

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

2-1-2010

Faculty Senate Agenda, February 1, 2010

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Agenda, February 1, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 413.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/413

This Faculty Senate 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 MEETING

February 1, 2010

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ed Heath
Approval of Minutes January 11, 2010
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Ed Heath
1. Roll Call
2. Next year's Faculty Senate Calendar
- 3:10 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Raymond Coward, Provost
- 3:30 Information Items**
• BFW Discussion.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 3:50 Consent Agenda**.....Ed Heath
1. Bookstore Report
2. EPC Items
- 3:55 Key Issues and Action Items**
1. Emergency Committee on Committees election.....Betty Rozum
2. PRPC Code changes Section 401 Composition and Authority of the Faculty
(partial changes, remainder of section) First Reading.....John Engler
- 4:30 Adjournment**



**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
JANUARY 11, 2010
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Ed Heath called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Mike Parent moved to the approved the minutes of November 30, 2009. Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Announcements

Roll Call. Senators, alternates and guests are reminded to sign the roll call sheet.

BFW/Faculty Input Regarding Furloughs - Doug Jackson-Smith. The BFW met with the President in December and discussed the issue of faculty playing a stronger role in budgetary decisions at the university, particularly in response to budget crises and the ways in which faculty views might be better represented. The BFW decided to move forward with discussions on furloughs even though it appears that it may not be an issue this year. BFW's process will include informing faculty about: what went into the furlough decisions last year, what other universities are doing, arguments for and against furloughs, and the structure of furloughs and how they are implemented. This document would then be disseminated to faculty as a starting point for discussion. As Faculty Senators you will be asked to become familiar with the information in the document and actively think of ways to get feedback from your colleagues and come back to the Senate prepared to have a discussion about this issue. The BFW will formulate a set of resolutions to structure the discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting. The Faculty Senate is an advisory body and should be prepared to bring forth their opinions and recommendations on this issue.

University Business – Provost Coward -- The President is in Seattle meeting with NWCCU.

Updates on three initiatives: First, the creation of the Caine College of the Arts. Last Friday the Board of Trustees approved this action and it will go to the Board of Regents this Friday. Second, the LAEP faculty was charged with deciding where administratively they would be best housed in the university. Third, the possible creation of a school for vocational and technical education; Gary Straquadine is chairing a committee with representatives from Engineering, Agriculture, and Education and Human Services. Ed Reeves is staffing the committee. They will explore this and make recommendations to the President.

The Provost opened the floor to questions regarding the President's letter about the budget. Question: Is there any more feedback about what legislative leaders are saying about the budget with respect to the university? Answer: There are two parts of the Governor's proposal that we are listening for feedback on. One is the 3% cut this year and whether the figure will go up. What we are currently hearing from legislative leadership is that until the second quarter figures are in and go to the Joint Economic Committee they simply will not know what will happen. The other part is the Governor's recommendation that higher education will be held harmless for the academic year 2010-11 so that the \$13 million cut might be delayed a year until July 1, 2011. The legislative leaders are not in disagreement with what the Governor is trying to achieve, but they don't buy his plan.

Within the next week to ten days there will be a large gift coming to the university. The announcement will be made after the Regents approve it. It will be the largest gift in the history of the university.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee has begun to look at 39 cases for promotion and tenure. Thirty-one are promotions from assistant to associate, 6 from associate to full, and 2 are promotions from lecturer to senior lecturer. The 31 cases from assistant to associate cover various categories, librarian, clinical, etc.

Enrollment, compared to day 1 last spring semester, is up 8%. Main campus has a 3% increase over what it was on day 15 of last year. The Regional Campuses are up 19.3%. Enrollments continue to be robust and strong; modestly on the Logan Campus but much stronger on the Regional Campuses, which is a pattern that we have seen for four consecutive years.

The Regents have approved the merger with CEU; it now must be passed by the Legislature. If approved, the merger will become effective July 1, 2010. CEU will be renamed Utah State University-College of Eastern Utah. This mirrors our Regional Campus names.

Information Items

Administrators Reviews – President Albrecht encourages faculty input on administrator reviews and a review schedule was included in the senator's agenda packet. Department Heads are evaluated every other year, however, interim or new department heads may not follow the schedule. All faculty members are surveyed for feedback on Department Head reviews, and approximately 84% of the faculty surveyed responded. A 360 degree performance evaluation is conducted on the Deans at least every 5 years. They are evaluated by some they report to, by other deans, by some under them, and input is also solicited from faculty. The number of faculty involved in the evaluation of deans is small compared to department heads.

