

Faculty Senate Minutes  
Thursday, January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2003, 3:30 pm  
Board of Trustees Conference Room

I. Call to order: 3:33 p.m. by President Brian Heuett

Attending: Senators - Brian Heuett (President), Robert Eves (President Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Steve Barney, Sara Ann Smith, Rea Gubler, Ty Redd, Steve Evans, Boyd Fife, Kay Andersen, Darin Wadley, Curt Bostick, Martha Hyder, Steve Heath, Karen Atwood (as proxy for Deb Hill), Kathy Black, Eric Brown, Mike Grady, Ron Martin, and Scott Lanning. Visitors: University President Steve Bennion, University Provost Abe Harraf; Excused: Deb Hill; Absent: Ken Laundra, Mike McGarvy, Roy Johnson, Jerry Bowler

II. Review and approval of minutes from the special senate meeting of January 9<sup>th</sup>: Motion to approve the minutes made by Steve Barney; seconded by Robert Eves; motion approved by unanimous vote of the senate. The previously approved minutes for the November meeting were mistakenly sent to the senate instead of the December 5 minutes. The approval of the December minutes will be delayed until the February meeting.

III. Officers' Reports

A. President - Brian Heuett: President Heuett welcomed Kathy Black after her illness. He then discussed the fundraiser the SUU Softball team is currently engaged in—selling bricks for a sidewalk. He queried the Senate as to whether they would be in favor of purchasing one of the \$50 bricks in the name of the faculty senate. Joe Baker moved that the senate purchase a brick, Steve Evans seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion to purchase the brick was approved by a vote of 18 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. Joe Baker was given the assignment to take care of the purchase.

B. Treasurer - Joe Baker

a. Financial Report: Joe Baker reported that the faculty senate account has a balance of \$13,633.58

IV. Committee Reports: Other than a note that the ad hoc committee, chaired by Steve Barney, convened to address the issue of revising the Faculty Senate Constitution had not yet been advised to proceed by President Bennion.

V. Old Business

A. Final Exams Policy (copy attached, 10 minutes): Robert Eves explained that since we had last seen this policy, the Deans Council had decided that they did not want to charge any kind of fee to students wishing to take an exam at a time other than when the exam is scheduled. He indicated that their reasoning was that student tuition had just been raised significantly and they were concerned at the prospect of adding more fees to already burdened students. He also reminded us that the intent of the fee was to prevent frivolous changing of exams. Virginia Stitt wanted to know if this policy would supercede the previous policy which included a \$10 fee for such changes. Robert Eves indicated that

this would indeed be the case. Eric Brown felt that he has too many students—5 or 6 out of 250—who want to change, and he likes the deterrent. Kathy Black thought the faculty was to have the final say in this matter, but this is apparently not the case. Eric Brown reminded us that the deans had included a \$100 fee at one time, but now they want none at all.

Virginia Stitt wanted to know why we were even dealing with this policy. It was reiterated that it was due to abuse of the previous version of the policy by faculty in terms of not requiring students to meet during the scheduled final. Robert Eves reminded us that paragraph 2 of the policy resolves the issue of meeting for finals and the senate had previously agreed that this was the case; the deans and the academic affairs committee wanted to address the fee issue at the same time. Kathy Black reminded the senate that the individual faculty make this decision regarding said mid-terms; that is, whether the student will be allowed to take the mid-term or not. She said that it seems, in the case of the final, the student could, by this policy, go over the head of the faculty. In that case it makes sense to charge the fee. Steve Barney indicated that he doesn't care about the fee. He wants the question of the exam being given or not to be up to the faculty member. He wondered why, if the faculty senate was in favor of the policy, the deans were involved. Robert Eves answered that their involvement is a result of tradition.

Ron Martin moved that we send the motion back to the deans just as it left the senate the last time it was discussed—with the fee included. The motion was seconded by Ty Redd. In discussion, Robert Eves reviewed the last iteration from the faculty senate. Virginia Stitt introduced a letter from Carol Ann Modisett regarding the fee. This letter is included at the end of the minutes. Steve Barney said that there has been too much discussion of this matter, and not enough on other important matters. The motion was called to a vote and passed in the affirmative by the senate with a vote of 19 in favor and 2 abstentions.

