

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

9-21-2015

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes, September 21, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes, September 21, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 217.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/217

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee 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.





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 21, 2015

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Ronda Callister (Chair), Paul Barr, Britt Fagerheim, Dennis Garner, Betty Hassell, Kimberly Lott, Mark McLellan, Dan Murphy, Jeanette Norton, Robert Schmidt, Charles Waugh, Vincent Wickwar, Lindsey Shirley (President-Elect), President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Secretary) **Excused:** Doug Jackson-Smith, Vijay Kannan, and Mike Pace. **Guests:** James Nye, Larry Smith, Amber Summers-Graham.

Ronda Callister called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Ronda Callister rewrote something she said to clarify its meaning. The minutes of August 31, 2015 were adopted.

University Business – Stan Albrecht - There is nothing that is pressing so the President opened the floor to questions. Robert Schmidt inquired about the “Year of Water” undoubtedly coming to an end and asked if another yearly topic is planned. The Provost stated that they don’t see the “Year of Water” ending as of December 31st; it will be carried on at least through the legislative session and perhaps the end of the academic year. Tim Vitale is looking into how we can transition it into another area of research, education and outreach. Since water is a critical issue in Utah it is the reason for continuing through the next legislative session. Robert extended Stan congratulations on his ten years as President. Vince Wickwar wanted to know about the Science Building. The State Board of Regents did not put it up on the list. The Building Board has more influence and the science building could still end up being in play. Charles Waugh asked if the Regents were doing some kind of turn taking strategy where they are counting Regional Campuses in the mix. The President said that conversations will continue.

Information Items

Human Participants in Research Policy - Mark McLellan – This is a policy that would not normally come to this body but the impact effects faculty in a great way and the body should be informed. The policy comes from our accreditation for human subjects which requires us to have an “institutional conflict of interest” policy. We already have a “personal conflict of interest” policy. There are times when institutions can be in conflict with projects that are coming in and this is focused on projects coming in as sponsored research and in this case just human participant’s research. This will affect between one and two projects a month. Contracts and gifts will be queried; the whole emphasis is to insure the integrity of the work making sure there are no conflicts of interest. A procedure has been developed to drive this process. A draft of the policy appears in the agenda packet. This item will be presented as an information items on the senate agenda.

Reducing the size of some Faculty Senate Committees – Ronda Callister - Ronda referred the committee to the materials in the agenda packet. There are three committees that might not need to be changed. FSEC functions well as is, EPC has no senators on the committee and is very structured, and the Committee on Committees with three people functions well. Since AFT staffs the grievance committees we don’t want to cut them too much because they need enough members to staff the hearings. Historically over time we have gone from 7 people on committees to 9 with libraries and extension, and then to 15. We now have 12 units plus 3 faculty senators that sit on these committees. PRPC, FEC, and FDDE could function very well with 7 people (see table on the 3rd page of the document). Ronda is not ready to do anything yet but would like the senate

representatives to serve for both the college and the senate in order to reduce the committee size but still provide adequate representation for both the units and the senate. Ronda would like feedback to see if there is any push back on reducing the committee's size. We wanted to look at reapportionment first to see how it might affect the units.

Reports

EPC Annual Report – Larry Smith - This covers the actions taken by the EPC and its three subcommittees in the last year. All items were acted on by the senate and approved. Please see the report in your agenda packet. The subcommittees include: Academic Standards Subcommittee, Curriculum Subcommittee, and the General Education Subcommittee. Each committee meets monthly and reports to the EPC. The EPC annual and monthly reports to the Faculty Senate are organized to include the actions of each of these committees and the subsequent action of the EPC. The R401 Proposals that EPC acts on are presented as well. The R401 is a specific form developed by the Utah System of Higher Education and it is used by all public institutions in the State that want to propose new academic programs. Two templates are used: a long template to propose a new degree program, and a short template when making minor changes to a program. These proposals come from the college curriculum committees/with department review then go to EPC and when necessary to the BFW, the Graduate Council, or the Council of Teacher Education. They then go to the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents. The timeline for taking proposals through the system is very tight because the Board of Trustees and Board of Regents don't meet for regular business meeting every month.

