

Faculty Senate Minutes  
January 31, 2013  
4:00 p.m. Charles Hunter Room, Hunter Conference Center

Senators in Attendance: Steve Barney, Julie Taylor, Nichole Wangsgard, Janet Seegmiller, Steve Irving, Sarah Duffin, Lee Montgomery, Jeff Barnes, Wayne Roberts (also proxy for Emmett Steed and Griffon Edwards), Artis Grady, Helen Boswell, Richard Cozzens (also proxy for Connie Nyman and Des Penny), Kim Weaver, Selwyn Layton, Mark DeBeliso, Randle Hart, Rachel Kirk, Kyle Bishop, Shobha Gurung, David Shwalb, Michelle Orihel, Randall Allen, Andy Marvick, Christine Frezza, Lynn Vartan, Jim McCoy, Jeremias Paul.

Guests: Brad Cook, Mark Atkinson, and Briget Eastep

1. Steve Barney: Call to order at 4:00 p.m.
2. Steve Barney: Called for a motion to approve the minutes of December 6<sup>th</sup>. Minutes were not taken at January meeting with Senator Steve Urquart. Motion by David Shwalb; seconded. No changes. Minutes approved. No one opposed; no abstentions.
3. Provost Report, Brad Cook:
  - a. **Update on state of budget for Utah.** Good news is that there is some surplus, but concern about providing funds for growth in public education and Medicaid increase. Governor has included \$20 million for higher education which would include a 1% compensation increase for public employees. Seven million would go for compensation and additional funds for mission-based funding which is good for SUU. Institution is grappling with impact of change in LDS missionary age. Enrollment is down this semester about 1.3% in budget-related headcount and the administration has found cuts for this semester. It is more complicated to figure out enrollment for next fall. Budget is being developed based on a 10% decrease in enrollment which is high estimate. President Benson is working to make cuts without impacting positions or to minimize impact to faculty and students. This is an opportunity to provide more focus for what we do well. Any questions?

Question: How many students are we talking about? Answer: Every one percent equals about 400.

Steve Barney: Are those tuition dollars we are losing and not state appropriated funds? Yes. So a 10% decrease in headcount is not a 10% decrease in funding. President's Office sent an email soliciting ideas for dealing with the shortfall.

Question: Do you perceive the need to declare financial exigency?

Provost: We are trying to understand how long this will affect us. We know there are enough students in the pipeline from Utah's K-12 schools to increase enrollment. We know that they will eventually return from missions to college. We are looking at a 24-36 month lag in enrollment until we get back up where we were this last semester.

4. Steve Barney introduced Mark Atkinson, dean of the School of Continuing and Professional Studies.
  - a. Mark was speaking as the chair of the graduate council and introduced a plan to improve graduate education courses through consistency of teaching staff. The plan is to equalize the online education and to incorporate the spirit and practice of experiential learning into online courses. We are discussing having graduate faculty qualify to teach online by taking an 8 -hour online course. What are your thoughts if we introduced something like that? It is not an action item; we just want to start the conversation.

Comments on the need for help with online courses, on evaluation forms, and the need for standardization in Canvas across the courses. It would be good to bring in those who have taught online. Steve Barney said that Dean Atkinson will draw up a proposal to bring to our faculty.

5. Kyle Bishop spoke to encourage faculty participation in Lunchbytes and Faculty Development. He asked for feedback to be sent to the Faculty Center of how to improve participation. Sessions are held during the Thursday University hour so that there is no conflict. Send comments to [facultycenter@suu.edu](mailto:facultycenter@suu.edu).
6. Steve Barney announced for Renee Ballenger the T-Fit activities for February.
7. Vice President Report:
 

Julie Taylor reported that the Trustees are meeting tomorrow morning, so little to discuss. They will be reviewing policies we have sent to them, i.e. the internship and syllabus policies. There are some updates to the website for standing committees that need to be made. There are two committees where chair has rotated off and there are no faculty senators on these committees. Mark DeBeliso volunteered to coordinate selection of a new chair for the Faculty Review Board. Jeff Barnes volunteered to coordinate selection of a new chair for the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee. Steve suggested these volunteers set up the first meeting. Are there any other corrections for the Faculty Senate Website?
8. President's Report:
 

Steve Barney received word this morning that the Events Services Advisory Committee is looking for a faculty representative. Under Policy 5:13, they will look at current fee structure and procedures for any anticipated changes needed for the next academic year in Events Services. This has come up in Faculty Senate discussions. Kim Weaver volunteered, but Steve arranged for another faculty member who is involved with events on campus. This is a new committee so there is no precedent for people serving on it.
9. Treasurer's Report:
 

Sarah Duffin.  
 In Faculty Senate Gifts Account: \$12,893.31  
 State appropriated faculty account: \$1,588.67

Steve will send out a solicitation letter this week for contributions to the Gifts Account.