B.Resolution R312 draft document (15 minutes): The resolution 312 draft regarding definition of this institution (included in the original form at the end of the minutes) brought to the faculty by Steve Heath was discussed. Steve reiterated that the regents have defined the institution, and that now the need of the regents is to define the limits for institutions in the tiers below SUU. He then said that the concern of himself and others is that we do not have the financial means to engage in the scholarly activities that seem to be indicated by the regents' definition, and that this will also create a situation that is less conducive to teaching—the focus of the university may change. Robert Eves brought up the idea that what ought to happen is the prevention of mission creep from the lower institution—that is the lowered tiered institutions taking on more and more of the role SUU should have based on the institutional definitions set forth by the regents. Ty Redd said the definition seems to be acceptable for us and that most of us agree with it—we can do the scholarly work if we desire; but we may not have the political clout to make it work financially.

Provost Harraf said that he has raised the issue of mission creep at other meetings regarding the placement of specific limits on the category 3 institutions. He said that the regents have been asked by the academics committee of the state to create a new draft

with clearer definitions and they are working on it at the present. Brian wanted to know if there was any type of timeframe—Provost Harraf said they would like to get this issue closed by March. Robert Eves wanted to know if the two drafts SUU (through the Provost's office) had crafted would go forward to the regents, and Provost Harraf indicated that they would not.

Steve Heath felt that the senate ought to say something about our stand. Steve Heath also said that he interprets the 1990 'law' as saying that if we support research we are breaking the law.

Kathy Black wanted to know how an institution moved from one category to another. Provost Harraf reminded us that the regents make those decisions. He also reminded us that we don't want to be a type one institution; but that, as a category two institution, we need to be engaged in scholarly activity. Robert proposed that the resolution be amended (the amended copy is also included at the end of the minutes) to remove one paragraph. Steve Heath moved that we accept Robert's changes to the resolution, the motion was seconded by Rea Gubler. Karen Atwood wanted to know where this document would go. There was discussion that such a document was not necessary, but there were a number of senators that thought it would be a good idea for the faculty to make some effort to communicate that they were in favor of the revised guidelines defining the role of the various institutions of higher education in the state. Robert Eves and Joe Baker said it would be a written statement going to the board of regents in support of the rewritten category definition of SUU. Eric Brown said the mission is contained in the regents' document. Provost Harraf said that the process is that the regents send out the guidelines for establishing the university mission for a response from SUU, SUU needs to respond to the guidelines, then the process is to form our mission based on the finalized guidelines. The Provost suggested that we might want to wait until the regents have sent the next revision of the guidelines.

The motion to adopt the changed resolution and send it to the regents was called to a vote and passed in the affirmative with 16 votes for, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Joe Baker then moved that we delay the release of our statement until after the regents release their document; Ron Martin seconded the motion. Kathy Black wanted to know if we are showing dissention or discord on the campus by putting out a statement that reiterates what the Provost has already done in his representation of SUU with the regents. Steve Heath was under the impression that the Provost had presented something else to the trustees. The Provost indicated that the 2 alternative guideline statements were not formally presented to anyone. Rea Gubler thought that we might need to change our document to reflect any changes made by the regents in the guideline document. Robert Eves reminded us that written documentation of our position made it clear how we felt. Ron Martin said it is a good idea to have something go with the Provost so all concerned will know that all concerned at SUU are unified. However, Ron also felt that it is a good idea to wait until we see the final regents' draft before we just agree to approve anything. Eric Brown reminded us that our resolution is merely a draft document. Joe Baker restated the motion, that we delay our faculty resolution statement until we have seen the

new regent's document. The motion passed in the affirmative with 12 votes for, 8 against, and 1 abstention. A final comment came from Eric Brown: He asked the Provost and the President if the faculty could strengthen our position. President Bennion said that it would help our position to have the faculty make a statement. The Provost reiterated that it is wise to wait until we see the final document.

## VI. New Business

A. Curriculum Development and Revision: Robert Eves, chair of the academic affairs committee, led the discussion and reminded us that we will do the little pieces of the curriculum policy first and the big piece later. He said that there is a 6 month investment in time in these policies. (Copies of this policy were needed by most senators and as a result discussion moved to the next item while the copies were being made.)

