

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

1-20-2009

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, January 20, 2009

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, January 20, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 394.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/394

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda 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

January 20, 2009
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Champ Hall Conference Room

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**
Approval of Minutes December 8, 2008.....Mike Parent

- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Raymond Coward, Provost

- 3:30 Announcements**.....Mike Parent
 - Next Brown Bag Lunch w/President & Provost, Tuesday February 10, 2009
 - The next FSEC meeting is Tuesday, February 17, 2009 in the College of HASS Conference Room
 - Status of Level 1 Code Changes

- 3:35 Information Items**
Bookstore Report.....Betty Rozum

- 3:40 Old Business**
PRPC Items.....Scott Cannon
 Grievance Policies and Procedures – Policy 407.1.2 (calendar change) [second reading]

- 3:45 New Business**
PRPC Item.....Scott Cannon
 Grievance Policies and Procedures - 407.1.2 (Calendar Change - language about availability of committee) [first reading]
EPC Items.....Larry Smith

- 4:15 Adjournment**.....Mike Parent



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

December 8, 2008

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Stan Albrecht, Byron Burnham, Steven Burr, Maria Cordero, Raymond Coward, Renee Galliher, Jake Gunther, Ed Heath, Kelly Kopp, Glen McEvoy, Mike Parent, Flora Shrode, Nathan Straight, Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Bloxham (Assistant).

Guests: Francine Johnson, Patti Kohler, Ed Reeve.

Mike Parent called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Byron Burnham moved to approve the minutes of November 17, 2008, Flora Shrode seconded, minutes approved.

University Business

President Stan Albrecht updated the committee on the student drinking death. It has been anticipated that there would be indictments, but there have been none to date. The executive leadership of both Sigma Nu and Chi Omega have been on campus and have followed the course of action that USU took which is to suspend the fraternity and sorority. The students will still live in the houses but the Chapters are not recognized and there are no activities. USU is continuing its own internal investigation and will take action appropriate to the Student Code and University policy, but that is trumped by any legal action to be taken by the County Attorney's Office.

There were also two recent accidents that that seriously affected two of our students. These have been some very difficult circumstances for us and for our students.

The Budget Reduction Review Committee has completed their work. The President is in the process of completing a letter that will go out the University community. The letter will describe the work and recommendations of the committee, the recommendations that are being accepted, the implementation of the reductions imposed by the special session of the Legislature, and possible future scenarios. The first round of cuts will not be the most difficult round for us. Current scenarios are in response to the legislative fiscal analyst, with another 5% reduction out of this years' fiscal budget, and a 10% reduction out the of 2010 fiscal year budget. The governor is trying to cushion the impact by proposing a 1.5% reduction out of the '09 fiscal year and a 7% reduction out of the next fiscal year with 3.5% of that coming back to us as back fill with one time monies, hoping that the third leg of that will not have to be imposed if the economy were to turn around.

In answer to the question as to whether this information has been communicated to the Deans and Department Heads, there is a meeting scheduled for Wednesday morning with the Vice Presidents and the Deans go the information over the weekend. As the Provost discussed with

the Deans, this is going to be a roller coaster ride for the next few months. We need to be careful about being too optimistic when the roller coaster is at the top or too pessimistic when the roller coaster is at the bottom. The Governor's cuts are 12.5 % when you take the 4% that we currently have and add all of his additions. The Legislative cuts are 19% when you take the 4% plus the 15% that the President just described. We will likely to be someplace in the middle.

The President said "these are huge numbers and it will require the hard work on the part of all of us to find our way through this while we maintain momentum and keep this great university moving forward. There is little solace in the fact that there are bigger numbers in other states right now. We are hearing figures as high as 33% in one of our neighboring states." A question was asked if a similar process will continue if more cuts are required. The committee will continue its strategic planning. There was another question about what was being done about working on the revenue side of the issue, such as an adjustment to tuition. We are running numbers on Tier 2 tuition. The up side to that is that as Tuition 1 numbers go down it gives us more flexibility of using Tuition 2 monies on campus. The more immediate revenue option for us is tuition increase. But, combining revenue needs with our strategic mission of access and opportunity is going to be a challenge.

The letter to the university will be out tomorrow. Extra time will be given in the Faculty Senate meeting for President Albrecht to answer faculty questions on these issues.

The Provost announced that Gary Straquadine was named Dean and Executive Director of the Tooele Regional Campus. He starts May 1, 2009.