#### 10. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

a. **Definition of Faculty Policy 6.0:** Committee Chair Lee Montgomery said the report of changes to the policy has been available to Faculty Senate members. No discussion. Motion to approve by Mark DeBeliso, seconded by Jeff Barnes. Unanimously approved with no abstentions.

b. **Faculty Due Process Committee:** Committee Chair Julie Taylor said the process ties into Definition of Faculty, so language was added that could make a case for non-tenured faculty to come under policy “as defined by Policy 6.0.” Minor changes are on pp. 7, 9, 14, and 17. Major changes on pp. 22 and 25, sec. e. The committee consulted with Mike Carter, Tim Lewis and Cindy Wright who have made contributions.

Comments: Randy Allen explained that the committee’s mandate was to look at how it interfaced with the definition of faculty and make the edit that was desired without looking at the entire policy. Mark DeBeliso asked for comment on the 24 hour policy. Julie said committee felt like there needed to be some kind of timeline so it wouldn’t sit on someone’s desk for a period of time.

Steve has asked the committee to reconsider who should be responsible for determining the availability of proceedings. On p. 6, fourth paragraph down, it says “The Responsible Administrator or the Chair of the Faculty Review Board has the sole determination of the availability of proceedings.” Why don’t we have it be collaborative or a joint effort? He has written to the committee suggesting it read “The Responsible Administrator or Chair of the Faculty Review Board ‘in conjunction with or in consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate’ will make a determination of the availability of proceedings.” He asked for dialogue on this. In current policy, any petition should be reported to the Faculty Senate president. Faculty Senators should bring feedback as it will be an action item in February meeting. Academic Affairs looked at this three years ago, so our consideration is after theirs. We could refer back to them if we have issues after February meeting.

#### c. **Engaged Faculty Sub-Committee.**

Steve Barney created an Ad Hoc Committee and their report is on Canvas. They were charged with exploring ways for the faculty to support EDGE projects and not overload faculty. They considered how faculty could be compensated in terms of work load. Not every EDGE project needs to be supervised by faculty. Students take three courses in the EDGE program: UNIV 1010 introduces EDGE process; UNIV 3925 allows for design of projects and identifying a supervisor; UNIV 4925 is at the end of the project. Students conceptualize, reflect on and disseminate the scope of their project. Each is an online 1 credit hour course with established curriculum.

In order to give faculty credit for supervising, it makes sense to make faculty members the instructors of record for those individual courses and then it would become part of their faculty work load. Steve and Bruce Tebbs looked at work-load policy for supervised instruction, and under

that policy faculty would get 1 credit hour for every 20 projects supervised. Committee considered if faculty could be instructor of record for the two classes, 3925 and 4925, but EDGE committee said one condition was that they not change the curriculum. Students entering 3925 would identify their topic and supervisor. If faculty member consented to supervise, then student would change registration into a section identified under the faculty member's name. Details for faculty credit still must be worked out.

Comments/questions:

Kim Weaver: We have a conflict in chemistry because we have had "EDGE-like" research projects before the program existed in Chem 2990 and 3990 classes. Some of those could be duplicates and we need to reconcile how students will do both. Steve responded that the intent is to add intentionality to both those types of classes. Bridget Eastep stated that curricular based activities can become EDGE-based projects. EDGE projects may be curricular based with intentionality and multi-disciplinary perspective. Discussion. Jeff Barnes commented on how it works in Business.

Steve Barney: There are many questions yet to be resolved. This is a brand new program and the numbers who will require a faculty advisor are unknown. It is a stipulation that faculty don't change the curriculum, so faculty members who want to work with the curriculum in their EDGE classes will be trained and vetted by the individual engagement centers they want to work with. Center directors committed to put together the training materials for the whole program and to help faculty understand the program and what their role would be from 1010 to 4995. Not everyone on campus can do this, but persons who have self-selected would go through the training process. EDGE centers will have those names on file and when a student comes looking for a faculty mentor, there is a list of names for the student to select from.

The second prong in this proposal calls for several EDGE Fellows who will choose to apply for these positions. They would be assigned to one of the EDGE Centers, to work under the EDGE Director and negotiate with their department chair or dean on which part of their workload would be reduced to serve as an EDGE Fellow, service, teaching or scholarship. This is a longer term solution to get people more involved with the EDGE centers and give faculty a permanent presence in the program.

These are the two ideas from the committee: First, to find ways to incorporate it into current faculty workload. Second, identify faculty through a competitive process who want to be a part of this engagement movement and have some sort of workload reassignment in one of the areas they normally contribute in exchange for their work in the centers.

