

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

1-10-2011

## USU Faculty Senate Minutes, January 10, 2011

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, January 10, 2011" (2011). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 13.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/13](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/13)

This Faculty Senate Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).





**USU FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 10, 2011  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Vince Wickwar called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

Steve Burr made a motion to approve the minutes of December 6, 2010 and Darwin Sorensen seconded. Motion passed.

**Announcements – Vince Wickwar**

**Roll Call.** Members are reminded to sign the role sheet at each meeting.

**University Business – President Stan Albrecht.**

The federal legislature did not pass the Omnibus Bill, with the result that last portion of funding for the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) building was lost for now. We will not know until March if there is any possibility of receiving the last portion of the funding needed for this project.

The restructuring of the Commercialization and USTAR operations is now in place. Rob Behunin is now the VP of Commercialization and Regional Development. He will be responsible for regional campus commercialization activities. In addition to his responsibilities for the Commercialization and Regional Development Office, he will serve as a member of the USTAR Executive Committee. He will also collaborate with the Huntsman School Entrepreneurship Program and continue his work with the Uintah Impact Mitigation Special Service District. The most noticeable change under the new structure is an emphasis on treating USU commercialization opportunities and activities as a single USU asset. The university, Utah State University Research Foundation and USTAR efforts, in terms of commercialization endeavors, will come together in a more synergistic and collaborative fashion. This will allow faculty, students, researchers, scientists, industry, investors and the community to have access to the complete USU commercialization portfolio.

Provost Coward commented on the search for the new Dean of Graduate Studies and VP of Research. The position is now being advertised. Dean Noelle Cockett is serving as the Chair of the search and screening committee. The new organizational chart is being vetted by the School of Graduate Studies as well as the Office of the VP for Research. Faculty members are encouraged to call Larry Smith if they know of people in their networks, on campus or off campus, who might be interested in this position. All interested individuals will be contacted.

President Albrecht urges faculty not to worry too much about some of the things that are in the newspapers regarding the next legislative session. During the first week of the session a base budget will be passed so that if at the end of the session they are unable to pass a revised budget they will not be "held hostage" to getting one passed. While the governor's budget holds higher education harmless, the legislature is talking about a 7% budget cut. Compensation remains the highest priority for this session followed by the Vet Science Program, operating and maintenance funding for non state funded buildings, and other capital projects.

### **Consent Agenda Items – Vince Wickwar.**

A motion to approve the consent agenda with the exception of the Computer Information Literacy (CIL) item in the EPC report was made by Tami Pyfer and seconded by Glenn McEvoy, motion passed.

Larry Smith explained the EPC's position and vote on eliminating the CIL exam. Over the last 2½ years the General Education Subcommittee has thoroughly examined this issue. The CIL exam is currently a graduation requirement for all USU students. The exam was implemented in 1997. The cost to take the exam is \$30. Student government representatives requested that the General Education Subcommittee review the relevancy of the exam in 2008. In Fall 2009, the entire university faculty was surveyed regarding student computer literacy. In Fall 2010, the General Education Subcommittee voted 14-2 to eliminate the CIL exam as a graduation requirement. This vote does not mean that the committee members felt that computer literacy and skills were not important and does not prevent academic units from making their own decisions about testing student computer ability, skills and knowledge. The CIL exam was a good thing when it was first implemented fourteen years ago. Given the incredible changes in technology since then and the greater fluency that students now have with technology, the CIL exam is no longer the best way to test computer literacy. In addition, passing the CIL does not ensure that students know the programs, because on average 25% of seniors do not take the CIL exam until right before they graduate. The General Education Subcommittee recommends that the CIL Testing Center continue in some fashion as a computer literacy resource for students. Faculty and advisors could send students to the Center to get the skills they need. Thus the Center could be transformed into a resource center for students who have gaps in their knowledge. Budget issues regarding this have not been discussed. Tyler Tolson (ASUSU President) said that he saw no problem with having a student fee to help fund this resource.

Tami Pyfer moved to accept the committee's recommendation to eliminate the CIL exam and Rhonda Miller seconded. Motion passed.

### **Action Items**

**Code Compliance Committee Renewal – Vince Wickwar.** The committee was formed as an ad hoc committee last year. The committee made a progress report to the Senate in September. It worked on a significant non-compliance issue last year and, as a result of its work, changes to the Faculty Code have been proposed. Thus, the committee did prove to be useful. However, because ad hoc committees have a tenure of one year, a renewal vote is needed for the committee to continue to function. In their last meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee proposed that the Code Compliance Committee be renewed for another year.

Darwin Sorensen moved that the Code Compliance Committee be renewed for another year. Glenn McEvoy seconded and the motion passed.

**PRPC 405.11.4(1) Tenured and Term Appointments: Evaluation, Promotion, and Retention (Second Reading) – Bob Parson.** PRPC recommended moving the final sentence of this section to a parenthetical item in the beginning of the section to make it easier to understand. The change has been made in the code but, due to a clerical error, was never approved.

Glenn McEvoy moved to accept the second reading and Ed Heath seconded.

Doug Anderson questioned why only lecturers are not required to have external review letters while all other term appointments are apparently supposed to have them. As a result, he questioned the need for the last paragraph. Ed Heath pointed out that this is a separate issue from the change in the paragraph above and should be referred to the Executive Committee for further action. There was much discussion as to whether the change proposed was a substantive change and if Dean Anderson's concerns were an unrelated issue. Glenn McEvoy and Ed Heath withdrew their motion. Discussion continued regarding the review and promotion procedure for lecturer ranks and other term appointments. Are external letters desirable for the promotion of

some people with temporary appointments. Provost Coward suggested a parenthetical phrase stating that external reviews are required for core faculty only. PRPC has not looked at the rest of section 405 yet. Comments were made that some senators were uncomfortable doing anything with this until the entire section had been reviewed. It was eventually decided that section 405.11.4(1) read “external peer review, required of core faculty only” as long as PRPC does not find that it conflicts with any other part of section 405. However, Dean Nat Frazier raised the question as to whether temporary faculty in the Federal Cooperator ranks, who are considered to be equivalent to core faculty, should have external reviews.

Nonetheless, Mike Parent moved that Section 405.11.4(1) be sent 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. Ed Heath seconded the motion. The motion passed.

### **New Business**

**Tenure-Review Timetable Discussion – Ed Heath.** This discussion pertained to the impacts of a possible proposal to change the tenure timetable for major reviews. While each year the tenure committee votes to recommend or not recommend renewal, there is currently a 3<sup>rd</sup> year review that carries more weight. It also involves the dean. Because of its greater significance, this review is done earlier in the year to allow the person more time to find another position if the decision is negative. The proposal would be to move this review to a 4<sup>th</sup> year review and to add a 2<sup>nd</sup> year review. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years, the evaluations would continue higher up the decision chain, as currently done in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year. This would result in major reviews being conducted in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> years (final year). This idea came out of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) recommendation that there be more emphasis on the evaluative role for the tenure committee. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years, this change would also lead to moving the decision date earlier. In addition, if the decision were negative in the 4<sup>th</sup> year review, the person would have a terminal year. There was some discussion of the pros and con’s presented with this agenda item and the impact on the candidate.

It was agreed that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will discuss the issue further at the January 18th meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn at 4:28 p.m.