WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY

Thursday, 12 February 2015
2 pm, MA211K

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AGENDA SETTING MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT -- Eric Amsel, Kirk Hagen, Ed Hahn, Kathleen Herndon, Craig Oberg, Carrie Ota, Shane Schvaneveldt, Chuck Wight, Mike Vaughan and Brenda Stockberger

Excused: Alicia Giralt and Carol Naylor

Guests: Sally Cantwell, Leigh Shaw, Drew Weidman, David Ferro, Bret Ellis, Becky Marchant, and Laine Berghout

1.   Approve the minutes from the 15 January 2015 meeting.

MOTION   To approve the minutes from the 15 January 2015 meeting by Ed Hahn.
SECOND   Kirk Hagen
OUTCOME   Unanimous

DISCUSSION No Discussion.

2.   University Curriculum Committee – Sally Cantwell, Chair
<u>Substantive Curriculum approved at University Curriculum Meeting 28 Jan 2015</u>

HONORS - Judy Elsley
Program Change Proposal - Honors Program, HNRS2050 (SS) added as required course.

EDUCATION
Child and Family - Wei Qiu and Teri Henke
Program Change Proposal - Early Childhood (AAS); Early Childhood (BS); Early Childhood Education(BS)
New Course Proposal - CHF4130 Language Development and Emergent Literacy in Early Childhood
New Course Proposal - CHF4730 Early Childhood/Early Childhood Education Program Development

HEALTH PROFESSIONS
Nursing - Kristy Baron
Program Change Proposal - RN to BSN
New Course Proposal - NRSG4045 End-of-Life Nursing Education Consortium

Medical Lab Sciences - Janet Oja
Program Proposal Change - Medical Lab Science BS
New Course Proposal - MLS3312 Clinical laboratory Immunology and Virology

COAST
Network Technology & Business Multimedia - Allyson Saunders
Program Proposal Change - Network Management Technology, AAS Degree
Program Proposal Change - Network Management Technology, BS Degree
Program Proposal Change - Network Management Technology, Minor
Course Proposal Change - NTM1300 Networks and Emerging Technologies
Course Proposal Change - NTM3710 Switching and Transmission Network Systems Management
Course Proposal Change - NTM3715 Transmission Network Applications

Course Proposal Change - NTM4700 Data and Voice Network Design
Course Proposal Change - NTM4710 Traffic Technology & Voice Network Design
Syllabus and Supporting documentation included

Computer Science - Brian Rague
New Program Proposal - Programming Essentials Institutional Certificate
New General Education Computer Information Literacy (CIL) Proposal - CS1030

SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
Political Science - Stephanie Wolfe
New Course Proposal - POLS2930 Peacebuilding in Rwanda
New Course Proposal – POLS4760 Rwanda: Genocide and Aftermath

BUSINESS
Business Administration - Clinton Amos
Program Change Proposal - BS in Business Administration: Marketing Emphasis

MOTION   Motion to move Curriculum as listed above to Faculty Senate by Kathy Herndon.
SECOND   Eric Amsel
OUTCOME   Unanimous

DISCUSSION   Follow up on COMM1270(January 15) and mention that support letters were received from the Philosophy department.   Watching total credit hours on programs so that they don't go over the total credit hours required for bachelors and associate degrees. Check CPPM if there is language that limits programs to a certain credit hours. There should be language in the Curriculum Policy that spells out that programs should not go over 120 hours. Many faculty don't know there is a limit or don't know the total credits of their program. Not aware that General Ed courses also need to be counted in the total hours. Add to the form the information on credit hours.   Will the new software track the total hours of a program? Will have to find out the answer to that. Word is getting out on changes being discussed on Gen Ed. This is in the development and discussion stage. Departments should examine when students become majors.

3.   PPM 3-27 Administrative Leave – Kirk Hagen, APAFT Liaison

DISCUSSION After the Senate voted on the Change to PPM3-25 Sabbatical Leave, there is also PPM3-27 that addresses Administrative Leave. Are there any inconsistencies that APAFT should look at in this policy? This isn't a faculty policy.   Should this be addressed by a different committee? It is really a Human Resources policy. Has anyone violated this policy? No. No one has had to return any funds. Concerning those who do not return after Sabbaticals – data was looked at last three years - 1 faculty member didn't return. Five years back, there was a higher number that didn't return due to a retirement incentive.   Administrative Leave is rare. Happens usually when a Senior Administrator steps down from a position. No action was ruled necessary on this policy. No vote taken.

4.   Admissions, Standards and Student Affairs Committee - Becky Marchant, Chair

PPM4-19 – Grading Policies

Excerpt of policy: A. GRADE POINT AVERAGE CALCULATION
The cumulative grade point average (GPA) is calculated by dividing the total number of grade points (the number of credit hours per course taken multiplied by the numerical value shown below for the grade received in each course) by the total number of credit hours taken. A student's overall WSU GPA will be calculated based only on courses taken at Weber State University and will be the GPA that appears will appear on the transcript for that student. Only letter grades (A through E and UW as defined in A.2. below) are used in computing the grade point average.

....