Question was asked if it wouldn't work to double the accounting for the subsequent 4925 class instead of having to get credit for the 3925 class, but President Barney indicated that the faculty needs to be involved in the formative stage of the proposal development in 4925. EDGE centers want us to bring the faculty in early in the process, and registrar says that's the easiest way to accomplish that. Is this a proposal that the Faculty Senate can support? I have universal support

from the committee to bring this forward. I would entertain a motion to accept these recommendations as proposals and move this forward to the Dean's Council.

Motion by Selwyn Layton and second by Jim McCoy. No further discussion. Motion approved with three abstentions.

#### **d. BA Requirements Committee**

Committee Chair Rachel Kirk reported that the ad hoc committee was asked to continue to require 16 language credits in the Bachelor of Arts program and try to make the BS and the BA more equitable. Committee chose to follow the University of Utah model, but morphed it. The third page of the handout has a suggested list of quantitative intensive (QI) courses of which students would take two to get a BS. If those two were already part of their major or minor, then they passed it.

Comments:

The School of Business faculty members did not like the idea that we have to add to the BS requirements, but the business classes we have already would satisfy this. Rachel Kirk explained that in many areas no additional classes would be required. Comment that this is just making them equitable by definition. Steve Barney: It is more equitable for those disciplines where a BA should be a viable option, but either they don't offer it or the students don't go for it because they meet the BS requirements just by doing their General Education.

Wayne Roberts made a motion that this go to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Discussion: Roberts experience was that the BS was a more rigorous degree and the BA was not as rigorous and had more flexibility. Didn't we just join a liberal arts group? [COPLAC] Is there research on this? Steve explained that this came from the Dean's Council where some wanted to reduce the foreign language credits to 12. He volunteered Faculty Senate to look at it. Ad hoc sub-committee looked at institutions across the country and came up with this proposal.

Discussion on the committee's proposal to make them equitable which they are not. A student can get a BS by doing just General Education and major/minor requirements, but to get a BA, a student must do those plus 16 hours extra of language.

Discussion: It seems like we're a Liberal Arts and Sciences university with professional programs. But our professional programs are the largest attraction to this campus, includes education and business, but other comments were that this would increase the level of quantitative competency among people who get BS degrees. That's the purpose behind this.

Committee members explained that the proposal encourages students to consider working harder in a very small number of programs where the BS seems unusual and a BA would be more appropriate. It was the understanding of committee's assignment that any degree that was heavily intensive in science, whether it was a BS in science or a BS in business or education, it would go on

through. The list is of QI classes would be applicable for many degrees and classes can be added to the list.

Steve Barney: The motion on the floor to send this to the Academic Affairs committee died for a lack of a second.

Randle Hart made a motion to send this back to the Dean's Council. Second by Kyle Bishop.

Discussion: Does sending it to Dean's Council indicate Faculty Senate approval? Response: Not necessarily. Can we table this discussion, but still move ahead with it?

Steve Barney: We have a motion on the floor to send this to the Dean's Council and a second. We can vote on that motion or rescind it.

Question called. Eight voted to send it to Dean's Council; 8 voted against, with 3 abstentions, and President Barney cast deciding vote to send it to the Deans Council for their consideration.

#### 11. Action Items

a. **GE Policy** proposal sets a 60 credit-hour limit by which General Education core classes must be completed effective with the 2013-14 e-catalog. Dean's Council approved it and asked the Faculty Senate to move forward on it. Courses impacted are those where juniors and seniors are taking up seats and freshmen and sophomores cannot register for them. There will be enrollment management with a hold on registration until a student passes the listed GE core classes.

Jeff Barnes made a motion to accept this policy; second by Steve Irving.

Discussion: It came to theater arts faculty from their dean; they unanimously felt we should go ahead with it.

Vote: Approved with three abstentions.

#### b. **Graduate Teaching Load Policy, Policy 6.27.**

Jeff Barnes made motion to approve this policy. Second by Kyle Bishop.

Discussion: Jeff Barnes said the accounting faculty liked the policy, but asked why the online classes had been stricken from this policy. Steve Barney said he would investigate this issue and why they are differentiating the online classes. Wayne Roberts indicated that on Page 1 it indicates that this implements "Regents' policy and workload standards for average teaching loads . . . to internal and external audiences."

Mark DeBeliso reported feedback on Page 4, D.1.c. where comments were made that there was concern about the word "may" in "Faculty teaching graduate courses **may** receive a teaching reassignment up to ¼ of their teaching load . . ." Kim Weaver moved to amend the motion to

include the word “shall” in D.1.c. line four, so it would read “Faculty teaching graduate courses **shall** receive a teaching reassignment up to 1/4 of their teaching load as approved by their Dean. . . . “  
Randy Allen seconded amendment of motion.

Question called. Passed unanimously including the proposed amendment of “shall” on p. 4.

Old and new business was deferred to the next meeting. Adjourned at 5:45 p.m.