Budget Advisory Committee Report – John Kras & Vince Wickwar. The committee was appointed almost two years ago. John was appointed as the Past President of the Faculty Senate; Vince came on in the third round as the President Elect. The committee is made up of 8 members; 2 faculty, 2 deans, Past President of the Professional Employee Association, and the Provost. The budget reduction process included presentations by the Vice Presidents and Deans which were evaluated on the basis of four criteria: 1) Did the cuts in one unit affect other units, 2) Make sure that the cuts did not have an impact on students, 3) See that the cuts might leave the unit in a position to advance well when the economy recovers, thus cuts were to be strategic, and 4) Each time there was a cut, there was also an investment fund created to strategically give money back to the units involved. The committee participated in 3 of 4 rounds of budget cuts. Question: "How was faculty represented, were they consulted?" John stated that they were not put on the committee to represent anybody; they were put on the committee to share their knowledge and insights on university processes. The deans and vice presidents had their own autonomy in formulating their budgets and there was a lot of variability across the university on how faculty members were involved in the budget reduction decisions. A lot of the confusion resulted from how the role of the Budget Reduction Committee was perceived. In some cases, the issue of faculty inclusion seems to be a department level issue and maybe a dean level issue. Question: Were the deans asked what kind of faculty involvement took place? Answer: There were lots of questions but it was not the committees place to micromanage their decisions. Question: What is the committee's future? Answer: The committee is not a permanent committee, we hope. But the committee is willing to serve additional time to maintain continuity. The President did address the role of the committee in his State of the University address. It was suggested that the role of the committee be communicated again.

Consent Agenda

Steve Burr moved to approved the consent agenda, seconded, motion carried.

Proposal to form Ad Hoc Committee – Code Compliance Committee

The issue of code compliance was discussed at the Faculty Forum and there were reports of instances where the code was not followed. The issue was taken from the forum to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and a proposal to create an ad hoc committee was brought forward to the Faculty

Senate. The Senate subsequently asked that the proposal be refined and now it is presented in its current form. Ed asked for a motion to have a consensus of the Faculty Senate to move the proposal forward. Vince Wickwar made the motion and Maria Cordero seconded the motion. Steve Burr asked if, because of the last sentence, if there needed to be a mechanism for review of the committee over time. Concern was expressed by Scott Cannon that the committee was being given authority to interpret the code. Discussion ensued and members were reminded that issues needed to come forward in such a way as to protect faculty confidentiality. Glen McEvoy said that the cases presented to the committee might bring insights that there are certain parts of the code that are ambiguous enough that rewrites will need come forward to the Senate. It was emphasized that the formation of this committee was to provide faculty with an informal way of dealing with inadvertent code problems so that issues could be resolved short of formal AFT Committee hearings. This process does not take power away from anyone but actually allows for guidance on an informal basis. It was decided that nothing needed to be added to the language of the proposal. In theory this proposal is good, in practice we will just have to see what happens. Doug Jackson-Smith called the question, a vote was taken and the motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Calendar of Meetings and Committee Reports

Executive Committee Meeting Champ Hall, Main 136 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	Senate Meeting Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	Senate Committee Annual Reports	University Council and Committee Reports
August 30, 2010	September 13, 2010		Graduate Council – Byron Burnham
September 20, 2010	October 4, 2010	Educational Policies Committee (EPC) – Larry Smith	Honors Program – Christie Fox Libraries Advisory Council – Ronald Ryel Parking Committee – Lisa Leishman
October 18, 2010 Immediately following FSEC Mtg. - Faculty Forum Planning	December 6, 2010 (This is the next FS meeting after Faculty Forum when reports come to the Senate)	Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) – Greg Podgorski ??	Athletic Council – Ken White
November 1, 2010 - FACULTY FORUM Eccles Conference Center Auditorium Room 216 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.			
November 15, 2010	December 6, 2010		ASUSU – Retention and FYE Report – Noelle Call
December 13, 2010	January 10, 2011		Council on Teacher Education – Francine Johnson Scholarship Advisory Board – Chelise Elwood
January 18, 2011 (Tuesday)	February 7, 2011		Bookstore Report – David Parkinson
February 22, 2011 (Tuesday)	March 14, 2011	Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee (BFW) – Vance Grange ?? Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFT)- Tony Peacock ??	Research Council – Brent Miller
March 21, 2011	April 4, 2011	Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC) – John Engler ??	Honorary Degrees and Awards – Sydney Peterson
April 11, 2011	April 25, 2011	Faculty Diversity, Development, & Equity Committee (FDDE) – Jennifer Duncan Committee on Committees – ??	Calendar Committee – Michelle Larson

Background on Furlough Decisions and Options at Utah State University

The Situation

Quick review of 2008/09: As most faculty and staff at Utah State University recall, growing state budget deficits led to the imposition of mid-fiscal year budget cuts at USU in early 2009. The timing of the announcement of these cuts reduced the options USU administrators had to address the rescission other than imposing mandatory furloughs on all USU employees (equal to 5 days per employee, taken over the spring break week, with pay cuts spread across the remaining months in the fiscal year).

Current Budget Situation: Over the last year, strategic budget cuts, tuition raises, and reductions in faculty and staff positions have enabled USU to meet most of the cuts in state support for the university. One-time federal stimulus funds were also used to cover additional gaps in our current budget. However, revenue projections suggest the state needs additional spending cuts in the current fiscal year to balance the budget. In response, the governor issued an Executive Order in December 2009 to require all state agencies (including state universities) to reduce their current budgets by an additional 3%. In early January, President Albrecht announced a plan to address these additional cuts without resorting to additional furloughs of faculty or staff. While the Utah legislature could still impose additional cuts in the current fiscal year (above and beyond the 3% imposed by the governor), President Albrecht has indicated a desire to address any new cuts without using furloughs.