EPC Items September 2015 – Larry Smith – Curriculum Subcommittee actions were discussed. The item from the Department of Applied Sciences, Technology and Education was not approved but that does not mean that it's dead forever. No one had issues with the essence of the proposal, but there were some stylistic issues that the EPC felt needed to be addressed. These have been addressed now and the proposal will be back on the agenda again next month. Larry summarized the rest of the report which is in your packet. Robert Schmidt asked if there was any more discussion on the Communication Intensive proposal in making written or verbal or both. Larry stated that it was the General Education Subcommittee business and they voted that the CI could be verbal or written, and in the next meeting it was reversed where it had to be both verbal and written. Robert thought that there was a survey to get feedback but Larry did not know where that was at but would check on it and get back to Robert.

Vince Wickwar made a motion to put these two items on the Faculty Senate agenda as reports. The motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt and passed.

Honors Program Report – Amber Summers-Graham – Amber is standing in for Kristine Miller who is on a research project. 2014 marked the 50th Anniversary of the Honors Program at USU. They celebrated with several new initiatives. They developed a new admissions process and implemented that this year. They have two new advisory boards a faculty and student board. They have created detailed handbooks for the capstone thesis process and the student practical application work. They have also created new co-curricular activities for students and faculty and transcript designations for service learning and the global engagement scholar. They produced a bi-annual newsletter and started a new recruiting event for high achieving high school juniors. She highlighted student awards and accomplishments and discussed the trip to southern Utah. Noelle Cockett complemented the energy of the Honors Program Office and staff and the work they have done and the comradery that is being developed in the program.

Jeanette Norton made a motion to put this on the agenda as a report. The motion was seconded by Charles Waugh and passed.

Libraries Advisory Council – Britt Fagerheim – The council only met once last year. The discussion centered on the planning for a new dean of libraries and the bankruptcy of SWETS one of the major publishers and aggregators. Next year's agenda items include identifying new representatives and chair for the council, review issues of funding support for electronic journals and discussion for the transition of a new dean.

Kimberly Lott made a motion to include the report on the FS agenda. The motion was seconded by Lindsey Shirley and the motion passed.

Parking Committee Report – James Nye – Last year there was a parking rate increase to offset the bond for the Aggie Terrace. The increase went up \$138,000 this year. We are down 58 stalls in the Blue Premium area due to construction of the welcome center. They are not replacing the booth due to costs. Other areas of construction are the Maverik Stadium where we lost 117 stalls due to construction which will be restored upon completion of the stadium. The Clinical Services Building that will begin in the spring will be a major construction project. They want 35 underground stalls and they cost twice what was expected at \$1.1 million. The new housing project where Mountain View and Valley View Towers exist they are wanting 100 underground parking stalls at \$1.3 million. As parking funds these projects it will definitely take away from what has been saved. A consultant was hired and they have done some amazing work. They have looked at all forms of travel to and from the university and have given recommendations on how to proceed and given infrastructure costs needed to make the proposal work. In the next several years you will see some major changes. If you are a single car occupant it will not be good news for you it will make it more difficult or costly for you to come to campus; however, if you are riding the bus, biking, or carpooling it may become easier. In the next 5 years some major increases in permit rates are needed to fund all of these things. As we try to maintain for the growth in students that we have we will have to start building up, so we anticipate another parking structure in the next 5 to 10 years. Now would be the time to start putting the financial package together for those structures because they are so expensive. Parking will be looking for another area to park State vehicles due to upcoming construction.

