



Thursday, 15 January 2015
2 pm, MA211K

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AGENDA SETTING MEETING MINUTES**

PRESENT: Eric Amsel, Alicia Giralt, Kirk Hagen, Ed Hahn, Kathleen Herndon, Carol Naylor, Craig Oberg, Carrie Ota, Shane Schvaneveldt, and Brenda Stockberger

Excused: Chuck Wight and Mike Vaughan

Guests: Sally Cantwell, Leigh Shaw, Stephen Francis, and Andrea Grover for Vern Morgan.

1. Approval of the minutes from 20 November 2014 meeting.

MOTION Approval of the minutes from 20 November 2014 meeting by Kathy Herndon.

SECOND Ed Hahn

OUTCOME Unanimous

Action Items

2. University Curriculum Committee – Sally Cantwell, Chair
Substantive Curriculum approved at University Curriculum Meeting 3 Dec 2014

EDUCATION

Health and Human Performance

Athletic Training Program- Jenn Ostrowski

Syllabi included

Program Proposal Change - Athletic Training, BS

Course Proposal Change - AT1500 Introduction to Athletic Training, Change in Credit hours

Course Proposal Change - AT4500 Clinical Application of Athletic Training, Change in Credit hours

Course Proposal Change - AT4501 Clinical Application of Athletic Training 4, Change in Credit hours

New Course Proposal - AT4750 Evidence-Based Evaluation & Treatment of the Sacroiliac Joint and Spine

Athletic Therapy Program - Valerie Herzog

Program Proposal Change - Athletic Therapy BS

New Course Proposal - AT4150 Therapeutic Modalities for Athletic Therapy Majors with Syllabus

New Course Proposal - AT4250 Rehabilitation for Athletic Therapy Majors with Syllabus

New Course Proposal - AT4650 Management for Athletic Therapy Majors with Syllabus

Special Education - David Byrd

Program Proposal Change - Special Education BS

All course proposal include a syllabus on each course.

New Course Proposal - EDUC3545 Elementary English Arts: Evaluation, Remediation and Supports

New Course Proposal - EDUC3565 Elementary English Language Arts: Evaluation, Remediation and Supports

New Course Proposal - EDUC3575 Elementary Mathematics: Evaluation, Remediation and Supports

New Course Proposal - EDUC4545 Individualized Behavioral Strategies using Applied Behavior Analysis

New Course Proposal - EDUC4565 Secondary English Language Arts: Evaluation, Remediation and Supports

New Course Proposal - EDUC4575 Secondary Mathematics: Evaluation, Remediation and Supports

New Course Proposal - EDUC4582 Special Education Level III Practicum

Child and Family Studies - Wei Qiu

Course Proposal Change - CHF4990A Seminar in Child Development, with Syllabus

SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Women & Gender Studies and Political Science - Stephanie Wolfe

New Course Proposal POLS2500 and WGS2500 Human Rights in the World with Syllabus

New General Education for Social Sciences POLS2500 and WGS2500

New General Education for Diversity POLS2500 and WGS2500

ARTS & HUMANITIES

Communication - Ryan Cheek

New Course Proposal - COMM1270 Analysis of Argument, Syllabus and Support letters

HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Health Sciences - Kraig Chugg

Program Change Proposal - AS in Health Sciences

Course Proposal Deletion - HTHS1115 Biomedical Principles for Certificate of Completion for Paramedics

Nursing - Sally Cantwell

Program Change Proposal - Associate of Science in Nursing

Course Proposal Change - NRSG Patient Centered Nursing Care 2, Deletion from Program.

SCIENCE

Microbiology - Karen Nakaoka

Program Change Proposal - Microbiology Major

MOTION Motion to move the Curriculum as listed to Faculty Senate by Ed Hahn.