Announcements

Next Brown Bag Lunch w/President & Provost is Thursday, January 15, 2009.
The next FSEC meeting is Tuesday, January 20, 2009.

Information Items

Council on Teacher Education

Francine Johnson presented the report. There were two program changes approved: 1) an addition of a teaching minor in Latin, and 2) the Department of History modified their history teaching minor in light of the challenge that the history students were experiencing on the Praxis II content test which is a required test for licensing and for meeting the No Child Left Behind requirement. The Utah State Office of Education no longer requires a teaching minor for secondary licensing but the Council voted to maintain the requirement of a teaching minor for USU in light of the feedback received from superintendents indicating the flexibility that a minor provides for them when they staff their schools. The State Office of Education approved the issuance of a Non-renewable Level 1 License for students who graduate but have not yet passed the Praxis II exam. USU requires students to pass the exam prior to being placed in student teaching. The Council voted to retain the policy that students pass the exam prior to student teaching. They must also complete either Math 1050 or Stat 1040, no substitutions are accepted in order to meet the requirements for national accreditation.

Student profile: there was an increase of 8% in admissions, composite ACT scores are above university admission levels, there is a 14% increase in graduates recommended for licensing, our placement rate for last year was 82%, and our Praxis II exam passing rate is about 93%.

Ed Heath moved to place the report on the consent agenda, seconded by Jake Gunther, motion passed.

Scholarship Advisory Board

Patti Kohler reported. There was a 25% increase in dollars spent on all scholarships. 2007-08 was the first year that USU moved to a full tuition and student body fees waiver as opposed to a dollar amount figure for our incoming freshmen. This is our first year for business differential tuition waivers, which is included in full tuition waivers. There was a tuition increase of 7% from the 2006-07 year which increased the amount of waivers available. A large group from the sponsored programs came this year; 156 Dominican Republic students and 13 students from Armenian. This group received a lot of scholarship money. Athletics scholarship changes were made to compensate for the increased tuition costs, and to cover online courses. The percentage of increase over prior years stayed same for most colleges. But two colleges had a decrease from the prior year (Natural Resources and HASS). There was a 15% increase in the number of students helped.

There was a question about where the money came from for this financial aid. In dollar amounts our 10% waivers, is the 10% that we get from tuition; our revenue tuition increased about 24%. There was a huge jump in the sponsored programs (international programs) and that money comes from the Dominican Republic government, we matched a portion of that. We had a 38% increase in the amount of students receiving private scholarships from outside sources. We did have a decrease in students receiving non-resident portion waivers. The 2007-08 year was our highest enrollment year, so the more students we have the more scholarship money we give out. Mike mentioned that USU students have a lower debt burden than any other public institution.

Ed heath moved to place the report on the consent agenda, Jake Gunther seconded and the motion passed.

Old Business

Code Review Committee Report

The FSEC voted to place the Level One changes as consent item on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting. There was a request from the Senate to remove two items from the consent agenda and bring them back under Key Issues and Action items or New Business: 401.3.2(3) and 405.11.4. After a lengthy discussion on section 401.3.2(3) it was decided that it probably required a substantive change and needed further review. Ed heath moved to make section 401.3.2(3) a Level Two code change and send it PRPC. Glenn McEvoy seconded the motion, motion carried.

405.11.4 - External peer reviews. This section deals with term appointments: general procedures for promotion. The only change is striking the last sentence of the paragraph. After considerable discussion it was determined that this section change is probably a substantive change. Procedurally this could be sent back to the Code Review Committee or go to PRPC. There was a concern that the PRPC would probably be confused by it and that it needed to go back to the Code Review Committee for clarification. Ed Heath moved to refer section 405.11.4 back to the Code Review Committee for clarification. Motion seconded by Jake Gunther. Motion carried.

The concern arose over a number of Level One changes that were presented in the form of questions; how will they be clarified and finished on the consent agenda? After reviewing some of these proposed questions it was decided that they could not really be voted on as is. It was suggested that Code Review Committee provide specific proposals for these items for the next Faculty Senate meeting. If this is not possible there could be a motion from the Senate to remove these items that are questions from the consent package. The committee would have 2 weeks to meet. There was a motion to refer these issues to Code Review Committee for revision. Motion was seconded. There was more discussion on why the committee did not make those changes to begin with. Clarification was made that the charge of the committee was to identify the needs/inconsistencies and not make the changes. After further discussion Mike Parent clarified

the motion, that the Executive Committee is empowering the Code Review Committee to make the Level 1 changes that they see fit, and redefine others that are more substantive to Level 2 changes, in order to have an edited version of the consent package to arrive at the Senate in January. Motion voted on and passed.