Future Budget Situation: Looking toward the next fiscal year (2010/11), the loss of one-time federal stimulus funds requires USU to plan for an additional \$13 million shortfall. In the fall of 2009, President Albrecht outlined a plan that would use a combination of Tier II tuition increases, additional budget cuts, and furloughs to balance the budget in 2010/11. Meanwhile, the Utah Governor's formal budget proposal uses other state resources to replace the lost stimulus funds, which could make new cuts and furloughs at USU unnecessary in 2010/11. However, legislative leaders have signaled a reluctance to follow the governor's recommendations, and there is a chance that USU will need to address the \$13 million shortfall – and perhaps additional cuts – in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010.

Summary: The current (January 2010) and future budget situation is very fluid – and won't be clarified until the Utah legislature completes its work in the current session. Under the best case scenarios, faculty and staff furloughs may be unnecessary. Under the most pessimistic scenarios, furloughs may need to be imposed to meet budget shortfalls in the current or next (2010/11) fiscal years.

Opportunity for Input: While every effort is being made to avoid furloughs, USU faculty and staff are being invited to provide feedback to the President regarding principles that could be used to guide the design of a furlough program (if it were to become necessary). This document is designed to provide background for discussions about the pros and cons of different types of furlough program options.

Issues to Consider when Implementing a Furlough Program

Why Furloughs? USU has used a wide range of approaches to address budget shortfalls in recent years (e.g., the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program, not filling open positions, reduced operating budgets, employee terminations, new revenue sources, and elimination of programming). Furloughs have been considered only when other approaches have already been utilized or are unable to meet budget requirements, or when budget rescissions are imposed in the middle of a fiscal year. Furloughs provide 'one-time' resources to respond to budget cuts, require employees to take one or more days of unpaid leave from their work, and are experienced as a one-time pay cut by furloughed employees. Compared to additional layoffs or permanent cuts in compensation packages, furloughs serve as a temporary means of belt-tightening that share the pain of cuts across many employees and avoid the loss of personnel required to maintain the work of the university. They also lessen impacts on contributions to employee benefit programs and long-run compensation trajectories.

Options for Implementing Furloughs. Furloughs can be applied in many ways. A key issue is deciding which employees are furloughed and how the burden of furloughs is shared across different types of employees. Another issue relates to the balance of fixed/scheduled vs. flexible furlough days.

Who gets furloughed?

- **Equal Length Furloughs:** The simplest type of furlough is to require all employees take a set number of days of unpaid leave (a ‘flat’ furlough). This generates differential percentage cut in the salaries of all employees based on the specifics of their appointment (e.g., 9 month employees have a higher percent cut than 12 month employees). Utah State used a equal length furlough approach last year.
- **Equal Percent Furloughs:** A similar approach is to impose furloughs of different lengths such that each employee receives a similar percent cut in their annual pay. Under this approach, full-time employees with 12-month appointments might see more days of furloughs than part-time or academic-year employees. Furlough burdens may be pro-rated depending on appointment level.
- **Tiered Furloughs:** Some institutions have adopted ‘tiered’ furloughs in which the number of furlough days or the percent pay cut taken by employees differs by salary or income category or by type of employee.
 - **Income-Tier Furloughs:** The most common tiered approach is to require higher paid employees to take more days of furlough. An argument in favor of this approach is that lower paid employees have less discretionary income and are more severely impacted by the loss of a similar percent of their income. An argument against tiered approaches is that it is unfair to higher paid employees, who already lose more actual income under equal length or equal percent furloughs.
 - **Funding Source-Based Furloughs:** Another approach to furloughs is to apply furlough requirements only to the state-funded portion of USU employee salaries. At USU, this might allow research personnel whose salaries are partially or completely funded through externally funded grants, as well as employees who are compensated in part by local governments through extension appointments to be less affected by furloughs.
 - **Targeted Furloughs:** Other tiered approaches require certain categories of employees – e.g., university administrators – to absorb a higher proportion of the furlough days (to reduce the burden on faculty and staff). Alternatively, some types of essential employees might be excluded from furloughs because their work is vital to the health, safety, or security of the institution and its clients.

When do furloughs take place?

- **Fixed or Scheduled Furlough Days.** Many university furlough programs require employees to use their furlough days on specific dates – usually chosen to minimize conflicts with core university activities (like classroom teaching). Last year, all USU employees were required to take their furloughs over the 5 working days of the campus spring break week.
- **Flexible Furlough Days.** Some institutions allow employees to select all or some of the dates when they wish to take their furlough days. Usually requests for flexible furlough dates require approval of supervisors and may be restricted to no more than one day per month. University faculty are often not allowed to use flexible furlough days to reduce instructional activities because this may conflict with institutional policies or accreditation requirements.

What are our Peer Universities Doing?

USU was relatively unusual among U.S. universities in utilizing furloughs to address budget cuts in 2008/09 (in part because we experienced deeper cuts last year than many other state university systems). However, furlough programs are increasingly common strategies to address fiscal shortfalls among universities throughout the United States.

Important background is found in a recent **Survey of Public Universities** conducted by the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities and summarized in a November 2009 report (<http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=1998>).