SECOND Carol Naylor

OUTCOME Unanimous

DISCUSSION

Comm1270 Analysis of Argument – There was a concern on the letter of support from Philosophy department. Philosophy didn't clearly state that they supported this class without reservation. They didn't get any feedback from their communication with the Communication's department. They didn't know that it was going forward to Curriculum committee. Other faculty in Philosophy were not notified about this course. If there is concern, it will be brought up in Senate. This could be resolved before senate if all parties agree and do not object to the course. Why does Communications need the course? It fulfills a need for argument development skills, will help Weber students with Debate skills, and help students that transfer from other USHE institutions. There may be some objection to the course at Senate. It will go forward. Communication will be asked to follow up with Philosophy to make sure they do not have any objections. Eric will communicate with the parties prior to the senate.

UPDATE ON CURRICULOG SOFTWARE – Sally Cantwell

Curriculog is the program that we have been looking into to automate the Curriculum process in submitting and approving courses across the university. It can be customized to accommodate required signoffs by department/college/curriculum/senate entities. Any faculty can create a course or program proposal and the program can pull in catalog requirements specifically for each program. This will be more accurate and streamline the time that it takes from creation to approval. This will be paid for by the

Provost and hopefully be implemented here at Weber by this spring/summer. The goal is to have it ready by this fall for faculty to begin using for curriculum.

Changes to Curriculum PPM goes through Curriculum Committee. Two changes are coming up from the General Education Committee. They will be proposing a new category of Gen Ed classes which cover two different Breadth areas. The course would be a three credit course but it would full fil six credits. This should come to Curriculum Committee in the next month or so. This would need to go into the Curriculum PPM (CPPM). Concern on the signoffs for Dev Math, Dev Eng and Leap courses. This needs to go into the CPPM as well.

Sally Cantwell to introduce this at Senate as an information item. When will the departments utilize it? We hope to start using this program would be this fall. Sally Cantwell has agreed to be Chair of the Curriculum Committee next year, it oversee the implementation of Curriculog.

3. APAFT Committee, Stephen Francis, Chair

APAFT 2014-15 Charges:

4. PPM 8-26 Advance Notice of Termination or Reduction in Status
Review and revise PPM8-26 to address situations in which a faculty member receives a conditional termination. Does "advance notice" as written in the policy cover cases in which the notice includes a condition, e.g. "unless there is substantial improvement in your Service to the University as detailed in your recent mid-tenure review, your appointment will be discontinued twelve months from the date of this notice." If necessary, investigate the legal interpretations of this policy with University Counsel.

POLICY PPM 8-26 Advance Notice of Termination or Reduction in Status

Except for the exceptions noted below and for termination or reduction in status for cause as defined in Board of Regents R481 section 3.6, any regular full-time, non-tenured faculty member whose annual appointment the University wishes not to continue, or wishes to continue with substantially reduced status, shall be given advance notice in writing of such intent by the provost as follows: (1) When given during the first academic year or during a one-year appointment, such notice shall be given not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of the year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination. (2) When given during the second academic year or during a two-year appointment, such notice shall be given not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination. (3) When given after two or more years, such notice shall be given at least twelve months in advance of the termination or reduction in status, but terminations or reductions in status during the regular academic year are to be avoided if possible.

A Dean may give written notice to a tenure track faculty member during a scheduled tenure review evaluation specifying that if the faculty member does not meet certain conditions within a specified period of time, the faculty member will be terminated on a specified date, consistent with the dates in the notification period stated in the preceding paragraph. ~~stated above.~~ If such notice is given, the faculty member must choose one of the following options:

- 1) Accept the conditions given in the notice. If the conditions are met as required, the faculty member will no longer be subject to that notice.
- 2) Reject the conditions outlined in the notice, in which case the faculty member will not be reviewed for tenure in the next academic year and will be terminated on the specified date.
- 3) Appeal the basis for the conditions through the process outlined in PPMs 9-11 through 9-12. The decision of the faculty member must be in writing and given to the Dean within 10 business days of the notification of the conditional notice. If the faculty member does not give the decision within 10

business days, option 1) will be the default. Notwithstanding any language herein, faculty members may be terminated for cause or other reason, as outlined in the Policies and Procedures manual.