A question was asked if there were any plans to put parking where the old trailer park was. James said that there were plans to put soccer fields there. Currently anyone with a yellow permit can park there. Another question was asked about the possibility of the projects that are planning underground parking to pool their money toward build a terrace rather than going underground. Parking did talk to the dean, because there is an underground tunnel there and how do you get past the tunnel. So there are discussions going on relating to this. The Deans needs are a little different in that the parking needed is for people accessing the Clinical Services Building. Another question asked for an explanation of the increase in the bond payment. That was the result of securing the bond when they couldn't afford it and they have been paying interest only. Now they are starting to pay the principle. The good news is that the Big Blue Terrace is now paid off. Charles Waugh complemented James on his work on the master plan; we have the lowest priced parking in the nation. The Parking committee is really doing good work on looking ahead and also looking at the environmental issues that face us in Cache Valley and looking at the whole picture in terms of everyone's needs and how we can reach our sustainability goals. Another question dealt with the use of Aggie Boulevard. The plan is to close it within the next 5 years from 11th East to Richards and Bullen Hall and have it open only to bikes and busses.

Mark McLellan made a motion to put this item on the senate agenda as a report. Britt Fagerheim seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Unfinished Business

402.12.7(1) Add "Faculty University Service Award" to the list of the Faculty Evaluation Committee Duties (second reading) – Vince Wickwar made a motion to put this on the agenda as a second reading as Unfinished Business. Robert Schmidt seconded the motion and the motion passed.

New Business

401.4.2.4 Proposal to change code to include State with Federal Cooperators (first reading) – Robert Schmidt summarized the proposal in that people under state contracts also service in the cooperator category. The proposal is fine but the title (4) needs to include "Federal or State Cooperator (FSC) Ranks". Robert made a motion to send it on to faculty senate as a first reading. Vince seconded the motion and the motion passed.

405.7-12 Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching is the major role assignment – Vince made a motion to send this on to the senate as a first reading. Mark seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Faculty Senate Reapportionment Proposal – Ronda summarized that when reapportionment was done last year Regional Campuses lost a seat and Doug wanted to know what happened. We discovered that Term Appointment people can service in Faculty Senate but they are not counted in the apportionment process. Doug and some of the term faculty thought that it was unfair and Doug has proposed that we should include them in

apportionment. The AAA ran an analysis of what it would look like if term faculty were included in apportionment (see tables in the agenda packet). The result was that Regional Campuses gains 2 senators, Agriculture gains 1 senator, and Engineering, Libraries, and Extension each lose a senator. Ronda wanted feedback from those who would lose a senator. Britt, who represents Libraries, said that it would be difficult when they had to switch off to cover the spot on the FSEC. She was concerned about the unfairness of the old way where Regional Campuses lost a seat. Charles asked for clarification on "term appointments". Ronda said that adjuncts are not included but instructors, researchers, federal cooperators. etc. Joan suggested that if you look in the section of the code that describes term appointments and it includes that list. Someone asked if it fluctuated from year to year and no one knew. Ronda stated that in 2009 and 2010 we lost a number of term appointments during the financial crisis but we have been hiring people back since then. Mark stated that we have had a record year in research funding and we are hiring more people that will do double duty. Robert asked if there were a minimum number of senators that anyone could have. Ronda said one and explained that you take 60 senators and divide it proportionally by the number of units and we have 12 units. Dennis and Betty were asked for feedback. Dennis said that Regional Campuses were delighted to have representation and be considered like everyone else. However the system is set up and designed for the numbers he thinks works out very well and they are glad to be here and have their input and know what's going on. Betty said that since theirs doesn't change it would not affect them either way and they are happy with how it is now. Ronda said that it did not feel like we had a strong sense one way or another. Paul was asked how he felt since it affected his unit, Engineering. He stated that they would be good citizens and do what needed to be done. Joan explained the caveat of rounding and the need to ask a unit one year when there was a tie if they were willing to round down.

Ronda asked for a hand vote to move this forward to senate, all agreed, it will go to the senate as New Business.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.