Their key findings include:

- 85% of institutions experienced a drop in state appropriations in FY 2009/10; with a majority experiencing cuts in state support of 10% or more. More than one-half of institutions expect more cuts in coming 18 months.
- Most institutions report that cuts are harming their ability to hire and retain faculty and staff, sustain student support services, and maintain infrastructure.
- More than 90% of public universities increased tuition in 2009/10 (the average tuition increase was 9.3%, though most institutions increased between 3-6%). Tuition increases typically were insufficient to offset cuts in state funding.
- Short-term adaptive strategies include:
 - 80% of institutions report reductions in staff positions, and half have used layoffs (mostly of staff, but not faculty).
 - 55% limited or froze out-of-state travel funds
 - **20% implemented mandatory faculty and staff furloughs in 2009/10.** (Note that 40% of universities whose budget cuts exceeded 10% used furloughs).
- Long-term adaptive strategies include:
 - 56-78%: Strategic review of programs, energy efficiency investments, increased enrollment goals
 - 40%: permanent changes in support or professional staff positions
 - 22%: permanent changes in tenured/tenure track faculty positions
 - 10%: decrease enrollment in high cost undergraduate and graduate programs

Examples of Furlough Programs in Other Universities

- **Oregon State University** – The OSU President received support from Faculty Senate to implement between 3-12 days of furloughs on all faculty, depending on salaries and length of contracts, with exceptions for grant-funded portions of salaries. The one-page proposal, as a motion, indicated OSU faculty support for a temporary pay reduction that adhered to the following principles: For all faculty, grant-supported salary is exempt, salary savings retained by university would be used to preserve faculty positions, tiered reductions based on salary, pay reductions are distributed evenly in monthly paychecks over. Exempts non-state portion of salaries, people making below \$1670 per month. See: <http://oregonstate.edu/senate/Budget/FAQ.pdf> and <http://harmony.scf.oregonstate.edu/blogs/aaup-osu/files/2009/11/Motions.pdf> for details.
- **Arizona State University** – The ASU President implemented mandatory unpaid furloughs on all employees. The length of furloughs varied by type of employee – administrators (15 days); classified staff (10 days); all other employees (12 days) prorated for full- versus part-time and academic- vs. calendar year employees. The result is a cut equal to 8-12 % of annual pay. Employees identify specific furlough dates subject to approval of supervisors.
- **University of California** – Regents approved this plan in July 2009. Under the plan, UC faculty and staff will be required to take from 11 to 26 furlough days -- amounting to a salary reduction of 4 to 10 percent -- with higher earners being forced to take more furlough days and steeper pay cuts. The specific number of furlough days each employee will take is based on a sliding scale across seven pay bands, ranging from those who make under \$40,000 to those who earn more than \$240,000. Campuses and other UC locations have flexibility in determining how furlough days are scheduled for full-time and part-time UC staff and faculty. UCLA has used a mix of fixed and flexible furlough days, leaving colleges and units to determine how to implement the flexible furlough day options. Faculty feedback on furlough options at the UCLA campus is discussed in more detail in the newspaper article reproduced below.
- **California State University** – unionized faculty approved 2 furlough days per month (a 10% pay cut) in the coming academic year to address a major budget deficit in the CSU system.
- **University of Wisconsin** – The governor imposed a mandatory furlough on all state employees (including university faculty and staff) equal to 16 days across a 2-year period for full-time employees (a 3.1% pay cut). In each year, all full-time employees are required to take 4 scheduled days (usually around holidays) on and then identify 4 additional ‘floating’ days for their furloughs. Fixed furlough days are implemented in ways that do not conflict with UW system guidelines and accreditation requirements. Employees with less-than annual full-time appointments receive prorated furloughs. Student employees are exempt from furloughs.
- **University of Illinois** – Mandatory 4 day furlough imposed for all faculty and staff in current fiscal year; administrators taking 10 days. Exempts employees earning less than \$30,000. Instructors will not be allowed to take days off when they're scheduled to teach to avoid impacts on students.

“Majority of UCLA faculty, staff prefer furlough option.”

UCLAToday, Cynthia Lee & Alison Hewitt (July 7, 2009)

Found at <http://www.today.ucla.edu/portal/ut/majority-of-ucla-faculty-staff-95383.aspx>.

Of the three proposed options for an 8 percent reduction in compensation, UCLA faculty and staff who sent in their comments to the UCLA Academic Senate and Campus Human Resources showed a strong preference for a furlough over salary cuts or a blend of salary cuts and furloughs.

More than 80 percent of the 191 faculty who responded individually and almost all of the Faculty Executive Committees (FEC) in the schools and College of Letters and Science favored furloughs for a number of reasons, said UCLA Academic Senate Chair Michael S. Goldstein. Among the most common of these was that a furlough sends the message that the university cannot continue to do the same amount of work for less money, and that the quantity and quality of work will suffer without appropriate funding.

A furlough would also establish a clear means of ending the salary reduction once the funding situation improves, Goldstein pointed out in a July 6, 2009, letter to Mary Croughan, chair of the UC-wide Academic Council, summarizing the UCLA faculty's position on many issues. Many faculty members also aired their concerns at a Town Hall meeting held last month by the Senate and attended by more than 110 people.