In absence of written agreement to the contrary, the right of advance notice shall not apply to (1) a faculty member whose contract states specifically that it is a one-year appointment only or some other definite term, (2) individuals serving in adjunct, clinical, visiting or temporary positions, or (3) part-time faculty members. An administrator holding faculty rank is entitled to the same advance notice of termination as any faculty member, but such advance notice is not required to change administrative status. Contracts shall be renewed at a salary rate not less than their current contracts or severance pay equal to their current contract salary shall be given in lieu thereof.

MOTION Motion to move PPM8-26 forward to Faculty Senate by Ed Hahn.

SECOND Alicia Giralt

OUTCOME Unanimous

DISCUSSION – The way it was written before it was too open and allowed faculty to take legal action and that is how the committee came up with the language to make the policy clearer. Did Legal Counsel have any particular issues? No they just were making sure that the wording was clear and understandable and it took Legal time to look at this for the committee and get back to them. They were in agreement with the wording.

5. Review PPM 3-25 Faculty Sabbatical Leave, add a section regarding a faculty resigning their position after sabbatical (not returning to university).

PPM 3-25 FACULTY SABBATICAL
(only the updated Section of the policy)

~~G. A faculty member on sabbatical leave is eligible for consideration for merits, advancement in rank, one-time bonuses and for any general or special adjustment in salary received by other faculty members of the University.~~

G. Faculty on sabbatical are eligible for merit, advancement, one-time bonuses, or other general or special adjustments of salary received by other faculty.

H. Sabbaticals and subsequent retirements or resignations: faculty who take sabbaticals are obliged to return to their university assignments: those who take one-semester sabbaticals must work another semester before retiring/resigning; those who take two-semester sabbaticals must work another two semesters before retiring/resigning. Those who fail in these obligations make themselves liable: they must return to the university the sum of their salaries and benefits they took during their sabbaticals. Or, if circumstances prevent them from working *completely* ~~wholly~~ through those last semesters, faculty must repay the portions of their salaries and benefits that correspond to *their outstanding obligations*. ~~their obligations still outstanding~~. The provost or the president may *waive* ~~forgive~~ those repayments (1) due to extenuating circumstances, or (2) because illness or accident prevent faculty from meeting this stipulation.

MOTION Motion to move PPM8-26 forward with minor edits to Faculty Senate by Eric Amsel.

SECOND Carol Naylor

OUTCOME Unanimous

DISCUSSION - Some minor wording changes were suggested by Kirk Hagen. (Shown above) Does this apply to maternity leave? Faculty also will leave after a maternity leave. This policy applies to only sabbatical. Weber State University had no policy covering a penalty for leaving after a sabbatical like other schools in the state do.

6. Review PPM1-17 – Selection and Evaluation of Academic Dean’s. Review and clarify the language in Section V- Evaluation of Academic Deans ; Specifically -- paragraph D Interpretation of the Dean’s Evaluation Survey –. Faculty want to know the information collected from the survey in the form of a summary report.

APAFT Committee discussed the policy and recommended that no changes are needed to the policy.

DISCUSSION

On second year review of the Dean, does the Provost give a report on the interim review? It is worded as “reviews” which it includes all reviews. The committee could request that information. The information would go to committee only. We can think about this further and On the second year review, is there a need for a response to go out to faculty? The Provost didn’t agree or disagree on this issue. Hold this policy until the new Provost is settled and see what their feeling is on the issue. Put this question to the Provost Screening committee to ask during interviews.

Currently, the University Librarian is equal to a college dean, but does not get reviewed the same as a Dean. The APAFT Committee asked that this be further discussed with the Provost. Craig Oberg recommended that the University Librarian be asked what their opinion on this issue is and also talk with the Provost on what the current policy is right now on evaluating the University Librarian. Depending on the discussion a charge for the APAFT committee would be recommended for next year.

The Executive Committee recommends that this Charge at this time and resubmit for next year.

4. General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee – Leigh Shaw, Chair

Mission Statement for the General Education program at Weber State University –
“The purpose of Weber State University’s General Education Program is to provide students with foundational knowledge and skills that transcend and enhance their academic program of study.”