At the last Senate meeting the motion to change Definition of Days (Code 407.1.2 and 407.6) was tabled so that it could be brought back in January. The tabled motion will be brought off the table as a Key Issues and Action item because that is where it was at the last meeting. The motion will be the same as it was once it comes off the table. That means there will be discussion on the motion. The committee was reminded that in the spring Diane Calloway-Graham made a presentation of issues that AFT found regarding definition of days. The AFT looked at the process with respect to grievances and found that sometimes it could take over 300 days for a grievance to move through the process when using the academic calendar. Examples were given in the report that provided significant information. When the proposed code language was finally brought before the Senate, this year, a third of the Senate members were new. Other Senate members were not fully engaged in the discussion. A question was raised as to whether the rights of faculty were being impeded by moving from the academic calendar to a regular calendar for the purpose of filing grievances. The FSEC was reminded that we have already moved to calendar days for sanctions. Mike then asked if there were things that needed to be considered as this was brought back off the table as a Key Issues and Action item.

After lengthy discussion of the issues it was stated that the tabled item will automatically come off the table so the Senate can debate the issue as the Executive Committee just has. There was concern that Diane's presentation was given over seven months ago, and a suggestion was made that the presentation be given again. More debate on the issue ensued. A statement was made reminding us that the original issue was over confusion about the calendar and what process went under what calendar. It was decided that we need, at least, the outline of the presentation given again so that the context of the issue can be understood. A comment was made that maybe Diane is on sabbatical. If Diane is not available Pat, who will take over as chair of AFT, can give the presentation. Mike will talk to Diane.

New Business

EPC Items

Ed Reeve presented the report. The Curriculum Sub-committee approved 158 requests. Due to the restructuring of the Economics Department and Elementary Education Department, 500 course changes will be needed. They are working to get those changes into Banner. The respective departments will send emails to affected students so that they know the courses may not be listed but the changes will be put in. The Provost takes these changes to the Board of Trustees.

The Academic Standards Sub-committee reviewed and passed the Academic Integrity Policy. The major revisions included a new Article #6 which necessitated a few modifications in other articles for consistency (see attached ASUSU Student Code). They worked five years on this Academic Integrity Policy. It has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for their consideration. There is no place in the Faculty Code that says the Senate approves changes in the Student Code. Mike asked how we should proceed. It was noted that there were certain actions specified for the faculty in the case of violation of academic integrity policy. The Provost mentioned that the President would not take this to the Board of Trustees without having a sense from the faculty that these were appropriate actions. If it went forward on the Consent Agenda a vote on it would mean that it had been approved by the Senate. If it was an Information Item there would be no vote. The Provost reminded the committee that this policy was discussed at a Faculty Senate meeting last year and that in the spirit of shared governance the students and the administration were saying to the faculty this obviously has an impact on the faculty. A question was asked about the extent of faculty involvement with the students as they

developed this policy. There was extensive involvement through the EPC. It was noted that this item is can be tracked over a number of EPC reports, and EPC was satisfied with the outcome.

Ed Reeve reported that in the General Education Sub-committee there were no action items but they did discuss the status of the CIL exam. The sub-committee wants to get more information and evaluate it. ASUSU passed a recommendation that is in the hands of the President, that the CIL exam be eliminated. Now the President will be asking the EPC to consider the recommendation, and after he has that judgment he will make the final decision. The sub-committee is also looking at the President's sustainability piece. They are looking at how we can get that into the General Education curriculum. There was some more discussion on CIL and there is still concern about information literacy. Students are looking to the internet as the authority without any way of qualifying the information they are finding there. A statement was made that the CIL exam is totally missing that because they have not found a way to make it performance based in its assessment. It was noted that students are paying a fee to take a test that over 90% of them pass in five of six areas. The one area that falls below that 90% is the ethics area. A question was asked about whom to contact if people want to express their concerns? Dick Mueller is chair of the General Education Sub-committee. Ed Reeve reminded the Executive Committee that these are just discussion items that the sub-committee is working on.