B. Faculty Preparations (copy attached): Karen Atwood moved to accept this policy as written, Virginia Stitt seconded the motion. Curt Bostick wanted to change the wording regarding changes to include faculty in the decisions. Robert Eves said that the purpose of the policy is to give the department chairs and deans guidelines regarding this matter. Ron Martin wanted to know why lab courses are not counted as a preparation. Robert Eves said that it is not the case that they are not, but that they may be an exception. Ron felt that this may be unfair, as lab courses may be more time consuming than lecture courses. Kathy Black wanted to know who this policy would impact—would we need new faculty, etc. in spite of current budget crunches? She felt we needed to know if something of this nature would be financially feasible. It was indicated that the policy was because of abuse by faculty—some have 8, 9 or more preparations in a given semester. Provost Harraf also mentioned the abuse of policies and that there are some small departments on campus that could be seriously affected; but we need guidelines. We can't say that we demand scholarly activity and then have faculty with 4 preps, as well. Ty Redd called the motion to question. The motion to approve the policy passed with 15 votes for, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The discussion then returned to policy 6.8.3 (copy attached) – Curriculum Development and Revision. Robert indicated that this policy is to expedite curricular changes. Virginia Stitt moved that the policy be accepted as written; Ty Redd seconded this motion. In discussion, Curt Bostick indicated that there is a split infinitive that needs to be corrected, and Karen wanted to have revisions of another improperly used word. The motion was called to a vote to accept the policy, with the minor grammatical corrections. The vote of the senate was unanimous in favor of the motion. (The accepted version of the policy is included at the end of the minutes.)

C. Policy 6.8 (copy attached). General Curriculum A and B. Virginia Stitt moved to accept this portion of the policy as written; Joe Baker seconded the motion. It was noted that some minor changes in punctuation were in order. Virginia and Joe agreed to this friendly amendment and the motion was called to question. It was approved in the affirmative by the senate with a vote of 20 in favor and 1 abstention.

D. Policy 6.8.2 (copy attached)

Robert Eves indicated that the meat of this policy was designed to describe how committees interact as curriculum is being reviewed for approval. Steve Barney moved to accept this portion of the policy as written; Karen Atwood seconded the motion. Ron Martin wanted to know why the curriculum committee exists. Robert Eves indicated that the policy explains that the committee is to oversee the processes regarding changes to curriculum and the approval of new curriculum. Curt Bostick felt that the committee should be disbanded. Ron Martin indicated that it doesn't make sense for a committee that has members in other colleges to say that curriculum proposals from another college are not good, or should not be accepted. Brian Heuett said that there are probably too many people on the committee; on the other hand, the various college representatives should be able to present proposed changes to the committee in such a manner that they will be accepted.

Karen Atwood said, that based on her Masters experience in a similar committee, the idea is to defend your position and this may need to happen at the undergraduate level as well. It helps to illuminate programs across the campus for all concerned. Robert indicated that part of the problem for the curriculum committee lies in the fact that this committee has been given no clear charge as to what they are to do. The policy has been rewritten to establish a clear direction and to provide guidance in what the committee is to do. Kathy Black indicated that she had served on a similar committee that oversaw curricula to avoid duplication of courses by departments/colleges and to assure that the process of gaining approval for curriculum was followed completely and properly. Her feeling is that the proposed policy is very much in this line. Provost Harraf would prefer that the committee be named the undergraduate curriculum committee (ucc); he also had concerns with the size and and indicated that some SUU students are concerned that there is no student representation on the committee. Robert Eves also indicated that the UCC also needs to take responsibility for the general education. Steve Heath called the motion to question. The senate voted in favor of approval of this policy by a vote of 14 for, 3 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Robert Eves then indicated that in the next meeting, sections 6.8.1 and 6.8.4 will be first two new items on the agenda, followed by the honors policy.

VIII.Motion for Executive Session: Motion for executive session made by Joe Baker; it was seconded by Ty Redd; the motion carried by unanimous vote of the senate.

IX.Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

## APPENDIX

### FINAL EXAMINATIONS

**PURPOSE:** Establish policy on administering final examinations

**POLICY:**

1. Final examinations for spring and fall semesters are held ~~for~~ **during** a designated period of time at the close of each session or semester as published in the final examination schedule.
2. Final examinations are part of the contact hour criteria for a credit-bearing class. Faculty members are responsible to meet their assigned classes during the time published in the final examination schedule.
- ~~3. When an individual student needs to take a final examination at a time other than that published in the final exam schedule, s/he may request permission approval from the faculty member and department chair to do so. If approval is granted, students are to be charged a \$50 unscheduled final examination fee, payable at the cashier's office. Once paid, the student will present a receipt to the faculty member prior to sitting for the unscheduled final exam. Half of the fee is placed into account number 3 17800 and used for faculty development. The other half is paid to the respective department.~~
3. 4. Students who demonstrate that their final exam schedule includes more than three examinations on a given day **or have a bona fide emergency** may request **from appropriate department chairs** to re-schedule additional examinations for another day and time without fee payment. Every effort will be made by faculty **and department chairs** to honor **such** student requests.
- ~~5. A final exam may be rescheduled (without fee payment) in case of bona fide student emergency as defined by the faculty member.~~