Amended statement:

“The purpose of Weber State University’s General Education Program is to provide students with foundational knowledge and skills that ~~transcend and enhance~~ enhance and transcend their academic program of study.”

MOTION Motion to move the Mission Statement for General Education as amended above by Eric Amsel.

SECOND Kathy Herndon

OUTCOME Unanimous

DISCUSSION - The current General Education Mission Statement was approved in December 2006. A sub-committee was tasked to find Ged Ed Mission Statements from comparable institutions and to work to craft a more coherent statement of what our mission and vision is for General Education now and in the future. Brandon Koford, Econ; Joan Thompson, HPHP; Susan McKay, English; and Jill Ericson, Student Success Center. They met and came back with a proposal and the Gen Ed committee worked to finish the version listed above. A recommendation was made to reverse the order of “transcend and enhance” to “enhance and transcend”. Many General Education classes lead students to their major or minor.

5. Cloud Storage & Application Policy – Vern Morgan, IT Policy & Planning Administrator

I. PURPOSE

Cloud storage and applications are valuable resources allowing University employees to store large amounts of information and perform collaborative tasks more effectively. There are, however, risks that must be mitigated in order to properly secure the data that is placed into and processed in the cloud. The purpose of this Policy is to provide the framework within which Weber State University employees will be expected to operate for storage and processing of Data in cloud environments.

II. SCOPE

This Policy and any of its supporting documents apply to all Weber State University faculty, staff, and anyone doing business with the university that has access to University data. Information that is not sensitive and is deemed to be the owned by an individual (e.g. lecture notes, videos, PowerPoint slides for classroom teaching) is not covered under this policy.

III. DEFINITIONS

Cloud Application - A computer program that does not reside entirely on a desktop or laptop computer which may access University data stored either in cloud storage, directly from a user's computer storage, or from other University physical storage mediums and where the processing of the data is performed on non-premise computer systems. The most common applications that fit this definition are any of the ones provided through the Google and Box application store.

Cloud Storage – A model of networked online storage where data is stored in virtualized storage pools generally hosted by third parties and in locations not owned by the University

Data – Information contained in either University computer systems, cloud storage, or in physical copy that is utilized for the purposes of administering University business or learning.

Sensitive Information – Any data, electronic or physical copy, of which the compromise with respect to confidentiality, integrity, and/or availability could have a material adverse effect on Weber State University interests, the conduct of University programs or the privacy to which individuals are entitled. Examples of such data would include the data protected by the Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA), Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) or other laws governing the use of data or data that has been deemed by the University as requiring protective measures.

ISO - Information Security Office

User - All persons and/or organizations that have access to University data.

IV. REFERENCES

PPM 10-1, Information Security Policy

PPM 10-2, Acceptable Use Policy

20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99 (FERPA)

15 U.S.C. § 6801 (GLBA)

Utah Code Title 63G Chapter 2 (GRAMA)

42 U.S.C § 1320d-6 (HIPAA)

V. POLICY

All Users who utilize cloud services for storage and/or processing of University data must utilize only University approved and contracted cloud services for such activities. Anyone wishing to utilize services for any reason outside of the University approved solution, must submit a copy of the contract for such services to University Legal Counsel and to the Information Security Office for review prior to purchase. Users must also review rights and permissions requested by an application prior to installation to ensure they do not put University data or systems at risk of being compromised. If the user is unsure of the risk of the rights or permissions requested, they must contact the ISO for further guidance. Additionally, cloud services users are required to comply with any additional requirements for the storage or processing of University data prescribed in PPM 10-1, Information Security Policy, and PPM 10-2, Acceptable Use Policy.

VI. Exceptions

University employees who are unable to comply with this policy must file an exception. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the ISO based on academic or business need and reviewed by the ISTF. The ISO will review exceptions annually for continued application and notify the exception holder of any concerns.

