

Faculty Senate  
March 25, 2004  
3:30 p.m.  
ELC 405

In attendance: Martha Hyder (proxy for Deb Hill and Judy Higbee), David Lund, Virginia Stitt (proxy for Darin Wadley), Douglas Molash, David Rees, Jeff Barnes, Kathy Black, Seth Armstrong, Bonnie Bishop (proxy for Rea Gubler and Ty Redd), Mike McGarvey, Richard Eissinger (proxy for Steve Heath?), Jim Aton, Luciane Berg, Mike Grady, Wayne Williams, Steve Barney, Ken Laundra, Eric Brown, Roy Johnson, Marty Larkin, Elise Leahy, Todd ?  
Visitors: Jeff Barnes, Abe Harraf

### Summary

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Jeff Barnes & discussion on the Academic Computer Users Committee: Asks for faculty senate support. Motion passes.
3. No news from Utah Faculty Senate Leaders meeting, discussion on neighborhood caucus meeting and choosing legislature candidates.
4. Trustees meeting report – Mike Leavitt commencement speaker, student applications up, 2<sup>nd</sup> tier tuition increase  
approved
5. Treasurer's Report -
6. Distinguished Faculty Ad Hoc Committee elected Dr. Stephen Roberds for the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer for next fall.
7. Discussion on laws regarding class scheduling and how the state figures those numbers.
8. Report on agenda items for trustees meeting on March 26<sup>th</sup>.
9. Policy 6.22 Policy for faculty: petitions
10. Copyright Policy & the Internet: passes with changes.
11. Annual Report of Academic Colleges and Schools: recommendation for deans to prepare a short report to the  
Provost at the end of each year giving the status of their college, passes with changes.
12. Care and Use of Vertebrae Animals Policy:
  - passed with 3 year term for chair & vice-chair
  - passed May meeting date

Virginia Stitt: moves to approve minutes. Doug Molash: seconds. No discussion. *Passes unanimously.*

David Lund: Jeff Barnes needs a couple of minutes. Jeff Barnes: I'm a member of the **Academic Computer Users Committee** and we would like to perform a strategic academic IT (information technology) survey campus wide. We would like feedback from all faculty members. We believe it's important to measure the progress toward integration of technology into curriculum, and to measure faculty satisfaction with technology in their offices and classrooms. With this information we might be able to make a better plan on how to find resources to get us where we want to be. Handout of rough draft of survey instrument we would like to make electronic and administer it in the near future.

*Would like support from faculty senate in our efforts and any recommendations as to how we might make this a better instrument.* Jim Aton: Will it come out as an email? Jeff Barnes: Yes. David Lund: Any other questions for Jeff? Any negative feedback? Jim Aton: I think it's a great idea. The key is putting it in some way that people will respond and not dump it in the trash. Jeff Barnes: With support from faculty senate, as well as working through our academic computer committee, where we will understand who has responded and who's not, we will then encourage individuals who have not responded to do so. We really want 100% response. Eric Brown: Question #4. Departmental Technology Committee. We don't have one. Jeff Barnes: I know. We think there should be a strategic recommendation of organizational change so every department has an individual responsible for technology in their department. Eric Brown: What would they be doing? Jeff Barnes: Working with faculty, reviewing syllabi and integration of technology in the curriculum correctly, looking at resources available for faculty in their offices to perform research online, determining where the faculty teach, in what buildings and if the classes are mediated, this committee would take on the departmental responsibility of this. We have unevenness of development across campus. We get 50-60 grand per year from students to upgrade software for students and faculty. Eric Brown: You have a fee for every class? Jeff Barnes: Where technology is integrated, yes we do. David Lund: Would entertain a motion in support? Doug Molash: Moves in support. Virginia Stitt: Seconds. Who?: What do you hope to do with this survey? Jeff Barnes: Faster integration of technology in departments for academic purposes Eric Brown: Will you ask for funds? Jeff Barnes: Yes. David Lund: I was on that committee for years. This would help to allocate how the money is spent. There are departments that don't take advantage of this technology. I would support this. Abe Harraf: It would have to go to the students for endorsement. This year the student vote was for \$2. This would be a stronger vote coming from faculty senate, students asking for more access to software, wireless, more computer access all over campus. If you look at fees for the last 10 years, we are 2<sup>nd</sup> from bottom in terms of upward in all student fees in this state. We need to boost that number up. We need your help and endorsement. Jeff Barnes: It might not hurt to have a student representative on this committee. We need everybody working in the same direction. We need to help students realize they're leaving a legacy. Todd ?: *Call the question. 19 in favor, 1 abstention, passes.*