"Many faculty members expressed a strong desire to stand in solidarity with the vast majority of staff at UCLA who have expressed a preference for a furlough over a simple salary reduction," Goldstein said. Faculty also asked that furloughs be structured in a way that would allow faculty and staff to return to full-time status if they can find funding from non-State General Fund sources to cover the difference.

On the staff side, , most of the 2,500-plus staff who sent in responses to Campus Human Resources strongly favored furloughs, although about 10 percent — mostly medical center staff — preferred salary cuts. About 15 percent supported the combination approach.

Both faculty and staff questioned the wisdom of reducing the earnings of those making \$46,000 and above by 8 percent, and those earning less by 4 percent. Many staff found the \$46,000 cut-off arbitrary and called for a broader sliding scale. Faculty pointed out that if such cuts were implemented, an employee making \$46,000 prior to the cuts would be making less than an employee making \$45,900 before the cuts. However, more than 90 percent of the faculty members who e-mailed in responses and many staff favored some kind of graduated system of cuts, given the vulnerability of junior faculty and staff and the high cost of living in Los Angeles. Opinion among the FECs was divided on this issue.

The majority of faculty — as well as many staff members — also preferred to spare faculty and staff whose salaries are drawn from research grants from cuts. Since these individuals do not draw salaries from state funds, Goldstein noted, "cutting them would do nothing to ameliorate the budget shortfall. Extending the burden of salary reductions to them seems pointless."

In fact, such a move could prove costly to the university and the state, many faculty members pointed out. Federal granting agencies may insist that unspent funds in a grant award be returned. "In addition to the loss of awarded grant funds, the University will suffer a loss of indirect cost recovery for funds returned to the government," the Senate chair explained. The state would also suffer reduced income tax revenue when salaries are reduced.

Faculty as well as staff also felt strongly about a number of other concerns:

- Regardless of what option the regents choose, steps should be taken to protect benefits, including health and retirement benefits.
- Due to the educational nature of postdoctoral programs, postdocs should be exempt from cuts, irrespective of the source of their funding.
- The UC Office of the President should give campuses more autonomy in responding to these cuts because the 10 UC campuses face different circumstances and constraints.

On Friday, July 10, UC President Mark G. Yudof is expected to outline a package of proposed fiscal measures, including the salary reduction option he is recommending, that he will present to the Board of Regents at the July 14-16 meeting for approval.

"Although we cannot predict what the president's recommendations to the regents will be, we have every reason to believe that the advice from employees throughout the university is receiving careful consideration," said Associate Vice Chancellor Lubbe Levin of Campus Human Resources, who commended faculty and staff for coming up with many creative ideas to make the proposed options more equitable.

"While many personal hardships were described, employees also indicated their understanding of the economic circumstances that required sacrifice to maintain the excellence of UCLA," Levin said. "They understood that other choices — such as large-scale layoffs — were even less desirable."

Goldstein warned that UC must find a way to cushion the blows for what may lie ahead — an 8 percent reduction in compensation, a possible increase in the cost of healthcare benefits and rapid escalation in contributions to the retirement system.

If UC cannot ease the impact on faculty and staff, "the quality of the entire University, no less its basic ability to function, is at dire risk," he noted.

Bookstore Committee Report

Introduction:

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, First Meeting Fall 2009

Betty Rozum, Chair, Faculty Senate Representative

Mark Riffe, Faculty Senate Representative

Kevin Johnson, CEA representative

Tyler Haws, ASUSU Student Advocate

Rick Kelly, Graduate Studies Vice-President

Ben Croshaw, Academic Senate President

Todd Redmon, ASUSU Science Senator

Matt Lovell, PEA Representative

David Parkinson, Ex-Officio, Director of Bookstore

Outline of Meeting Facts and Discussions:

The Committee met on November 4, 2009. All members were present, and the meeting notes are attached. The committee charge was reviewed, followed by an overview of major changes occurring in the bookstore over the past year. Significant changes included the new computer system that has been implemented, and preparing to meet the new requirements outlined by the Higher Education Opportunity Act (H.R. 4137). The committee had several questions, which were addressed by David. See attached meeting notes for details.

Issues:

The composition of the committee has been in flux. In the fall, there was a miscommunication regarding the chair of the committee. Betty Rozum has acted as chair, and Victoria Grieve had been approached to chair. It was decided that Betty would continue this year, with Victoria taking over in the fall of 2010. Victoria will be invited to the spring meeting in order to acquaint her with the work of the committee.

Recommendations or actions needed before work can continue:

None at this time.

Supporting Materials:

Meeting notes are attached.

Attachment: Meeting notes

Bookstore Committee

Meeting Notes

November 4, 2009

1. Purpose of committee:

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 two faculty members.

The committee also includes one representative from PEA, one representative from CEA and two representatives from ASUSU. The director of the Bookstore serves in an ex-officio capacity.