### 6.8.3

Academic Affairs Committee Changes 9/02. (Approved 10/02)

### CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION-TIMING OF CURRICULAR CHANGES

**PURPOSE:** To enable ongoing curricular changes

POLICY:

- A. Departments are expected to systematically review curricula, including comparisons with peer institutions, accreditation/certification criteria, revisions to syllabi, and other changes deemed necessary in the discipline.
- B. Curricular changes can be implemented as soon as administratively feasible.

6.8

**Academic Affairs Committee changes (10/8/02) are normal, italicized text. Stricken text is ~~double strikethrough~~. (Approved 10/02)**

**DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION OF CURRICULUM: INTRODUCTION**

PURPOSE: To establish **policy and procedures** ~~guidelines~~ for curriculum changes.

REFERENCES:

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R465, General Education

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R467, Lower Division Major Requirements

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R471, Transfer of Credit

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R472, Course Numbering

Board of Regents Policy and Procedures R473, Standards for Granting Credit for Course Work Completed at Applied Technology Centers

SUU Policy and Procedures 13.9, Deans' Council

SUU Policy and Procedure 13.28, Committee on Curriculum Planning

SUU Professional Education Coordinating Council Bylaws

POLICY:

## I. General

A. The mission, vision, and goals of the University, as approved by the Board of Trustees, are included in this document as Appendix A, Mission, Vision and Goals of Southern Utah University.

B. ~~Derived from the University's mission statement, the mission of the Committee on Curriculum Planning~~ *University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is to process review and approve or reject undergraduate curriculum proposals and to assess curriculum, its soundness, relevance, and efficiency in accordance with standards and/or guidelines of accreditation.*

### Mission and Vision of the University

a. ~~The mission of Southern Utah University (Source: Utah State Board of Regents Master Plan 2000, p. 9):~~

~~Southern Utah University has the mission of a comprehensive, regional university in southern Utah. It provides undergraduate liberal and professional education in business, education, humanities, performing and visual arts, social sciences, sciences and technology. It offers specialized certificates, associate, baccalaureate, and selected professional graduate degrees.~~

~~The Board will enhance Southern Utah University's mission by assuring its competitiveness in providing a unique residential university setting with strong undergraduate programs and a limited number of master's degree programs.~~

b. ~~The vision of Southern Utah University (Source: Draft document, January 19, 2001):~~

~~Southern Utah University is a nationally recognized university providing high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in a personalized learning environment which:~~

~~§ \_\_\_\_\_ Emphasizes as its pivotal hallmarks superior teaching and exceptional service to students;~~

~~§ \_\_\_\_\_ Supports scholarly endeavors, selective additional national accreditations, and increased admissions standards as further indices of quality;~~

~~§ \_\_\_\_\_ Enlarges enrollment to a size of 9,000 to 11,000 students, achieving an economy of scale in operation and access to programs;~~

~~§ \_\_\_\_\_ Strengthens its mission and role as the regional university of southern Utah by offering 10-12 masters degree programs, and selective new undergraduate programs and services to meet the needs of SUU students and southern Utah; and~~

~~§ \_\_\_\_\_ Enhances students' personal and professional development through an inviting menu of co-curricular, social, cultural, and athletic activities.~~

## II. Definitions

### \*Program requiring approval of the Board of Trustees and Board of Regents

Baccalaureate degree*	122 semester hour minimum plus course level requirements
Composite Teaching Major*	47 semester hour minimum in a field approved by the Utah State Office of Education
Composite Major*	52 semester hour minimum in a discipline; no minor is required.
Emphasis	12 semester hour minimum within the major
Major*	36 semester hour minimum in a regentally approved discipline that is nationally classified by the U.S. Department of Education
Major (Education)*	36 semester hour minimum in a regentally approved discipline that is nationally classified by the U.S. Department of Education and is approved by the Utah State Office of Education
Minor*	16 semester hour minimum in a regentally approved discipline
Minor (Education)*	18 semester hour minimum in a regentally approved discipline as approved by the Utah State Office of Education
Option	A choice within a specialization as defined by a department
Track	A focus within a graduate program