David Lund: There is nothing else to relate about the Utah Senate Leaders meeting. You all received a short letter from me about that meeting. If we want to get more money from the state we need to be proactive. Kathy Black: Before we become too proactive we need to find out what's going on at other universities around the country. I heard the University of Colorado may be closing and giving credits to their students to go elsewhere. At some institutions that are big research institutions there is no money. It's a flight from academia into places where they can...I'm all for proactive, but maybe we ought to not what the political climate is. David Lund: For your information, they are looking at other states. 60% have unionized. The Utah Faculty Senate leaders are really trying to find the best solution. Some in the legislature and governor had promised to stand up for us, and when the budget was being cut, no one said anything. One of the governor candidates I spoke with said higher education funding will diminish; higher education will have to look at the private sector for funding. Speaking of politics, we have elections coming up. This is my interpretation of our current constitution and how it reads. As you look to replace senators going out they have to have half the votes of the people in their departments or college, depending on how you set up your elections. You're responsible to see that they are run correctly. As the constitution requires, I got a list of all full time faculty from the Provost's office. Look at the numbers based on our old constitution. One of the colleges has to have a senator they haven't had in the past. Your name is not on it if you are currently serving or going off. Your responsibility is to check with all of those people in your college and see if they are going to be around. If they aren't going to be around, make a note of it. Also, ask if they are

willing to serve. There's no need for them to be on the ballot if they're not willing to serve. This should give you fairly good instructions as to how to run the election. Old and new constitution is with President Bennion right now. I believe he's quite pleased with the way it looks, that it puts us in a shared governance situation. We will print a copy of the side by side version to you to get to your faculty for a vote.

David Rees: At the last trustees meeting it was decided that Ex-Governor Mike Leavitt will be the commencement speaker. Completed applications are up by 556. Trustees approved a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier tuition increase. Also approval of 2% salary increase. Tomorrow they meet again, will act on recommendations for rank and tenure.

Bonnie Bishop (Proxy for Rea): Campus 2 account balance: \$1,308.44. Moved bank account to new campus account: \$13,047.08. David Lund: We have ordered a new tape player. All 2 account money will be spent this year, part of it will go for a laptop computer to be used by the faculty senate secretary. Money from faculty dues—call for scholarship applicants has gone out (2 for non-traditional students).

Richard Eissinger (Proxy for Steve): Distinguished Faculty Ad Hoc Committee elected Dr. Stephen Roberds for the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer for next fall.

David Lund: I talked to Mike Richards about the laws regarding scheduling and how the state figures into that. Bonnie Bishop: People are very concerned about that. They want to see in writing where the state says we have to have 30% our classes at 3:00 in the afternoon. Why are we having so much trouble finding out where it is? David Lund: They're still looking for it, we'll have to wait on that. Abe Harraf: It's a policy in practice right now. David Lund: Faculty senate leaders talked about it and the U of U has the same problem. They're fighting that too. That group has put a committee together to see what can be done to amend that policy. Abe Harraf: Students themselves are asking for them in the afternoon. There are courses that are overlapping in different colleges.

Abe Harraf: Trustees meeting tomorrow. Recommendation for rank and tenure will be reviewed and letters of notification will be sent to candidates Monday. We put together a section for department chairs, deans, and LRT chairs to hear from university LRT. General Education Committee was formed. Have had one trip to a conference. They met yesterday to come up with a plan, it will be a long process. Representative from each college over there. Number of committees working on it. Two policies go for approval tomorrow. Student fees and faculty professional responsibility. Also some course fee increases. Policy to follow new process to raise student fees. Trustees like to see student endorsement of fee hikes. Tomorrow is Founder's Day celebration; we will honor some people—Dr. Sterling Church and one other local person and a couple of other people.