DISCUSSION Andrea Grover represented Vern Morgan. The policy came about because of data that is being stored where we do not have access. Dropbox, cloud, people leave the university something happens and we no longer have retention of the data. Make sure that data that is needed by the university is being stored in location that the university has control over. Box, Google Drive are the main ones that are for cloud services. IT is trying to write policy to catch up with the changing technology. IT has created a policy committee to keep up with issues. Eric Amsel raised concerns on, "What is the process on approving IT policies?" The Executive Committee doesn't accept any policy from any other group directly usually. Have it vetted in another committee just so that it is presented a chair of a Faculty Senate committee should be the one presenting a PPM proposal. Eric recommended to let the appropriate committee to look at this review it and pass it and then have the Chair of the Committee come to the senate and explain it in ways that faculty can understand it. The IT department has an individual that writes the policy, he sends it out to many people to review it with their comments. It is sent out at least twice or more and they are invited to sit in and review all the comments made. Not just IT is looking at it. Would ARCC be the committee that would have the expertise to review this policy? Would it be beneficial to have IT to work with ARCC? There will be a lot more of these coming through. There is a new data warehouse, a system that contains a lot of banner information in it. They have to control access. That will be a complicated policy to control it. ARCC can be charged to interface with the IT group next year. Not attempting to stop the policy.

II. Scope

Information that is not sensitive and is deemed to be the owned by an individual (e.g. lecture notes, videos, PowerPoint slides for classroom teaching) is not covered under this policy.

Has this sentence been through Legal? Yes it has. Went to Legal this morning.

Never been able to get an answer about whether or not who owns copyright on Canvas?

If I put my lectures on Canvas, who owns it? This implies ownership and copyright. Andrea will check with Patrick Thomas and have this clarify who owns information on Canvas. This information will be sent to the Faculty Senate Office.

It was recommended to move the policy to Faculty Senate and charge ARCC to cultivate a good interface method and have the Chair of ARCC bring PPM changes that affect faculty.

MOTION Motion to move to forward pending clarification of the sentence in II. Scope by Eric Amsel.

SECOND Shane Schvaneveldt
OUTCOME Unanimous

6. Environmental Issues Committee – Craig Oberg, Chair

EIC Committee member substitution Spring 15 – Matt Gnagey for Greg Parkhurst who is on FMLA Spring 2015 semester.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES COMMITTEE 2014-15

<u>Three Year Term</u>	<u>Two Year Term</u>	<u>One Year Term</u>
Will Speigle, COAST	Carla Trentleman, S&BS	Jan Hamer, A&H
Greg Parkhurst, B&E	John Mull, S	Shaun Hansen, B&E
Cass Morgan, ED	Chris Hauser, LIB	Alice Mulder, S&BS
Janice Thomas, HP	Natalie Williams, ED	Mary Beth Willard, S&BS

Chair: Alice Mulder; Liaison: Shane Schvaneveldt; Administration: Madonne Miner; *Ex Officio* 's: Kevin Hansen, Hal Crimmel (Sabbatical Spr 15)

MOTION Motion to appoint Shaun Hansen, B&E as Interim Chair for EIC during Spring 15 by Eric Amsel.

SECOND Kathy Herndon
OUTCOME Unanimous

Discussion - Alice Mulder has been appointed the Director of the new Sustainability Center and so she has asked to be relieved of the Chair of EIC. It was recommended that Shaun Hansen, B&E, be made the Interim Chair for EIC for Spring 15. He can work with Alice Mulder as needed. If he is eligible to continue to a second, three-year term on EIC, he can decide to remain as Chair.

MOTION Motion to approve Matt Gnagey (substitution Spring 15) for Greg Parkhurst (both B&E) on EIC by Alicia Giralt.

SECOND Carol Naylor
OUTCOME Unanimous

7. Ombuds Position Announcement

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT 2014-15

FACULTY OMBUDS

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is in the process of identifying an experienced full professor interested in serving as the Faculty Ombuds. This is a new position created for the purpose of providing informal assistance to WSU faculty in addressing University-related complaints, conflicts or problems involving or affecting them. The goal of the WSU Faculty Ombuds is to help faculty solve problems early, informally, and at the lowest levels to minimize the need to pursue formal grievance procedures. The Ombuds uses conflict resolution methods such as mediation, facilitation, conciliation and shuttle diplomacy to help resolve issues.