Another question arose about the Academic Integrity Policy and whether students had upper administration or other faculty input outside of the members of the EPC. The Provost said Steve Hanks worked as the go between with students and the EPC to fashion something that was acceptable to both. He said the substantive conversations happened last year and the year before, and that this is the end of the process. The question was asked if the Executive Committee were just saying OK? This is an argument for keeping it on the Consent Agenda. It was suggested that it would be useful for EPC to put together a timeline of all the other times that this has been debated and discussed at the Faculty Senate to clarify what has been done and when. It would also be helpful for the sub-committee to document when they dealt with this so that the lengthy work of the sub-committee was not second guessed. It was stated that the Deans have had their chance for feedback as well. Kelly Kopp moved to put this report on the consent agenda, seconded. If someone were to try to pull this from the Consent Agenda it is hoped that Larry Smith or Ed Reeve will be there prepared with information on how frequently this has been visited over the past several years. Motion carried.

Faculty Forum Minutes

There was one more item to announce to faculty members who constitute the faculty forum committee, the Faculty Forum minutes have been revised and passed out. These minutes go on the Faculty Senate webpage. If changes need to be made let Mike or Joan know, we wanted you to be informed before they were posted to the web.

Mike asked if there was any other business. A question was asked about what happened with the meetings with the representative from Black Student Union. Several meetings have taken place between Mike, Christina Mason, the initiating group, officers of the Black Student Union, the President, and the Provost. As a consequence a position paper was prepared on the bases of the minutes of that particular meeting and co-authored Christina and Mike. That paper talks about there being policy in the faculty and student codes that address issues of harassment and discrimination. USU has a no tolerance policy for harassment and discrimination. This particular incident needed to be addressed but did not rise to the level of either harassment or discrimination. Process and procedure became something that was very important. How does a student know how to go about responding to an incident like this in class? We can use Connections for the purpose of having a case or activity that would sensitize students to this particular issue and also inform them of where they could turn to find support if this issue surfaced in a class. There is also support within Student Services in Multicultural Student Services Office. Moises Diaz has been through this and is well trained in and is putting together

a group of individuals who can respond to a variety of issues that might involve race, gender, and harassment. It is recognized that if there is an event that occurs in a classroom, there has to be an equal and important level of response that comes through the Provost's Office. Within the Provost's Office, Ann Austin is the natural connection so that if something is brought to the Multicultural Office it goes to Ann simultaneously or immediately. A teaching approach could be used where the issue was addressed by coming back into the classroom with experts to talk about the nature of the problem. Then it could be communicate more broadly through a brief presentation and appended to course syllabi. Then this could be reported at the Department Heads Conference at the beginning of the year. From there it could find its way into Department meetings that are held with faculty and staff. Once done, if there is curriculum built into the Connections class, there could be a connection to frequently asked questions or to Multicultural Student Services where there could be a PDF file on this kind of an issue where students could access information. Moises is preparing presentations that people can access. Glen and Christina are taking the dimensions of this issue and building a teaching case out of it. The Provost indicated that faculty reached out to the student and it really impressed them. This was a clear reaction by the faculty that said "how can we make this better, and how can we avoid this in the future". The students stated that they were really happy with how the President an listened and really cared about their viewpoint and feelings.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Bookstore Committee Report

Introduction:

Charge:

The Bookstore Committee establishes and promotes communications and understanding between the Bookstore and the faculty and students. The Committee includes two faculty appointed by the Senate. The committee is chaired by one of the two faculty members.

Committee Membership, Fall 2008

Betty Rozum, Chair, Faculty Senate Representative

Mark Riffe, Faculty Senate Representative

Pat Anderson, CEA representative

Steven Russel, ASUSU Student Advocate

Adam Fowles, Graduate Studies Vice-President

Jeremy Jennings, Academic Senate President

Lance Pflieger, ASUSU Science Senator

Matt Lovell, PEA Representative

David Parkinson, Ex-Officio, Director of Bookstore

Outline of Meeting Facts and Discussions:

Last year, attempts to convene the committee were unsuccessful. The person originally slated to chair the committee left the University, taking the documentation of the committee's composition and activities with him.

The committee met twice in the fall of 2008. In the first meeting, held September 24, 2008, members discussed the purpose of the committee and David Parkinson provided an overview of the Bookstore. Topics discussed included desire from students to have the list of adopted textbooks available sooner, the possibility of electronic textbooks, faculty and student relations, and the need to maintain better continuity on the committee. David Parkinson felt the Committee could best help the Bookstore by helping improve campus relations.

The second meeting was held November 10, 2008. The Committee discussed methods for soliciting faculty feedback and established a recommended meeting schedule.

Issues:

The Committee felt it would be best to stagger the terms of the two Faculty Senate Representatives in order to provide better continuity for the committee. Betty Rozum agreed to serve as chair for an additional year. Mark Riffe's Faculty Senate replacement will serve as the chair-elect for 2009-2010.

The Bookstore has successfully reached out to students and has collected considerable student feedback via surveys and events. Gathering faculty feedback has been more challenging. The Committee feels the Bookstore would

benefit from additional means of collecting feedback from faculty. In particular, the Committee feels it would be beneficial to solicit feedback from members of Faculty Senate on an annual basis.

Recommendations or actions needed before work can continue:

The Committee would like to distribute a brief survey or feedback form to Faculty Senate members in the fall. We would like a few minutes of meeting time to discuss the need for this information and to distribute and collect the information.

Supporting Materials:

Meeting notes are attached.

Bookstore Committee Meeting
Meeting Notes
9/24/08 @ 2:00 pm
Bookstore Conference Room

Present: Jeremy Jennings, Academic Senate President; Steven Russel, ASUSU; David Parkinson, Director of Bookstore; Mark Riffe, Faculty Senate; and Betty Rozum, Faculty Senate.

- 1) Introduction of members and review of charge:** The Bookstore Committee establishes and promotes communications and understanding between the Bookstore and the faculty and students. We briefly discussed options for ensuring more continuity in the membership. Betty is checking to see if there is a way to stagger the terms of the faculty senate representatives.
- 2) Issues/concerns brought to members by colleagues**
 - a) Jeremy asked about publishing the list of textbooks earlier so students have the opportunity to shop for their books sooner. David reported that a bill will go into effect in July 2010 that will require this. There are some challenges that the Bookstore will face in meeting these requirements.
 - b) Betty asked about the option of electronic textbooks. Steven reported that he conducted a survey last year to gather feedback from students about electronic textbooks. His study showed that the majority of students do not want their textbooks in e-format. He will forward the survey results to Betty. David reported that the Bookstore is watching this issue closely.
- 3) Overview of the Bookstore and how this committee can be useful to the Bookstore.** David provided an overview of the operation of the bookstore and we discussed how the committee might assist David.
 - a) Overview
 - i) **What is the purpose of a campus bookstore?** David's philosophy for the Bookstore is that the Bookstore should have available any items needed by students to take courses at USU. He addressed the fact that his operation must be responsive to the needs of faculty and staff. The Bookstore is a major outlet for University branded clothing and other Aggie items. Alumni rely on the bookstore for their USU paraphernalia as well.
 - ii) **Director's motto.** If students need it to go to school, the Bookstore should have it in the store.
 - iii) **Challenges facing the Bookstore.** David discussed the following challenges he faces in operating the Bookstore:
 - (1) **Market.** The Bookstore competes in international, national, and local markets. Amazon.com and other online booksellers are a key competitor for book sales. Aggie apparel is available at Walmart and other national stores. Locally, there are bookstores directly competing in the textbook market, as well as office supply and computer/technology stores.
 - (2) **Textbooks**
 - (a) *Adoptions.* The process of getting books on the shelf for students is lengthy. Right now, the departmental staff assistants have the forms for spring semester textbook adoption. These are due to the Bookstore by October 10. The faculty determines which books will be purchased, and a number of factors are considered when calculating the number of books to order (class size in previous years, number of anticipated used books for sale, etc.). With competition for local stores and online booksellers, determining the number of books to order is very tricky.

- (b) *Faculty relations.* The Bookstore has had high turnover in the director's position, which has negatively impacted faculty relations. Mark raised the concern that many times his students will report that their textbook is not in stock at the Bookstore. This puts students at a disadvantage and is very frustrating for both students and faculty. David hopes to work more closely with faculty to determine the number of books to order. This is one area where this committee could help the Bookstore – in improving faculty relations.
- (c) *Student perception.* Students think the Bookstore is expensive. Using previous editions is one way to save students money. Mark reported that he allows students to use the current or previous edition of the text for some of his classes. David said he can order in previous editions, which will be significantly less expensive, if faculty will let him know when they identify the texts to be used. David discussed some of the market pressures that drive the costs of books, and how this impacts student perception. He also mentioned that some courses require very obscure texts, which are difficult to locate. Students can find these at the Bookstore, but would have difficulty locating them through another retailer.
- (d) *Electronic/digital texts.* David reiterated that the Bookstore is watching the developments here. Until they are more beneficial and cost effective, they will not be prevalent. However, he feels they are coming.
- (3) **Image (perception is reality).** People feel that everything at the Bookstore is expensive because the textbooks are expensive. In reality, office supplies are less expensive at the bookstore than at the major competitors.
- (4) **Regional Stores.** The bookstore has outlets at the regional campuses. The Bookstore faces challenges in getting the list of books adopted for courses at the regional campuses in a timely manner, and must generate enough revenue to staff and run these sites.
- (5) **Bond.** The Bookstore, along with the other auxiliary services, has signed on to the bond that built the new housing and parking complex. It is imperative that the Bookstore run in the black so the credit rating is not negatively impacted.
- (6) **Funding model.** The Bookstore is self-sufficient. It must generate enough revenue to cover salaries of their employees, plus provide a portion of the salaries for the administrative employees in Auxiliary Services, and rent at the TSC and the regional sites.
- iv) **Role we play in the University community.** In addition to the services provide in the store itself, the Bookstore collaborates with students and campus groups. An example of this is the game day t-shirts sold by AUSU. Additionally, the Bookstore contributes more than \$180,000 to the University.
- b) How can the committee help the Bookstore? The committee can best help the Bookstore by working to improve campus relations. The Bookstore is working on finding a new website provider and improving their site. An RFP has gone out for a new computer system to track inventory and sales. The current system is very outdated. This new system will have capabilities that should help improve relations.

Meeting Schedule

We discussed how often we should meet and felt we needed to meet at once more before the end of the semester. A meeting will be scheduled for the week of November 10.

Bookstore Committee Meeting
November 11, 2008

Present: Jeremy Jennings, Academic Senate President; Steven Russel, ASUSU Student Advocate; David Parkinson, Director of Bookstore; Mark Riffe, Faculty Senate; and Betty Rozum, Faculty Senate.

1. Bookstore update from David.
 - a. The Bookstore is finished with the RFP for the new software system.
 - b. The staff at the Bookstore have been very busy with getting the stores at the regional sites up and running.
 - c. Textbook adoptions were due on October 10. David is sending notices out to departments reminding those who have not completed the forms to do so, and thanking those who have already submitted their requests. He hopes this will improve communication with faculty.
 - d. The Bookstore is working to improve the process of book adoption. This will be important as efforts to implement the bill requiring textbook adoption information to be made available sooner.
2. Issues and Discussion Items
 - a. Student feedback: Steve Russel, who is also an employee of the Bookstore, has implemented several surveys to solicit student feedback, including one prepared for the upcoming Grad Fair. The Bookstore provided tours for AUSUS officers and was successful in obtaining feedback from this group. David plans on continuing with the surveys for student feedback.
 - b. Faculty feedback: It has been more difficult to solicit faculty feedback. David plans to visit each department, but that will take some time to complete. The Committee discussed several possible means of soliciting faculty feedback.
 - i. Mark Riffe suggested the Bookstore ask each department's staff assistant to collect and send to the Bookstore suggestions and concerns each semester when the textbook adoption forms are completed.
 - ii. The Committee felt it would be useful to request comments from members of Faculty Senate early in the fall. We will need to ask permission to have a few minutes on the agenda, and will need to prepare a form or survey for this.
 - iii. A suggestion box in the Bookstore was suggested.
 - iv. The Bookstore should participate in the New Faculty Orientation program.
 - v. David should implement his plan to visit each department.
3. Preparation of the Senate Committee Summary Report
 - a. The Bookstore Committee report is due to the Faculty Senate Executive Secretary by noon on January 6, 2009.
 - b. Issues identified above will be included.

- c. Betty Rozum will prepare a draft report and send it to committee members for review by the end of the week.
- 4. Meeting Frequency. We discussed how often this group should meet and felt the following schedule would be most beneficial:
 - a. Early spring: meet to prepare the survey to be used in the Fall Faculty Senate meeting
 - b. Early fall: hold an orientation meeting to introduce new members and provide an opportunity for the Bookstore to give an overview of operations.
 - c. Late fall: after feedback is collected from Faculty Senate, meet to review it and prepare the annual report.
- 5. Meeting Adjourned

Number 407

Subject: Academic Due Process; Sanctions and Hearing Procedures

PRPC Draft Revision D: Jan 14, 2008

Date of Last Revision: May 23, 2008

(green: text presented to FS in Dec, red: text added as per Dec FS recommendations, blue text added after Jan FS recommendations)

1.2 Definitions of Days

~~In all of the proceedings under Policies 407.3 through 407.8 a day is defined as a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday during the defined period of appointment for the academic year. Official University holidays are not days.~~

~~Except for investigations into research fraud or where the parties mutually agree otherwise, the clock stops from the date of spring commencement until the first day of the following academic year (see Policy 404.2), from the last day of fall semester until the first day of the subsequent spring semester (where the last day of a semester includes the period for final examinations).~~

~~In all of the proceedings under Policies 407.9, .10, and .11, a day is defined as a calendar day (Sunday through Saturday) unless expressly stated as a working day (Monday through Friday, excluding holidays). Also, the clock does not stop for these proceedings.~~

In all proceedings under Policy 407, a day is defined as a calendar day (Sunday through Saturday) unless expressly stated as a working day (Monday through Friday, excluding holidays).

407.6 GRIEVANCES

Faculty members may grieve actions taken against them, including actions initiated by the University against the faculty member. Grievances are allegations of arbitrary or capricious conduct; violations of legal, constitutional, or statutory rights; or violations of this code or other adopted policies and procedures. A faculty member may not grieve a decision reached under Policies 407.3, .4, and .5.

~~The grievance action calendar of events under 407.6.1-6 may be suspended during the summer (between the last day of spring semester to the first day of fall semester) for a reasonable time if key participants would not be available.~~

Alternate language for above para;

~~The grievance action calendar of events under 407.6.1-6 may be suspended during the summer (between the last day of spring semester to the first day of fall semester) or holidays if key participants would not be available.~~

PRPC NOTES: As requested in the Jan FS, the above red language has been changed to more flexibly allow suspension of the calendar for grievances without limiting this option to summer. Our concern however, is that grievance proceedings can be adversarial by nature and perhaps as much as any other section of the code, the process needs specific codified procedures. PRPC therefore suggests the alternate paragraph for FS consideration. This alternate paragraph preserves the request from the FS that suspension of the calendar not be limited to summer but is less subject to interpretation than the first paragraph. Both paragraphs preserve faculty rights as currently defined in the code.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee January 13, 2009

The Educational Policies Committee met on January 8, 2009. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page¹ and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the January 8th meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee which included the following notable actions (Curriculum Subcommittee minutes²):
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 32 requests for course actions (see minutes²).
 - The request from the Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences to change the name of the department to the Department of Nutrition, Dietetics and Food Sciences was approved.
 - The request from the Departments of Environment and Society and Watershed Sciences to jointly offer the Geography degree was approved. This degree is currently being offered in the Environment and Society Department.
 2. There was no December meeting of the Academic Standards Subcommittee to report on.
 3. Approval of the report of the General Education Subcommittee. Of note:
 - Discussion of the status of the CIL requirement continues. The subcommittee is collecting more information about the need and validity of the CIL exams including a faculty survey about the exam.
 - The General Education Subcommittee is making a revision to the General Education Subcommittee Course and Syllabus Approval Process instruction sheet to state that "If the course is to be offered online, or by self-study, or distance delivery, the proposal should address how pedagogy and content criteria will be met given the constraints of these formats."
 - The subcommittee continues to consider ways to include a sustainability piece in the General Education curriculum at Utah State as required by agreement with the American College & University Presidents.
 - All other higher education institutions in Utah except USU and the College of Eastern Utah require at least a C- as the minimum grade in ENG 1010. Utah State University accepts a D. The General Education Subcommittee and the EPC agreed that it would be appropriate to raise our minimum grade to a C- so we are aligned with other institutions in the state. To do this, will require a proposal from the Department of English.
 - At the Educated Persons Conference in November, the Board of Regents asked that our General Education Subcommittee review our programs to see how they align with the LEAP (Liberal Education and Americas Promise) Project Essential Learning Outcomes. The Regents' want to assess general education and degrees across the entire system and they are looking at the LEAP objectives as a starting point to do that. The General Education Subcommittee will compare our "Citizen Scholar" statement with the LEAP outcomes before their next meeting to determine how they align with the LEAP objectives.
1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/EPC/2008-2009/Minutes/Jan82009epcminutes.pdf>
 2. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/EPC/curriculum/2008-2009/Minutes/Jan82009ccminutes.pdf>