Luciane Berg: Report and open a discussion: Policy 6.22 Policy for faculty. I've received some letters from faculty on micromanagement or disciplinary actions going on from the president. We met to discuss issues a few weeks ago and we found chinks in due process roles. One is administrative officer and chair of faculty review board and the review board itself and the responsible administrator are not easily found when a petition is filed. The other one is it is really hard to decide what is/is not a petition. Faculty feel threatened when disciplinary action seemed to be taken out of policy. Some of the ways the policy could be more functional:

- Standing administrative officer or make faculty review board a standing board
- Every college have a representative
- Standing chair also

How do we know what the complaints are and when a petition is filed? Memos coming from President seemed to be out of policy order. Administrative person can be almost anyone except the President, and they need to be approved by faculty senate, couldn't find where that had been done. David Lund: We found it was usually appointed by the Provost and the dean, but not from the college. David Rees: One problem with the policy is that it presumes that the complaint comes from students who go to president instead of with the professor. Second problem is community gets involved and parents go to the President. Policy assumptions are bad. I think policy needs to be re-looked at. Need to funnel the complaints. This will take several meetings. Jim Aton: Usually the dean or department chair handle complaints, involving faculty would be a good thing. Faculty Senator from that college would be the administrator along with the dean and the chair. Marty Larkin: Faculty involved should be tenured so they won't be intimidated. David Lund: At this point, the most intelligent thing would be to put together an ad hoc committee. David Rees: Or turn it over to the academic affairs committee; I'm thinking next year. We're through. Virginia Stitt: Need to finish up one—Policy on Policies. Luciane Berg: It would be nice to have it set up so that in the fall we're ready to move on it. David Lund: David, would you be willing to make the assignment to Academic Affairs Committee? Lucianne Berg: The policy was written for bottom up procedure, it works good in that case, but it's not the way it happens.

Kenny Landra: One of the ambiguities is defining what is a petition. David Lund: There needs to be a basic and clear procedure to handle these things in a more efficient manner. Marty: We need to be aware of legal issues. Wayne Williams: If there are legal issues, we have to have a procedure defined. we have to have procedures to follow, no matter where it enters, and it needs to be standardized. Lucianne Berg: Paper trail documented, even notarized.

David Rees: Copyright Policy—Primary purpose is to define or give examples of what is fair use. Has been thrown into confusion by internet. When can professors copy and use? The document comes from University of Texas. Necessary to take a good document and adopt it for our purposes. Two changes: 1.) Instead of calling it a "Copyright Policy", we call it a "Copyright Guidelines". 2). Under "purpose" we're restating the purpose to read to establish guidelines regarding copyright issues within which faculty could reasonably expect institutional support. What we're basically saying is that if the faculty member stays within these guidelines and is later sued, expect university come to their defense if they can show they stayed within the guidelines. David Rees: *Motion to accept* Jim Aton: *Second* Mike Grady: *Typo on page 4 "lacko"* Virginia Stitt: *calls the question. 20 in favor, 2 abstentions. Passes.*

David Rees: Annual Report of Academic Colleges and Schools—There's currently no policy that requires the deans to prepare a short report to the Provost at the end of each year giving the status of their college. This document requires such a report and gives suggestions and recommendations as to what might be included in that report. David Rees: *Motion to accept* Jim Aton: *Seconds* Kathy Black: *Special recognition by faculty or of faculty?* Wayne Williams: *Clarification on #6. I'm not sure that includes just special recognition of faculty. There might be special recognition of others.* David Rees: *How about if we say "faculty, staff, and students"?* Steve Barney: *Moves to accept changes* Wayne Williams: *Seconds Passes unanimously.* Steve Barney: *Comment #9—change to "future goals and objectives, how they align with the university mission and vision, and how these are to be measured".* Luciane Berg: *Seconds.* David Lund: *Call to question second amendment. Passes unanimously.* David Lund: *Those who favor approving this policy as it has now been amended with those two items. Voting was unanimous.*