2. Current membership:

Committee Membership, as of Fall 2009

Betty Rozum, Chair, Faculty Senate Representative, Associate Dean, Library
(betty.rozum@usu.edu; 7-2632)

Mark Riffe, Faculty Senate Representative, Associate Professor, Physics Dept.
(riffe@cc.usu.edu; 7-3896), in spring Victoria Grieve, Faculty Senate Representative,
Assistant Professor, History Dept., (Victoria.Grieve@usu.edu; 7-0145)

Kevin Johnson, CEA Representative (kevin.johnson@usu.edu)

Matt Lovell, PEA Representative; Budget Office, Communicative Disorders and Deaf
Education (matt.lovell@usu.edu; 7-2623)

David Parkinson, Ex-Officio, Director of Bookstore (david.parkinson@usu.edu; 7-1667)

Tyler Haws, ASUSU Student Advocate VP (hawzie@gmail.com)

Todd Redmon, ASUSU Science Senator (t.r@aggiemail.usu.edu)

Rick Kelly, Graduate Studies VP (Richard.kelly@aggiemail.usu.edu)

Ben Croshaw, ASUSU Academic Senate President (b.crosh@aggiemail.usu.edu)

3. News and updates from the Bookstore (David Parkinson)

- a. New Computer System. The Bookstore has been working for over 1½ years to implement a new computer system for the bookstore. The process involved submitting an RFP, visiting sites with the system in place to evaluate it in the “real world”, installing and converting over 17,000 SKU’s. The new system was installed in September and has several enhancements. The old system worked on Windows 98, and lacked the security to properly handle credit cards. The new system allows more flexibility and capabilities for customer relationship management, similar to the customer loyalty cards at stores like Smith’s grocery store, that will

allow the bookstore to notify students of the buy back prices of books they previously purchased. It will also allow website integration that will facilitate purchasing books for students.

- b. Higher Education Opportunity Act H.R. 4137. This new federal law requires colleges to inform students at the time they register for a class of all costs associated with the course, including the cost of the textbook. This means faculty will have to select their books earlier. The Registrar's office has been leading the effort to implement this at USU. Students will be able to purchase their books from the bookstore, or elsewhere. They will know the bookstore price up front (at the time of registering). This will give students more opportunity to comparison shop. So far, faculty have not complained about the earlier textbook adoption dates.
- c. The bookstore is attempting a new pricing model, partly in response to this new legislation. In the past, university bookstores were the only businesses that could readily supply textbooks – other entities were not familiar with the process. They employed a pricing model that has been in place for a very long time – price plus a fixed mark up for new, and for buyback, they offered 50% of the cost of a new book. The new model will affect the price of the buyback, and will also help the bookstore be more competitive.
- d. The four regional campus stores showed increased sales. Industry wide, university bookstore sales are down. The increased sales at the regional campus sites are probably due to the explosion of enrollment growth there.
- e. The Bookstore will be closed Friday and Saturday (Nov. 13 and 14) for physical inventory.

4. Questions, issues, concerns, from committee members

- a. The ASUSU Academic Senate selects the book of the semester. Does the committee have suggestions for books that deal with higher education issues that would be good candidates? Betty said she would check with library staff and report back. *Some suggested titles:*
 - i. *The Closing of the American Mind*. In Merrill-Cazier Library under call number **E 169.1 .B653 1988**. Description from Amazon at <http://www.amazon.com/Closing-American-Mind-Allan-Bloom/dp/0671657151>
 - ii. *Why School?* By Mike Rose. Not yet available in the library; description from Amazon at http://www.amazon.com/Why-School-Mike-Rose/dp/1595584676/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1257471593&sr=1-1
 - iii. *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More* by Derek Bok. Not yet available in library; description from Amazon at <http://www.amazon.com/Our-Underachieving-Colleges-Students->

[Learning/dp/0691136181/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1257463115&sr=8-1](http://www.amazon.com/dp/0691136181/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1257463115&sr=8-1)

- iv. *My Freshman Year: What a Professor Learned by Becoming a Student* by Rebeka Nathan. In Merrill-Cazier Library under call number LB 3605 .N34 2005; description from Amazon at <http://www.amazon.com/My-Freshman-Year-Professor-Becoming/dp/0801443970>

- b. Do students prefer hard copy or e-books for textbooks? What impact does e-format have on pricing? Ten years ago we started seeing books on CD and other interactive electronic versions. Print remained the preferred format. Now we are seeing more options coming available, but students report they still prefer the print. The student representatives on the committee cited the ability to annotate and highlight the text, plus better portability (as opposed to carrying around your laptop). David indicated that industry surveys back this up. E-textbooks cost about half what a print textbook costs, but there is no option for buyback (so the cost ends up about the same for students who sell back their books). Some publishers are offering the option of purchasing both print and electronic together, but for more money. The profit margin for the bookstore is very slim for e-books.
- c. Other than book sales, how is business at the bookstore? David reported that the bookstore is doing okay in technology sales, even though this is the first year sales are down. Industry wide, the economy has hurt technology sales. The bookstore has a fairly robust relationship with Apple to sell their products. Apple is easy to work with, providing educational discounts and a set, but thin, profit margin. The bookstore had tried working with Dell to offer PC's, but Dell was extremely difficult to work with due to inconsistent pricing. They are now offering three models of HP computers. HP offers more stable pricing. The bookstore is also offering Samsung netbooks. The bookstore will only offer technology products that are sound with good reputations.
- d. What is the impact of theft at the USU Bookstore? The bookstore has a limited number of security cameras (more would be nice, but they are limited by the amount of funds they have available). David would prefer better security so students would not be required to leave their backpacks outside. He feels this sends the wrong message, but doesn't have another solution at this point. The industry average for "shrink" or loss due to theft is 2%. USU is below this, at about 1%, but David would like to see this even less.
- e. How can the committee help the Bookstore? David said the biggest help would be with customer service relations management. He is working to develop better contacts with students – possibly by capturing email addresses from the students. He would like to be able to capture the student's A number as well, since this would allow him to send targeted emails to students, notifying them that the book they used this semester

could be sold back to the bookstore and the price they would get for the book.

