish its work until March 3, making it impossible for PRPC to act on these revisions in time to advise the FSEC at its March 21 meeting; hence, the evident necessity of circumventing PRPC during this process.

PRPC will meet again on March 15, and if necessary on April 5.
REPORT OF THE
HONORARY DEGREE AND AWARDS COMMITTEE
to the
Faculty Senate
April 4, 2011

The information contained in this document is CONFIDENTIAL and for review by the Faculty Senate only. It is not to be disseminated to any person outside of the Faculty Senate.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Douglas S. Foxley, Chair (Board of Trustees)
Ralph W. Binns (Board of Trustees and Alumni Council President)
Douglas Jackson-Smith (Faculty)
Laurens H. Smith, Jr. (Provost’s Office)
Paul D. Parkinson (Alumni Council)
Suzanne Pierce-Moore (Board of Trustees)
Sydney Peterson (President’s Office)
Jeffrey R. Smitten (Faculty)
Tyler L. Tolson (Board of Trustees and ASUSU President)
Wayne Wurtsbaugh (Faculty)

PURPOSE

The Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee’s major responsibilities are to implement procedures to solicit and encourage an adequate number of qualified nominations; to review all nominations for Honorary Degrees, Commencement Speaker Awards; and to forward nominations and recommendations to the Board of Trustees for their final selection and approval.

This year the committee worked diligently to seek a list of qualified nominations for Honorary Degree and Commencement Speaker Awards. To seek nominations for the awards, print and on-line advertisements were placed in key newspapers and USU publications, presentations were made to various USU advisory groups, and all USU alumni were contacted for their suggestions.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Honorary Degree Recipients 2011

The Honorary Degree and Awards Screening Committee recommended five candidates for honorary degrees to be presented at Spring Commencement 2011. The Board of Trustees has approved the following five candidates:
Mike Dmitrich

Mike Dmitrich was born in Murray, Utah, and moved to Carbon County when he was five. In 1954 he was recruited to play football at USU and in 1955 was awarded a full-ride football scholarship. After an injury he returned to Price and played for the College of Eastern Utah. His professional career started in the mines of Carbon County. For 18 years, he worked in the mining industry, starting underground for the Kaiser Steel coal mine. He later took over government relations for the Cyprus-Amas Willow Creek Mine and has over 30 years of under- and above-ground mining industry experience.

At the age of 31 he was elected to the Utah House of Representatives and held office in that body until 1990. He served as the House Minority Leader from 1983–1990. In 1991 he was appointed to the Utah State Senate and elected to the senate in 1992. He was the longest serving legislator on Capitol Hill when he retired and had served continuously in the Utah Legislature for 40 years. He has been a long-time passionate voice on Capitol Hill for public and higher education and for the health and economic stability of Utah families.

Karen Haight Huntsman

Karen Haight Huntsman is one of the most influential women in Utah. Karen served for 10 years on the Utah State Board of Regents and was a clear and reasoned voice on the issues facing higher education. She has also served on the University of Utah National Advisory Council, as Director of the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, Director of First Security Bank, Director of Intermountain Health Care, Director of KUED, Co-Chair of the Primary Children’s Medical Center Foundation Board, and the National Board of Christians and Jews. Karen has been instrumental from the beginning in the development of the Huntsman Corporation – from its initial start as a small plastics packaging firm to one of the world’s largest companies with plants and operations in many countries. She always served as a senior officer and director of the company.

The success of Huntsman Corporation has enabled Karen and her husband, Jon, to contribute to many worthy causes. In the U.S., they have given financial assistance to the homeless and disadvantaged, and have provided funding for medical and educational centers including the Huntsman Cancer Institute at the University of Utah and the Huntsman Center for Global Competition and Leadership at the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School of Finance. At Utah State University, they have provided substantial funds for the Huntsman Environmental Research Center, the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business, and the David B. Haight Alumni House. Several other Utah colleges and universities have also benefitted from their gracious contributions to various programs and building projects. Their humanitarian work has been extended abroad to both flood casualty victims in Thailand and those left homeless by the 1988 earthquake in Armenia.
Syng-il Hyun

Syng-il Hyun is a graduate of Utah State University who has a long record of outstanding accomplishments in higher education and in government service and who has achieved national and international prominence. He has served as President of a major private university in Korea, and as an elected member to Korea’s National Assembly, a governing body comparable to the United States Senate, where he gained support for improving the country’s educational system.

Syng-il was prominent in the movement that resulted in increased democracy in Korea and is remembered in Korea as one of the college students and intellectuals who fought for the democracy of the Korean people in the 1960’s, when Korea was in difficult times in terms of political democracy. He is a highly recognized expert on relations between South Korea and North Korea and is a highly accomplished Korean scholar whose works are known and cited by scholars in the United States and other countries. His service contributions in both higher education and in national government arenas are of the highest merit. Syng-il has shown great leadership and achievement as an academician and also as a politician. In the history of Korean political development, he is one of the distinguished intellectuals who fought and sacrificed for democracy.

C. Hardy Redd

C. Hardy Redd has spent his career in ranching and has helped shape the community of La Sal, Utah, the ranching community of southeastern Utah and southwestern Colorado, local and state politics, and the directions of state and community organizations. His ties to the community and land have led him to active roles in the Republican Party, the Society for Range Management and the Utah Endowment for the Humanities. He served three terms in the Utah State Legislature.

Hardy's long involvement with Utah State University began as a student and has continued through service on the board of trustees and the dean’s council for the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. Hardy and the trustees of the Charles Redd Foundation endowed the first chair in the Religious Studies Program in the history department at Utah State University. Today, the Redd Chair is held by a distinguished professor. Hardy and his wife, Sunny, have continued their family legacy of philanthropy through their own gifts and those of the Charles Redd Foundation. Hardy has carried on the family's philanthropic tradition with gifts to enhance many programs, including Dialogue, The Journal of Mormon Thought and The Society for Range Management.

John Wilkerson

John Wilkerson, a New York City-based venture capitalist in the medical field, was born and raised in Elko, Nevada. He attended USU and in 1965 received his bachelor’s degree in biological sciences. He continued his education at Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y., and received a master's and a doctorate. His career began at Johnson and Johnson, where he was a
top-rated health industry analyst. He is the founder of the Wilkerson Group and is co-founder of Galen Partners. In addition, John and his wife, Barbara, are co-founders of the E. L. Rose Conservancy in northern Pennsylvania. The Wilkersons collect early American folk art and paintings of the early works of central and west Australia. Their personal collection has been displayed in various museums around the country.

Commencement Speaker 2011

The Board of Trustees has approved John Wilkerson as the Commencement Speaker for Spring 2011 (see short bio above). Additional names have been submitted for Commencement Speaker for Spring 2012.
Committee Members

Yolanda Flores Niemann, Provost's Office - Chair
Camilla Lyman, Associated Students of USU
Dillon Feuz, Faculty Senate
Stephanie Hamblin, University Advising
Bill Jensen, Registrar’s Office
Deb Megill, Classified Employee’s Association
Matt Lovell, Professional Employee’s Association
Trevor Nelson, Graduate Student Senate
John Mortensen, Registrar’s Office
Sydney M. Peterson, President’s Office
Scott Bates, Faculty Senate
Blake Tullis, Faculty Senate
Taun Beddes, Faculty Senate
Robert Wagner, Regional Campuses and Distance Education

Purpose

The Calendar Committee is charged with the responsibility of reviewing, evaluating, and recommending the University’s academic calendar and employee holidays. The actions of this committee are ratified by the Executive Committee upon the advice of the Faculty Senate.

Spring 2011 Calendar Committee Actions

1. The Committee discussed concerns from the faculty regarding the academic calendar, including the following:

   a. Classes are often being cancelled when they’re off the regular schedule, e.g., a Thursday schedule on Friday;
   b. Some faculty members seem to not be aware of these different schedules;
   c. Students’ work schedules are interrupted by the different class schedule; complaints about different class schedule are coming from Logan and CEU;
   d. The different number of instruction days for fall and spring is very unbalanced (70 vs. 73); faculty members have to make significant adjustments to cover the same material;
   e. Some faculty members, especially those with children in the K-12 system, would like for the USU spring break to overlap with that of Logan and Cache School Districts.
   f. Other contextual considerations for these proposed options include: the lack of a fall-term commencement ceremony; pending changes to the summer terms; and alignment with other research universities in the state with respect to summer work and internships.
2. The Calendar Committee asks that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consider the following options for the 2014 calendar; these options were developed based on the concerns noted above:

**Fall Semester**

a) Fall 2014 – Option A: Maintain status quo for fall semester, including having Friday class schedule on Thursday, October 16 (70 instructional days), as indicated on the attached academic calendar proposal.

b) Fall 2014 – Option B: Begin classes on Wednesday, August 20, and end on classes on December 5; hold finals Dec. 8-12 (73 instruction days). The USU Connections Program will need to adjust if this option is selected.

c) Fall 2014 – Option C: Begin classes on Wednesday, August 20, eliminate fall break, have a week-long Thanksgiving break (71 class days). The USU Connections Program will need to adjust if this option is selected.

d) Fall 2014 – Option D: Begin classes on Monday, August 25, classes end on 12/08. December 9 will be an interim day, pre-finals day, and finals will be from 12/10 - December 16 (73 instructional days).

**Spring Semester**

a) Spring 2014 – Option A: Maintain status quo, including having Monday class schedule on Tuesday, February 17 (73 class days), as indicated on the attached academic calendar proposal.

b) Spring 2014 – Option B: Eliminate Monday class schedule on February 17 and make it a regular Tuesday schedule (this flexibility is the result of the 73 class days in spring), and keep calendar the same as proposed in other respects.

c) Spring 2014 - Option C: Begin classes on January 12, and end on May 8, moving spring break to 1st week of April to overlap with local school districts (73 instructional days). The Calendar Committee notes that beginning classes later in January will allow USU to consider adding a “winter” semester between Christmas break and start of spring semester (for the purposes of allowing for a “winter semester” USU might also consider postponing the first day of spring semester until after the Martin Luther King holiday.

d) Spring 2014 – Option D: Maintain status quo (as indicated on the attached calendars), but begin discussions with school districts to determine if both systems can move toward an agreed-upon spring break.

3. The Calendar Committee proposes acceptance of the employee holiday calendar (attached).

4. The Calendar Committee proposes acceptance of the 2014 summer schedule (attached).

5. The Calendar Committee proposes that the RCDE Schedule be added to the academic calendar.
# Utah State University 2014 Employee Holiday Calendar

## Notes

### 2014 Employee Holidays

- **January 1**, New Year’s Day
- **January 20**, Martin Luther King, Jr.
- **February 17**, Presidents’ Day
- **May 26**, Memorial Day
- **July 4**, Independence Day
- **July 24**, Pioneer Day
- **September 1**, Labor Day
- **November 27, 28**, Thanksgiving Day
- **December 25, 26**, Holiday

### Options for flexible day

- *24 December* - Approved

---

## Utah State University 2014 Employee Holiday Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td><strong>January 1</strong>, New Year’s Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td><strong>January 20</strong>, Martin Luther King, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td><strong>February 17</strong>, Presidents’ Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td><strong>May 26</strong>, Memorial Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td><strong>July 4</strong>, Independence Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td><strong>July 24</strong>, Pioneer Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td><strong>September 1</strong>, Labor Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td><strong>November 27, 28</strong>, Thanksgiving Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td><strong>December 25, 26</strong>, Holiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Created using a template from www.vertex42.com/calendars
Utah State University
2014-2015
Academic Year Calendar

Fall 2014
- August 25, First Class Day
- September 1, Labor Day Holiday
- October 16, Friday Class Schedule
- October 17, Fall Break
- November 26, 27, 28, Thanksgiving Break
- December 5, Last Class Day
- December 8-12, Finals

Spring 2015
- January 5, First Day of Classes
- January 19, Martin Luther King Holiday
- February 16, Presidents' Day Holiday
- February 17, Monday Class Schedule
- March 9-13, Spring Break
- April 24, Last Class Day
- April 27-May 1, Finals Week
- May 1-2, Commencement

Notes
- January 15
- February 15
- March 15
- April 15
- May 15
- June 15
- July 15
- August 15

Created using a template from www.vertex42.com/calendars
March 11, 2011

Proposal To Develop a Comprehensive, Strategic, Visionary Diversity Office at USU, led by a full-time administrator.

In our charge as the Faculty Senate committee on Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity, (FDDE) we are responsible for collecting data, promoting best practices, and making recommendations for enhancing faculty diversity.1 Through our efforts, we have come to realize that a myriad of diversity initiatives and committees exist across USU but no single office promotes, oversees, enables or encourages their efforts. The Provost’s web page, for example lists 38 resources in diversity matters (http://www.usu.edu/provost/faculty/diversity/) yet many of the most effective programs, like the ADVANCE program, Science and Engineering Recruitment Team (SERT), Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Allied (LGBTQA) Center, Women and Gender Research Institute, The Presidents’ Diversity Committee, Women’s Center, Center for Women and Gender either no longer exist, were not listed, or have been reorganized into different organizational units. The Affirmative Action/ Equal Opportunity office lists even fewer resources (12) and similarly has fallen behind in updating the names and organizations of diversity-related resources on their web page. In a report from our committee in 2011, FDDE showed that the Affirmative Action/ Equal Opportunity office is not qualified to oversee diversity efforts, its staff lacks the needed training, and the main role of that office--compliance with State and Federal regulations--is in direct conflict with advocacy for diversity2. Because diversity

1 The actual language of our charge: “The duties of the Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee are to collect data and identify and promote best practices for faculty development, mentoring, and work environment to facilitate the success of diverse faculty at all career levels; provide feedback and advocate processes for faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention that promote diversity, fair pay standards, and work/life balance for the faculty; report on the status of faculty development, mentoring, diversity and equity; and make recommendations for implementation.”
efforts are not integrated, groups are often unaware of, repeating, one another’s efforts and may not be making the best use of limited resources. Real improvement in faculty and student diversity is inhibited by the scattered and eclectic nature of these wide-ranging efforts. A diverse campus climate could grow through a more coordinated effort.

Diversity has many forms. We visualize a campus that celebrates the many differences within our community and encourages further diversification. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, regional background and more. In this letter we focus mostly on the underrepresentation of different racial groups at USU because comparative data are most available and reliable for the racial composition of our faculty and students and because the ADVANCE grant recently helped to move our campus forward in gender equity. Faculty surveys show that USU does not appear to value racial diversity as much as it appears to value gender diversity.  

Examination of tenure and tenure track faculty demographics reveals the limited racial diversity at USU. As Figure 1 and Table 1 (at end) indicate, the vast majority of tenure-track faculty members at Utah State University are white. Gender diversity lags the general population and the student body by 20%. In summary, during 2010-2011:

- 436 of 476 tenured faculty members were white (91.5%) and only 40 (8.5%) were other races.
- Of the 40 tenured faculty members of other races, 26 were Asian/Pacific Islander.\(^4\)
- 82.5% of the untenured faculty members (157) were white and only 33 (17.5%) were other races.
- Of those 33 untenured faculty members, 26 are Asian/Pacific Islander.
- There were only two tenured faculty members classified as Black and there were no untenured Blacks.
- There were only 11 tenured (2%) and 6 untenured (3%) faculty members classified as Hispanic or Latino.
- There were just two untenured faculty members of American Indian/Alaska Native origin and no tenured American Indian/Alaska Natives.
- As Fig. 2 indicates, for all subject areas but engineering, USU is hiring many fewer faculty of other races than are available nationally.
- Female faculty members represent about 30% of the workforce yet women comprise half the population (Fig. 3).

---

\(^2\) See the letter from the FDDE committee concerning the shortcomings of the AA/EO office in our 2010 report to the Faculty Senate.

\(^3\) HERI Surveys in 2004 and 2008.

\(^4\) "Asian/Pacific Islander" and other terms denoting ethnicity and race used in this proposal are prescribed by AA06 Affirmative Action language. USU uses this language when asking employees to identify their own ethnic/racial group.
Fig. 1. Diversity among USU tenure-track faculty, students and the population of Utah State University
Fig 2. Percentage of minority faculty at USU compared to availability by college
Fig. 3. Percentages of female tenure track faculty by year (top) and by college (bottom).
Limited faculty diversity is mirrored in the limited diversity of the USU student population. While diversity has improved in the past several years, Whites still account for the vast majority of students (92%)(Fig. 1). In summary, in 2010 across all campuses for students who declared ethnicity:

- 800 USU students were Hispanics (<4%)
- 248 were Black (approximately 1%)
- 438 were Asian/Pacific Islander (<2%)
- 177 (<1%) were American Indian/Alaskan Native
- 20,409 (approximately 92%) were White

While Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Asian/Pacific Islander numbers are lower, but similar to statewide proportions, Hispanics are very underrepresented at USU, where they account for <4% of the student body, despite comprising 13% of the state population in the 2010 census, and 9% of the population in Cache Valley (Fig. 1). Locally, Hispanics comprise almost 25% of the Logan City School District student population. Nationwide numbers are much more diverse than Utah's, with Whites who are not Hispanic accounting for just 65% of the US population, Blacks accounting for 13%, American Indian/Alaska Native accounting for 1%, Asian/Pacific Islanders for 5%, and Hispanics for 16%.

Furthermore, in the home counties of two our Regional Campuses, the numbers of Native American students far outstrip national and statewide averages. In Uintah County, almost 8% of the K-12 population is of Native American descent and this number rises to a stunning 53% in San Juan County. Because the representation of Native Americans on the faculty at those campuses is negligible, it is even more important to have a system in place to address issues of diversity on our regional campuses.

It is well known that faculty and student diversity are related. Students very often rely on faculty mentors who are from their own racial backgrounds for guidance, and solidarity, especially in a predominantly white school environment where some students may not feel entirely welcome.

---

5 Nationwide numbers are much more diverse with Whites who are not Hispanic accounting for just 65% of the US population, Blacks accounting for 13%, American Indian/Alaska Native accounting for 1%, Asian/Pacific Islanders for 5%, and Hispanics for 16%. Population estimates for Utah and the US come from Census.gov.


7 Population estimates for Utah and the US come from Census.gov.

Increasing the racial diversity of faculty correlates with increasing the enrollment and retention of diverse students.⁹

The value of a diverse campus community has been identified as a positive social good. Research conducted by the American Association of University Professors has demonstrated that both faculty and students find that diversity provides positive educational benefits:

Now we know that education is a two-way exchange that benefits all who participate in the multicultural marketplace of ideas and perspectives. This new vision has supplanted an idea of education in which disciplinary and cultural experts transmit their privileged views to others—a perspective far more likely to have been held by people outside the academy than by those within colleges and universities themselves…. Attention to multicultural learning extends the meaning of personal, social, and moral growth and improves the capacity of colleges and universities to achieve their missions.¹⁰

Moreover, granting agencies have identified the value of diversity and may now be taking into account plans to recruit and retain diverse students and faculty as demonstrated in the reader reports from a 2005 USU proposal for the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) grant: “The track record for minority recruitment is lacking. The institution will need to implement specific efforts to recruit underrepresented minorities.” Furthermore, even the United States Supreme Court (in Grutter vs. Bollinger (University of Michigan) as well as The University of California vs. Bakke) has found that increasing the diversity at state universities offers compelling educational benefits.

Believing that an integrated campus vision, as well as outreach, training, leadership, and advocacy, regarding diversity are fundamental components of an equitable and affirmative campus climate as well as a positive educational experience, FDDE examined the ways that several other universities across the United States address diversity issues. We examined fifteen universities, several of which are peer institutions of USU. Of the fifteen, the efforts of five institutions - Texas A&M University, University of Utah, North Carolina State University, University of California Berkeley, and Arizona State University - seemed most successful. What we learned from these institutions is the importance of the following:

- A centralized office that improves integration and focus of diversity efforts on campus;
- The leadership of a Vice President, Vice Provost, or similar high-ranking executive with background and expertise in diversity issues. This individual must direct the office on a full time basis, shaping and responding to diversity efforts across campus;
- A direct reporting line to the President and/or Provost of the university;


• A steering committee that regularly informs and responds to this executive;
• Prominence of a diversity goal in the university’s mission statement;
• A centralized website that details diversity efforts of faculty, student, and community;
• A link to this web site on the president’s website and the university’s home page;
• A focus on integrating diversity efforts throughout the university so that diversity issues are not marginalized in one office or with one leader or group of people.

The successful universities we studied have diverse faculty and students, as well as clear dedication to continually developing and improving campus climates that strongly value diversity. Diversity is a theme that permeates and integrates each university’s web presence.

We talked with administrators leading diversity efforts at Texas A&M University, the University of Utah, and Arizona State University about the impact their offices have had on campus diversity efforts. All agreed that their offices sent clear institutional messages about the importance of diversity on campus, at all levels. They emphasized that support and endorsement of the university presidents and provosts are key to the success of this effort. With this input, these institutions developed strategic visions regarding diversity and wove this vision into the mission statements and programmatic planning of the universities. All the offices of the people we spoke with have high visibility and strong impact on campus. The leaders we spoke with agreed that students, faculty, staff, and leadership all appreciate the positive impact of diversity on their campuses. This understanding gives these diversity offices and administrators authority and increased opportunities to discuss and advocate for diversity. From our discussions with various administrators, we would like to highlight the following:

• Dr. Delia Saenz, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and Director of the Intergroup Relations Center at Arizona State University, agreed that the diversity efforts she spearheads only became effective with the full support of the provost and president of ASU, as well as the collaboration of the committees with which she works. She emphasized that the values of the university must be clear in its mission statement and goal of a more diverse campus that mirrors our society.

• The Associate Vice President for Diversity at the University of Utah, Dr. Octavio Villalpando, emphasized that the person leading the university’s diversity effort must have high rank in the form of Full Professor, Vice President, or higher so that he/she can successfully advocate for faculty and students. Dr. Villalpando also emphasized that a strategic diversity plan and resulting efforts benefit all students and faculty by growing the diversity of the student body and faculty. He reported that his office has had a strong impact on increasing student diversity, doubling their population of student ethnic minorities since 2005. In tracking students who work with his center, Dr. Villalpando has documented an 85% retention rate, higher even than that of University of Utah honors students.

Without the leadership of a dedicated administrator, as well as presidential and provost support, diversity efforts remain unfocused, small scale, and restricted by the limited powers of the committees or individuals that lead them. We believe USU presently addresses issues of diversity in these limited, unfocused, and therefore less successful ways.
As a result of our investigative findings, FDDE recommends that USU create a comprehensive, strategic visionary plan regarding diversity with clear goals of:

- Increasing the diversity of faculty, staff, and students on our campuses in all areas: race, gender, sexual orientation, disabilities and other underrepresented groups;
- Increasing the retention and inclusion of underrepresented faculty, staff, and students;
- Increasing the diversity of our administrative and executive leaders;
- Developing a campus climate that strongly values diversity;
- Providing expert training in the areas of enhancing diversity; dealing with discrimination; and improving the overall campus climate for diversity;
- Integrating and improving diversity efforts across campus.
- Promoting the recommendations of single-focus diversity efforts on our campus and helping to implement change after a Diversity-related grant expires. Many key changes and structures begun by the ADVANCE grant and SERT committee have been dropped, in part because no central office is charged with carrying on.
- Being vigilant for problems on campus and always questioning whether new initiatives and programs embrace diversity as much as possible.

We recommend leadership of this initiative by a Vice President, Vice Provost, or similar-rank executive who has:

- Substantial scholarly background and expertise in diversity-related issues;
- Proven leadership abilities;
- Sensitivity to the challenges faced by faculty, students and scholars of different races or other underrepresented groups;
- Ability to lead the diversity effort in a full time, or nearly full time, manner so that his/her energies and priorities can remain focused.

We envision an advocacy office as an “umbrella” organization-with a strong executive-level leader enhancing, promoting, and guiding the many excellent offices, initiatives, grants, centers, and committees across our campuses, as well as providing the unifying push for coordinated progress in diversity. The efforts of the Center for Women and Gender (http://www.usu.edu/womenandgender/htm/about); USU Access & Diversity Center (http://www.usu.edu/accesscenter/), LGBTQA Programs (http://www.usu.edu/lgbtqa/); and President’s Diversity committee, to name a few, would all be enhanced by this coordinated emphasis or office. While an office or center devoted to Diversity might be a powerful way to promote this effort, other administrative structures may work equally well.

Finally, we also recommend that the university create a steering committee that is charged with collaborating with the diversity leader to shape a strategic vision and action plan. We suggest that the chair/leader of each of the diversity organizations, committees, or initiatives on campus be represented on this steering committee. The confluence of organizations and ideas should eliminate redundancy, streamline efforts, and increase the impact of the stand-alone initiatives, resulting in a more effective use of existing scarce resources of the university.
It is important that this strategic vision evolve into an actionable plan that results in enhanced campus wide appreciation for and promotion of diversity. The result may be an office devoted to these issues; however, we want to caution USU that an office with limited focus on diversity may be easily marginalized. A substantial, integrated, and actionable vision for a diverse campus environment requires that the vision be integrated across campus and that the efforts not be compartmentalized. Realizing this vision will require full time leadership, fiscal resources, and support staff that includes a skilled web designer. We believe such an effort can help USU reach its goal of “build[ing] a socially and intellectually vibrant campus community, enhanced by the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students” (http://www.usu.edu/president/missionstatement/). It may also become a model for other universities seeking to do so.

Thank you very much for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity Committee, 2010-2011

Jennifer Duncan, Libraries, Chair
Sherry Marx, Education and Human Services
Alison Cook, Business
Suzanne Janecke, Science
Christopher Neale, Engineering
Reza Oladi, Agriculture
Alexa Sand, Caine College of Arts
Maria Cordero, CHaSS
Karen Mock, Natural Resources
Virginia Exton, Regional Campus & Distance Education
Donna Carter, Extension
Nick Morrison, Senate
Lucy Delgadillo, Senate
Lyle Holmgren, Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ethnic Code</th>
<th>Occupation Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full-time job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Part-time job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Tenure Status of Ethnic Groups