David Rees: Care and Use of Vertebrae Animals—Page 4 has major changes. 1.) Comparing offices to IRB policy, felt it was better to make 3.12 on page 4 wording the same. OSP—office of sponsored projects. 2.) Everything under the direction of the Provost is academics, so make reports to Provost and make him the responsible party. 3.) 3.16 It says meetings are held once a month. Don't see the need; one at the beginning of each term is sufficient, others as needed. Required meetings will be held in September/January/June. David Rees: *Motion to accept this policy as written.* Virginia Stitt: *Seconds.* David Lund: Any other discussion? Lucianne Berg: When you made changes from President to Provost, that doesn't happen very often throughout the policy, and changes are not made on mine. Abe Harraf: Not sure exactly what we called it. David Lund: That office may possible have a name change in the future. Abe Harraf: Some grants bypass our office. Quasi department. Marty Larkin: I resent that. ... (Lapse in tape) Abe Harraf: They get some students through math. They are staff. Richard Eissinger: Regarding copyright laws, we might want to be more specific as to where we borrowed this information. It wouldn't be good to violate the policy we're adopting. Lucianne Berg: 3.5 Looking for the chair and vice chair. Suggest one-year term. That might be too short, make it a 2 or 3 year term. *I would like to make a motion to change that to a 3-year term.* Kenny Laundra: *Seconds. Call to question. One abstention, the rest in favor.*

Steve Barney?: I find it offensive that the policy for animals is longer than the policy for humans. Lucianne Berg: 7.2.8 page 10. My concern is with Bill O'Neal's replacement and this becoming part of the grants person, IRB person and animal review board person, how are we going to find someone knowledgeable in analgesics and euthanasia? Those are all licensed positions. Who?: Wasn't there a mention somewhere in here about a veterinarian? David Rees: The board was composed with a veterinarian. 3.2 States the need to have a veterinarian. We'll need to reach out to the community. Lucianne Berg: Shouldn't be the responsibility of the person we are currently trying to hire. Abe Harraf: This person will be able to coordinate this, not be in charge. David Lund: How do we change the wording of this? David Rees: I suggest we don't change it. Lucianne Berg: The consulting service will be the responsibility of the board? David Rees & Abe Harraf: Yes. Roy Johnson: 3.16 Where got rid of the month, as a faculty do we want to have a mandatory meeting in June? David Rees: This is not a faculty committee. Could we do it in May before finals? Lucianne Berg: While we're still under contract. David Rees: 3 voting members would move it to May. I have no problem with that. Who?: Or April. David Rees: Will they be ready to present it in April? Lucianne Berg: Better to do it in May. Roy Johnson: *Proposes to move to May.* Lucianne Berg: *Seconds.* Virginia Stitt: *Calls into question. 1 abstention, rest in favor. Motion carries.*

David Rees: It should be noted that this policy puts responsibility on this office to get qualified people. David Lund: I'm on that committee. We have taken that into consideration. The candidates we are looking at are pretty darn good. Call question on policy to approve policy on the care of animals. Two abstentions, rest in favor.

David Lund: Any other business? Marty Larkin: How will rank and tenure letters go out? Abe Harraf: Any way you like, I'm not sure how it's been done in the past. David Lund: They came through campus mail last year.

Steve Barney: moves for an executive session. Lucianne Berg: *Seconds.* Wayne Williams: Policy 6.27 faculty workload. Message forwarded. Distance and concurrent enrollment at 1.33 times the class credit. Should faculty receive a contract that pays at 4 credit hours? David Lund: There is currently a committee looking at that. Abe Harraf: 3 policies address this now. Change has taken place—last year we got caught budget wise by legislature. Converted continuing education to a self-

support model to save \$600,000 and to save cutting positions and departments. Conference Services have to break even and pay for their own salaries and benefits. From a purely business standpoint, it's necessary to duly reward faculty and at the same time doing what is comparable to other institutions.

Wayne Williams: Rough guess on where it gets resolved? Abe Harraf: July 12<sup>th</sup>? David Lund: I'm pretty sure that's fair and equitable

Wayne Williams: Motion to adjourn.