*THIS IS A CLEAN COPY, APPROVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (10/22/02)*

## **UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION—PROPOSING NEW CURRICULUM OR CURRICULUM CHANGES**

**PURPOSE:** To describe the process for changing or proposing undergraduate curricula

**POLICY:**

### **I. General**

- A. Curriculum changes begin with approval of a proposal by the Department/Division Curriculum Committee (DCC). The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) provides forms and standards to be used to guide and systematize the process. College representatives to the UCC may be used as consultants to assist individuals or departments/divisions in creating or changing curricula. Proposals are delivered to the College/School Curriculum Committee (CCC) and copied to the respective Dean.
- B. College curriculum committees review proposals approved at the department/division level. The CCC then either forwards the changes to the UCC or returns them to the DCC with recommendations.
- C. After the approval of the CCC, curriculum proposals are sent by the committee chair to the UCC chair.
- D. The UCC approves proposals or returns them to the department, via the CCC, with recommendations.
- E. Curriculum proposals approved by the UCC are forwarded to the Provost. The Provost then has thirty days to endorse the proposal or notify the UCC of a formal review. Since significant information goes into making good curriculum decisions, such reviews should rarely occur. If the Provost does not act within thirty days, the proposed action becomes University curriculum.
- F. Final arbiter in matters where consensus cannot be reached is the accrediting agency.

## II. Types of Curricular Changes

Three types of curricular changes are: consent, substantive, and program proposals.

### A. Consent changes include:

- Changes in existing titles and prefixes
- Changes in existing delivery (e.g., classroom, web, EdNet)
- Changes in existing prerequisites
- Changes in course sequencing
- Changes to existing course descriptions
- Consolidations
- Deletions
- Method of grading

1. Consent changes are submitted on the curriculum Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal Form and acted upon by the DCC and CCC. Following the CCC's action, the chair submits the change form to the UCC for consent action. The UCC reserves the right to recommend that a consent change be considered as a substantive change.

### B. Substantive changes include:

- New courses, experimental courses, or significant changes in course content
- Changes in credit hours
- Changes in contact hours
- Changes in course level (lower division, upper division)
- Changes in general education
- Changes that may be in conflict or competition with courses or programs of other departments.
- Changes in university requirements for degrees

1. Substantive changes are submitted on the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal Form, acted upon by the DCC and CCC, then submitted for action to the UCC.

### C. Program proposals include:

- New programs (majors, emphases, concentrations, minors, or certificates)

1. Proposals for new programs are submitted on the Board of Regents forms (Policy R-401), and reviewed by the DCC, CCC, UCC and then forwarded to the Provost for action.

## III. Approval Process for Curricular Changes

A. Requests for new academic programs, program additions or program changes as defined in policies of the Utah Board of Regents will be processed according to procedures detailed in Regents policy R-401.

B. Requests to add/delete academic majors, minors, emphases, and courses, as well as for substantive changes in courses as described above, will be submitted for action according to procedures detailed in this policy. Program additions or revisions that require action by the Board of Regents will be submitted to the committee in the Regent's format. Further, upon approval of proposals for academic programs under Regents policy R-401, courses supporting such proposals will be submitted for approval under guidelines of this SUU policy.

C. Proposed changes may originate with a faculty member, an appropriate department/division committee, or a student organization, and must follow the procedure outlined in this policy.

D. Proposed course changes must be submitted on the appropriate form, and the stated criteria must be met for action at all levels of review. Courses and programs submitted on an experimental basis will be for a limited time (generally one to three years) and will include an assessment component to evaluate the effectiveness of the experiment.

E. Proposed course changes must be approved by (1) the DCC of the department/division through which the course and its credit are to be offered, (2) CCC and (3) the UCC. If a curricular change affects teacher education, coordination with the Professional Education Coordinating Committee (PECC) is expected following approval by the CCC.