- f. What does the Bookstore do with profits? The Bookstore is a self-supporting enterprise. Any profits go into a R&R (retained earnings) account and are used for capital purchases, facility maintenance, etc.
5. Next meeting: We will schedule the next meeting for some time in March.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee January 19, 2010

The Educational Policies Committee met on January 14, 2010. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the January 14th 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 meeting of January 14 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 28 requests for course actions
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee December 2009 meeting. Of note:
 - The Academic standards subcommittee approved the following language changes for the General Catalog concerning second bachelor's degrees.

Current Language:

Second Bachelor's Degree

Applicants for a second bachelor's degree must file an application with the Admissions Office and obtain the recommendation of their academic dean prior to being admitted. A second bachelor's degree is available only to those on whom a first bachelor's degree has been conferred by a regionally-accredited institution. Students must complete a minimum of 30 USU credits beyond those applied toward the first bachelor's degree, 18 of which must be earned in department approved upper-division courses related to the major. USU credits may be earned in courses completed at USU's Logan campus or at designated centers, or through classes offered by Regional Campuses and Distance Education through USU. Candidates for a second bachelor's degree must have met the American Institutions requirement in the first bachelor's degree, or complete the requirement before receiving the second bachelor's degree.

Note: *The first bachelor's degree must have been awarded by a regionally-accredited college or university.*

Revised Language (Changes to existing language underlined.):

Second Bachelor's Degree

Applicants for a second bachelor's degree must file an application with the Admissions Office and obtain the recommendation of their academic dean prior to being admitted. A second bachelor's degree is available only to those on whom a first bachelor's degree has been conferred by a regionally-accredited institution. Students must complete a minimum of 30 USU credits beyond those applied toward the first bachelor's degree, 18 of which must be earned in department-approved upper-division courses related to the major. USU credits may be earned in courses completed at USU's Logan campus or at designated centers, or through classes offered by Regional Campuses and Distance Education through USU.

Students may apply for a second bachelor's degree only if the major is different from the major in the first bachelor's degree. Candidates for a second bachelor's degree must have met the American Institutions requirement in the first bachelor's degree, or complete the requirement before receiving the second bachelor's degree.

Note: *The first bachelor's degree must have been awarded by a regionally-accredited college or university.*

3. There was no December meeting of the General Education Subcommittee.

PRPC Report for Faculty Senate, 19 January 2010

Summary

1. Section 401.5 becomes Section 401.4 because of the removal of an earlier section.
2. Minor grammatical, punctuation, and capitalization changes.
3. 4.2(3) PRPC is not aware of any change that faculty appointed to the Research Ranks are classified as term faculty.
4. 4.3(4) PRPC raises the following question: Why are Federal Cooperator ranks the only term faculty exempt from limitations listed here?
5. 5.2(1) PRPC feels strongly that language should be kept limiting adjunct faculty appointment to 50% in order to deter the replacement of benefits-eligible faculty with adjuncts.
6. The term “resident faculty” continues to be replaced with “faculty” to include faculty from both the main campus and branch campuses.

401.54 THE FACULTY WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS

54.1 Description and Appointment Requirements

The faculty with term appointments consists of individuals appointed to perform specialized academic duties who make substantial and regular contributions to a University academic unit, but do not have the permanence of appointment of tenured and/or the prospect of permanence of appointment of tenure eligible faculty.

~~These appointments must be commensurate with the specialized duties to be performed. Proposed term appointments must be considered by committees using appropriate standards and procedures which apply to an appointment to a tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty position.~~

Term appointments are for one academic or fiscal year in duration and are automatically renewed based on funding and performance, unless the faculty members holding such appointments are given notice of nonrenewal (policy 404.1.2(4)). The faculty member who holds a term appointment has no claim to a de facto permanent appointment based on length of service. Appointments for less than one academic or calendar year's duration are made to the temporary ranks (policy 401.6.2(3)). For those faculty whose appointments depend on extramural funds, the appointment is dependent upon the availability of those funds. Term appointments are established only in an academic unit.

~~In other units, term appointments are not made.~~

54.2 Academic Ranks

The academic ranks for the faculty with term appointments follow.

(1) Lecturer ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members whose function it is to teach remedial, beginning, or, on occasion, intermediate university courses, are appointed to one of the following titles: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer. ~~Appointments to lecturer positions are made only in academic units.~~

(2) Clinical ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members whose primary function is the supervision of students in clinical practicum, residency, and intern programs are appointed to one of the following ranks: Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor. Clinical appointments are made through academic units.

(3) Research ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members whose primary function is research and whose source of funding is extramural are appointed to one of the following ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. ~~Appointments to research ranks are made only in academic departments.~~

Comment [JE1]: A question was raised about whether these faculty have become tenure-eligible. PRPC members are not aware of any change.