The position is for a 3-year term. The appointment is to begin Fall 2015 through the Summer of 2018. Quarter time release will be given. Following the first year, the position will be reviewed to determine what compensation (released time, money, summer stipend, etc.) is warranted by the position.

At the end of each year, the Ombuds will provide a summary report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee describing the work s/he has done throughout the year.

The successful candidate should be a full professor with at least 10 years of service at Weber State with knowledge of university departments, administration, policies and procedures. The ideal candidate should also possess strong communication skills including listening and conflict resolution methods such as mediation, facilitation, conciliation and shuttle diplomacy. The candidate should also demonstrate the ability to be impartial to help resolve issues and be able to keep all information confidential. Training may be provided as needed.

Applicants should **email or send a brief vita (not to exceed 3 pages focusing on Ombuds related experiences) and letter** outlining your interest and experiences to Brenda Stockberger, 210J Miller

Administration Building, MC 1033 or bstockberger@weber.edu by February 1, 2015. Review of applicants will begin immediately.

DISCUSSION - Craig Oberg discussed with Mike Vaughan and he did not object to the Summer Stipend and was okay with the adjustment to the schedule. Which will be August to August due to the issues that come up Spring and Summer. The Search committee for the Ombuds position will be the Executive Committee and there will be a voting member of Administration as well. It was recommended to move this as an information to the Faculty Senate. The position to be distributed to faculty as soon as possible.

8. Other Items

Eric Amsel, Liaison for General Education Committee –

1. A questionnaire about General Education will be sent out to faculty this spring. It will ask for feedback on Gen Education – what do they want from Gen Ed, what is valuable about Gen Ed, what needs to change on Gen Ed, etc. They hope to compile these results as part of the broader changes that GEIAC is going to propose. This will be put on the agenda for Faculty Senate as an information item to let faculty know that it is coming. Encourage faculty and give an incentive for faculty to complete the survey. It will take less than 15 minutes.

2. Working on two paths for General Education. Concerns about the overall credit hour burden in General Education. Discussion trimming the overall credit hours in the Breadth area. This is still in discussion and working on the best way to go about this. Some ideas are cutting out the Computer skills courses and folding them into existing courses. Most students now are competent in computer skills. Library Research piece is still needed. Some new Gen Ed courses will be coming forth to Curriculum Committee to be on the schedule for Fall semester. Casey Bullock suggested the prefix WSU to reflect the interdisciplinary courses. If we can reduce or streamline General Education requirements, that leaves room for more elective courses within the Associates or Bachelor's degree. This is all being discussed and will continue to be discussed.

3. Data Warehouse - Weber State University has a large demographic of students from West Valley City near Salt Lake. It was thought that we start losing students south of Davis County.

4. Alumni Association is concerned about having a low number of H. Aldous Dixon Award nominations. President Wight asked Eric Amsel to ask the Executive Committee to submit nominations.

5. Can Associate Dean's get Performance Funding?

Who is faculty? Who can earn this new Performance Funding? Can Dean's and Associate Dean's be eligible for this? If the work is done before and beyond the Dean position, then it is possible that they could apply for it.

6. Alicia Giralt.

Several faculty have come to her concerned with how ARCC distributes funding. They said that the process seems very unfair and they are quickly rated. The first application gets the funding and there is no more money for anyone else. Should ARCC be tasked to review how the applications are rated? The Committee already did this a few years ago. Carrie Ota, ARCC Liaison said that it seems to be the members on the committee this year. They chose to not discuss or change any of the amounts. Everyone was present. Continue to keep track of what happens as ARCC meets for Spring proposals.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Next Meeting: Faculty Senate, 22 January 2015 at 3:00 pm WB206-207

Next Meeting: Agenda Setting – Executive Committee 12 February 2015 at 2 pm in MA211K