IV. Criteria for curricular/course decisions. The curricular committees (DCC, CCC, and UCC) will consider criteria including, but not limited to, the following:

A. Course syllabus

- syllabus complies with university policy 6.36

B. Centrality to the mission of the institution

- contribution of course to its respective curriculum
- extent of interdependence and synergy with other University curricula
- contribution to general education requirements

C. Pedagogical considerations

- general academic merit
- evidence of variation in teaching/learning methodologies
- course delivery method

D. Skills

- verbal, nonverbal and/or media communication techniques
- written communication
- critical thinking/listening activities
- team-building techniques in problem solving
- research and analysis
- service learning

- computing and technology
- E. Technical resource impact
- availability of required technology and resources
  - adequate library/information resources
- F. Assessment
- consistent with unit assessment plans
  - assessment activities are measurable
- G. Diversity
- advances understanding of people and ideas
  - addresses issues in contemporary society
  - broadens world view
- H. Costs
- impact on degree requirements
  - faculty workload
  - contact hours
  - faculty preparations
  - operating budgets
  - capital costs
  - space requirements
  - indirect costs
  - cost efficiencies
- I. Potential for growth and recognition
- possible specialized accreditation
  - develops national stature
  - capitalizes on emerging fields

## V. Unit Processes and Standards

### A. At the Department/Division Level

1. The faculty review and decide whether to revise the curriculum. The standards by which course proposals will be evaluated are [departments/divisions may develop additional standards]:

a. appropriateness of the proposed number for the course and the rationale for the course level (e.g., lower division, upper division) and type (e.g., lecture, seminar);

b. rationale provided for developing/offering the new course or curriculum change, including,

- the proposed course is aligned with similar department curricula
  - the proposed course is required for an accrediting/certifying agency (attach a copy of documents stipulating the requirement);
- c. concordance of the content and/or method of the proposed course with the department/division's academic discipline;
- d. availability of qualified faculty to staff the course;
- e. suitability of the method(s) of teaching and learning and the mode of delivery to be used in the class;
- f. responsibility for communicating changes that may be in conflict or competition with courses or programs of other department/divisions; and
- g. compliance of the proposal with the criteria for curricular/course decisions, discussed in IV, above.

#### B. At the College/School Level

1. The CCC will conduct a substantive review and decide whether to approve the new course or curriculum change. The following standards may be used [colleges/schools may develop additional standards]:
  - a. integrity of the proposed curricular change;
  - b. consistency with relevant university curriculum policies and procedures for new course proposals;
  - c. adequacy of budgetary and instructional resources required to offer the course;
  - d. reasoned and relevant explanation for substantive duplication when duplication appears to exist; and
  - e. compliance of the proposal with the UCC criteria, discussed in IV, above.
2. The CCC will consider and act on each curriculum change request.
3. Upon approval by the CCC a signed, approved proposal will be forwarded to the Chair of the UCC. If the course change affects teacher education, the CCC will coordinate or delegate coordination with the PECC. If the CCC recommends disapproval of the course, an explanation of the disapproval will be transmitted to the DCC.

4. Course change proposals submitted by colleges/divisions carry no implicit request for change in program requirements or supplemental funding. If a course change proposal requires either of these, it is the responsibility of the college dean (or designee) to support the program change and/or provide supplemental funding as needed.

C. At the University Level

1. The duties of the chair of the UCC

- a. Circulate a list of all new courses, changes or deletions to the members of the committee and post the list in advance of committee meetings to the UCC's web site. (Committee members will notify college/school faculty of proposed changes. Faculty members who have substantive or jurisdictional concerns about proposed course changes are to notify their committee representative.)
- b. Arbitrate conflict between departments/divisions.
- c. Insure that curriculum proposals are placed on the committee agenda within 30 days of receipt.

2. New Program Proposals

- a. The UCC will review new programs, make recommendations, and forward all proposals to the Provost.
- b. Some new program proposals will need Board of Trustee or Board of Regents' action. Refer to Regents' policy R-401 for further information.

FACULTY PREPARATIONS

I. **PURPOSE:** To describe the University expectation for course preparations by the faculty.

II. **REFERENCES:**

SUU Policy and Procedures 6.0, Definition of Faculty

## SUU Policies and Procedures, 6.22 Faculty Workload

### III. **POLICY:**

A. Definition. A faculty preparation is the number of distinct course or curricular preparations assigned per academic year (fall and spring semesters). For example, three distinct course preparations for four classes fall semester, and one distinct course preparation for five classes spring semester constitutes four course preparations for the academic year. Multiple class sections or a fall course repeated spring semester constitutes one preparation.

B. The University expectation for standard, 3 credit-hour classes in each academic college is no more than five (5) preparations per faculty member per academic year. Exceptions to this policy may be made by department chairs/division heads. Justifications for such exceptions may include, but are not limited to: faculty expertise/qualification, individual instruction, labs, studio or activity/field trip courses.

1. The intent of this policy is to provide to department chairs/division heads a standard for course preparations as they make teaching assignments. The objective of the policy is to standardize maximum course preparations in a non-punitive manner.