(4) Federal ~~C~~ooperator (FC) ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members who are federal employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal government, whose primary function at the university is equivalent to core faculty, and who serve as faculty under cooperative agreements between the University and the federal government (e.g., U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service) are appointed to one of the following ranks: Instructor (FC), Assistant Professor (FC), Associate Professor (FC), or Professor (FC).

Appointments to federal cooperator ranks are made only in academic units where such cooperative agreements exist.

(5) Federal ~~R~~esearch (FR) ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members who are federal employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal government, whose primary function at the University is research, and who serve as faculty under agreements between the University and the federal government (e.g., U. S. Department of Agriculture) are appointed to one of the following ranks: Assistant Professor (FR), Associate Professor (FR), or Professor (FR). Appointments to federal research ranks are made only in academic units where such agreements exist.

(6) Edith Bowen ~~T~~eachers.

Faculty members who hold certification or licensure required by public schools and

whose primary function is teaching preschool, elementary school, or developmentally disabled students at Edith Bowen Elementary School; are appointed to one of the following titles: Teacher, Mentor Teacher, or Master Teacher. Appointments to teacher ranks are made only by the College of Education and Human Services.

45.3 Limitations on Positions: Faculty with Term Appointments

(1) No ~~T~~enure

Faculty with term appointments are not eligible to enter the process that leads to the granting of tenure, unless the faculty member's status is changed.

(2) Changes in ~~S~~tatus.

All changes in status from term--appointment faculty to faculty with tenure or tenure-eligibility require a national search.

(3) Leave.

Faculty with term appointments are not eligible for sabbatical leave, but ~~under appropriate conditions~~ may be granted professional leave under appropriate conditions, as determined by the appropriate administrator.

(4) Limitations on ~~F~~aculty ~~P~~articipation.

Faculty with term appointments are eligible to be elected to and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate. The participation in faculty affairs of faculty members holding lecturer, clinical, research, federal research, or teacher positions is subject to the following limitations: (a) they may participate in the processes of setting policy within their academic units only to the extent determined by their appointing departments, colleges, or other academic units; (b) they may serve as members of appointed faculty committees and may vote on all matters except those relating to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion of tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty; and (c) they may not be counted among the number of tenured and tenure-eligible ~~resident~~ faculty members for purposes of apportioning Faculty Senate members. Federal ~~C~~ooperator ranks are exempt from the foregoing limitations on faculty participation with the following exceptions: they may not serve on committees or vote on matters relating to retention or tenure of tenure-eligible faculty.

Comment [JE2]: A question was raised whether these committees need to be specified. PRPC believes the existing language is sufficient.

Comment [JE3]: PRPC poses the question to FS as to why FC are the only term faculty exempt from the foregoing limitations?

401.56 FACULTY WITH SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS

56.1 Description and Appointment Requirements

The faculty with special appointments consists of those individuals whose appointments confer a limited association with the University. Such appointments are made to establish

an association with professional peers for temporary or part-time service.

Faculty members with special appointments must possess qualifications and experience commensurate with those required for tenured and/or tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty. Proposed special appointments must be considered by appropriate departmental procedures. Periodic reviews of the performance of faculty members with special appointments may be conducted. Faculty with special appointments are not eligible for tenure.

56.2 Academic Ranks

The academic ranks for the faculty with special appointments follow.

(1) Adjunct ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members whose association with an academic department is secondary to an appointment within a different department, institution, organization, or other personal and professional interests are appointed to one of the following ranks: Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are made for less than 50 percent time only.

Comment [JE4]: A questions was raised about whether this statement should be removed. PRPC feels strongly that it should be kept to deter replacing benefits-eligible faculty with adjunct faculty.

(2) Visiting ~~R~~anks.

Faculty members from other academic institutions who are participants in a university exchange program or who are employed to teach one or more ~~quarters~~ semesters for an academic department while on leave from another academic institution are appointed to one of the following ranks: Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor.

(3) Temporary ranks.

The term temporary may precede all tenure-eligible academic ranks. In extraordinary circumstances, academic units may be forced to fill faculty appointments on a temporary basis. The temporary nature and the length of the term of such a position must be clearly specified in advance. The term cannot exceed one academic year and is renewable up to an additional two years. An exception may be made for long-term international assignment. Temporary appointments shall not be used as long-term strategies for accomplishing the duties of academic departments or academic units.

Comment [JE5]: A question was raised about whether who specifies "extraordinary circumstances" should be specified. PRPC believes the existing language is sufficient.

56.3 Limitations on Positions: Faculty with Special Appointments

(1) No tenure eligibility.

Faculty with special appointments are ineligible for tenure.

(2) Limitations on faculty participation.

The participation of faculty members holding adjunct, temporary, or visiting positions is subject to the following limitations: (a) they may participate in the processes of setting policy within their departments only to the extent determined by their appointing departments; (b) they may serve as voting members of appointed faculty committees except those relating to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion of tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty and faculty with term appointments; (c) they may not be counted among the number of ~~resident~~ faculty members for the purposes of apportioning the Faculty Senate members; and (d) they are ineligible to be elected to and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate.