

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, January 31, 2002, 3:30 P.M.
Hunter Conference Center, Yankee Meadows Room

I. Call to order by President Steve Evans at 3:32 p.m.

Those attending: Steve Evans (Pres.), Brian Heuett (Pres. Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Rick Lambson, Robert Eves, Boyd Fife, Henry Brimmer as proxy for Eric Brown, Ben Davidson, Curt Bostick, Darin Wadley, Todd Amon as proxy for Steve Heath, Rea Gubler, Deborah Hill, Greg Colf, Tom Cunningham, Steve Barney, Richard Dotson as proxy for Idir Azouz, Jim Mills, James Aton, and Kay Anderson; Visitors: SUU President Steven Bennion, Rhiannon Bent (journal), Provost Carl Templin, Mike Richards, Glen Pryor, Dale Orton. Absent: Ron Martin

II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of December 6, 2001. There was no discussion and no amendments were suggested. A motion to approve the minutes as written was made by Robert Eves. The motion was seconded by Deb Hill. The minutes were approved as written by vote of the senate, 16 votes in the affirmative, and 1 abstention.

III. Priority Item: Report by Pres. Bennion on Legislative Matters and Other Items. The full cut in funding for the 2001-2002 year is 3.23% and a like amount for the 2002-2003 year. This translates to \$200,000 for the remainder of this year (most of which will likely come from surplus tuition) and \$870,000+ for the entire 2002-2003 year. They are still actively lobbying the legislature and others to help alleviate budget strains at SUU. Due to cuts the likelihood of a salary increase this year is minimal. There is some money for engineering and technology and Pres. Bennion has made a pitch for some of this money to come to SUU. He has no idea if we will receive any. Robert Eves asked if there are specific places where funding must be cut. Pres. Bennion said it has been left to the universities. Robert then asked Carl Templin if any decisions had been made regarding specific cuts at SUU. The response was that such plans are in the works for next year and the Deans are trying to come up with a reasonable plan.

President Bennion then discussed the state's capital building needs. We are still on the list, and there is talk of a bond to fund needed building projects. The bond discussion is a result of low interest rates, as well as the backlog of building needs. However, he said he is only half optimistic that our Education building will be included even if the bond passes. The administration is actively recruiting lobbying to get the bond passed with sufficient funds to allow SUU to build its much needed education building.

Finally, he indicated that the disposition of the prioritization is now with the trustees and slated for discussion at the next trustee's meeting. He also indicated, in answer to a question from Tod Amon that the idea of creating a Foreign Language Department is

not on the trustee's next agenda and that it would not appear there until a cost effective plan to establish such a department could be developed.

IV. Officers' Reports/Business

A. President

1. Grading Policy: Robert Eves asked Mike Richards to summarize the changes recommended by the Deans. They only asked to keep the sentence regarding length of time for grade changes. Carl Templin indicated that this change along with dropping specific reasons for grade changes made it easier for faculty to make necessary changes. Rea Gubler wanted to know how grade changes are handled if the faculty member is no longer here? According to Provost Templin, the grade is then changed through the regular appeal process and the Dean changes the grade, unless the former faculty member can be found. Steve Barney wanted to know how incomplete grades are to be handled, since they cannot be done electronically. For now, the manual policy must be followed and Mike Richards indicated that electronic grading was beyond the scope of this document. He stated further that policy would be constantly reviewed as needed in regards to electronically entered grades. The 2-year time limit for changes was then questioned, and the response was that this time limit was in line with the rest of the universities in the state. Henry Brimmer questioned the withdrawal policy. He did not like the fact that students could withdraw very late in the semester without any consequences. The response was that the UW grade resolved this issue as it is given when the withdrawal comes too late. It was then moved by Jim Aton that the policy be accepted as written, the motion was seconded by Jim Mills. There was no further discussion. The motion passed with 20 votes in the affirmative and one against.

2. Policy on Sabbatical Leaves: Jim Aton indicated that there is a change needed in the statement so that those with terminal degrees be given priority in the selection process. He suggested that priority should go to faculty development with no other strings attached. Jim then proposed that non-degree seeking proposals be given priority and so moved. Virginia seconded this motion. The motion carried by a vote of 20 senators in favor of the motion, none against it, and two senators abstained.

Robert Eves then questioned the compensation of 2/3 or 5/6 of the percentages for those seeking early sabbatical, which did not take into account those coming in with tenure. It was suggested that maybe we should grant years toward sabbatical along with rank and tenure years being granted. It was then noted that someone could be hired with tenure and be immediately eligible for sabbatical leave. A motion was made by

Robert Eves to change the wording regarding portions of sabbatical, and it was seconded by Jim Aton. Motion defeated with 6 in favor, 10 against. In discussion, Joe Baker then asked what the purpose of a sabbatical is? Is it to prevent burn out by allowing a break from regular duties? Steve Barney felt that faculty senators had not had adequate time to evaluate the policy. Rea Gubler felt a little pushed to really consider the document, since complete editing marks showing changes were not evident therein. The previous motion to change the wording was then voted on. It was defeated by a vote of 6 senators for, 10 senators against and 6 abstained.

Richard Dotson then moved that we table this until the committee has had a chance to look at the policy, revisit some of the wording, and then send it to Mike Richards. Steve Barney seconded the motion. In the discussion it was requested that since Microsoft Word is now the software supported by the university, it should be the word processor of choice. Deb Hill asked that the editing be marked properly on policy documents so we could tell what had been done when reviewing them, and Robert Eves thought it might be good to send out the edited draft along with the final copy. This motion, tabling the discussion of this policy until further revisions could be carried out was carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the senate.

3. Information Technology - Policy on Network Security. Glen Pryor led the discussion. He indicated that people are always trying to break into our system. Some companies have developed software that could be used to set up computers on our campus to become software distributors. We have a firewall to prevent this, but a sophisticated program can get around the firewall. We need to retain our ability to communicate worldwide and still prevent this kind of activity. He described a recent case in which this occurred. Robert Eves wanted to know what illegal activities are. They are not defined. How do we coordinate with the Information Technology (IT) Department? Glen said that anything that requires a license must have a license. It was then asked why we had to have this policy? Glen said to protect ourselves. Mike Richards indicated that this policy is the only one we have with a periodic review, and the continual review is due to the ever-changing face of technology. It also gives our IT staff the chance to find and repair problems within our system. Tod Amon moved that the policy be accepted and the motion was seconded by Henry Brimmer. In discussion, Robert Eves wanted to know where this policy came from, since the policy had not been seen by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee. It was clarified that the policy came from the IT department and had only been reviewed by the Academic Computer Users Committee and the Deans. The changes in the policy were only in the networking area and were designed to deal with current technology problems, as well as to protect the university's computer environment. It was noted that the

sentence regarding downloading of software be stricken, since it was covered elsewhere and would be far too restrictive. Steve Barney requested that the glossary of terms be moved towards the beginning of the document so those with less technical knowledge can better understand it. Curtis Bostick then questioned the language regarding reasonable cause on page 10 in the second paragraph of the Security and Privacy, part c. The suggestion was made to change “reasonable” cause to “sufficient” cause. Finally, it was suggested that some specific language, regarding the person with authority to enforce the policy, be added to avoid arbitrary action by IT personnel. A vote on the motion carried with 21 votes in favor of the motion to accept the policy changes as amended and one abstention.

B. President-elect

1. Curriculum Committee (New approach for curriculum matters) – Diana Graf had a handout regarding the rationale for changing the curriculum policy. The old document is 18 years old, and needs revision. This is necessary to meet Northwest Accreditation standards regarding curriculum and especially to address the policy that curriculum be faculty driven. They want to change the format of the policy to five sections to facilitate future changes and suggested several major changes in the document itself. These major changes included: revision of the mission statement to align it with the current university mission statement, increase the size of the committee to allow more faculty input, change the composition of various committee levels and how members are chosen (from appointed to elected), expand the role of the committee, adjust the time frame in which the Deans and President’s Councils deliberate to speed up the process, provide for annual curriculum review in each department, implementation of new curriculum as soon as possible, and a single form for all changes. This policy is now in the hands of the Deans Council. Brian Heuett indicated that this policy will give more power to the faculty regarding curriculum. The document will come to the Senate after the Deans Council has reviewed it. Steve Evans reminded us that this item was for discussion only.

V. Organizational Reports.

A. Staff Association is Lobbying for New Education Building and a plea was made to write letters to Utah legislators to lobby for the bond to fund the teacher education building. Materials including names and addresses of legislators, lobbyists, and a sample letter were made available. A number of senators indicated that they would be willing to send out such letters.

B. Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee – Proposed Faculty Evaluation Form. Tom Cunningham indicated that the late hour precluded long discussion on this matter, but that the committee was still interested and would welcome feedback from the faculty.

VI. Other Business

A. Development of Faculty Senate Website – Tom Cunningham said we need a process to get information regarding committee work, lists, etc. We may discuss this at the next meeting.

B. Treasurer

1. Report on Scholarship Funds and Other Finances – Brian Heuett mentioned the scholarship committee and associated scholarships and made a plea that applications be encouraged and solicited. Steve Evans reminded the senate that these scholarships are needs-based and that we can offer them, in part, due to the dedication of the faculty in paying their yearly dues.

2. Report on Provost Search Committee – Joe Baker indicated 22 applications have been received and that the search closes on March 1. The committee is filling their responsibility and should be able to choose a qualified provost from among the applicants.

VII. Motion for Executive Session made by Robert Eves. The motion was seconded by Tom Cunningham. The motion was carried by unanimous vote of the Senate in the affirmative.

VIII. Adjournment at 5:11 p.m.