F. REPEAT COURSES

Each WSU course (unless specifically listed as repeatable for credit in the course description) may be used only once in total hours and GPA.

A course will appear on the transcript each time it is completed, but it will be counted only once in the total hours and only the most recent ~~WSU~~ letter grade will be used to calculate the GPA. CR (*credit*) is not considered a letter grade and will not cause a previous grade to be discounted.

Once a bachelor's degree has been posted to a student's permanent record, courses used for that degree may not be repeated to improve the GPA.

All courses which have been repeated will have the symbol "E" (connoting excluded) noted in the Repeat column of the transcript except for the last time the course is posted to the transcript.

DISCUSSION -   The ASSA committee has been reviewing the policy on repeating courses. The policy excerpt above was updated to reflect the option recommended by the committee in the best interest of the student. This is defined as "*accept the last class regardless of where it comes from*" . See the synopsis below for explanation.

Paragraph from the synopsis of committee discussion -

> *Accept the last class regardless of where it was taken.* This option is a compromise between the two first two options. It is not the most student friendly option but it has smaller effect on the integrity of the transcript. This policy would allow a student who failed a course at WSU go to another institution and pass the equivalent course and transfer back to WSU to exclude the WSU failing grade. This option will still affect the integrity of the transcript but the population of effected transcripts will be significantly smaller than the other option. This option also maintains some urgency in the class when a student repeats the course. Because we will accept the last class regardless of where it came from or regardless of the grade received. The student still needs to pass the class. On the other hand, in the situation where we accept the high grade, there is no urgency when a student repeats because the penalty is no worse than the first time the student took the class. This can be viewed as a positive and a negative.

DISCUSSION Continued – This situation doesn't happen that much, around 200 incidents had occurred in the last five years. Registrar's office gathered this data.   The ASSA Committee felt that this was the best recommendation to keep the integrity of the Weber State University student transcript and not block the students from progressing in their program of study. This is a good compromise. If a transfer course is articulated as an equivalent course, it is accepted.

MOTION   Motion to move PPM4-19 Grading Policies forward to the Faculty Senate by Eric Amsel.
SECOND   Kathy Herndon
OUTCOME   Unanimous

Second Item for ASSA:

Charge #3 states: Review existing policy and consider requiring programs (such as developmental and other gateway programs) to submit to some mechanism of review for changes to their program admissions/placement standards when those changes impact students and other programs across the University.

Our questions regarding this charge are -

1. **Is the term "gateway program" intended to include only developmental (remedial) programs or to be interpreted more broadly? If applied more broadly, how should a gateway program be defined?**
2. **What contact person (most likely the person who brought the charge to Executive Committee) can ASSA talk to or meet with for clarification?**
3. **What example(s) exist to illustrate the type of concern Charge #3 is intended to address?**

DISCUSSION – The ASSA committee needs clarification on Charge #3. What is meant by a "gateway program"? How broadly are we interpreting that? Could a contact person come to an ASSA meeting to help explain this? Last August, there was talk about dropping Accuplacer testing. This would have impacted a lot of students who attempt to get around Developmental Math. This caused great concern. How can a program change the rules that would impact thousands of students without any Faculty Senate input? There should be Faculty Senate input on these type of courses where it will impact the entire university. That was the motivation for this charge. Developmental English doesn't have this problem, since it is embedded in the English Department. Faculty have control over Developmental English courses. Developmental Math doesn't have that control. It is run by a staff member who reports directly to the Dean of the College. The Math Department has no formal control or impact on Developmental Math. It has created a tension on how Developmental Math is being run. Would LEAP be listed among those programs? For curricular proposals, we wanted another department to sign off on them. Other programs who don't have any other sign off is Honors and BIS. These programs function differently than Developmental Programs which have a gateway function. Discussions worth having about changes in policy in programs like LEAP, Developmental English, Developmental Math that would implicate faculty to a least discuss and sign off on new or changes to course proposals.

Jurisdiction issue with Developmental Math because the USHE years ago deemed that developmental course work was non-college course work. They don't rise to the level of college course work. Unforeseen ramifications of that decision is that the technical colleges are now teaching it. Their justification has been USHE only have jurisdiction over college course work. You have determined that it is non-college coursework so they can do whatever they want.

There was no vote on this issue. Action is for Eric Amsel to have a conversation with Administration and to attend a future ASSA meeting to clarify this charge.

5. General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee(GEIAC) – Leigh Shaw, Chair
   General Education Social Sciences Learning Outcomes (approved University Curriculum Committee 28 Jan 2015)

   General Education Social Science Breadth Area Mission Statement

   The mission of the Social Science general education area is twofold: (1) to provide students with a basic understanding of people and their behavior within their environments; and (2) to empower students to contribute to society in their particular professions and as engaged citizens of their various communities.

   Social Science General Education Student Learning Outcomes
   Students completing a social science general education course will demonstrate their understanding of:

   Interactions between individuals and society
   Describe how individuals and groups influence and are influenced by social contexts, institutions, physical environments and/or global processes.

   Application of concepts, theories and methods
   Apply basic social science concepts, theories and/or methods to a particular issue and identify factors that influence change.

   Diverse perspectives
   Identify an argument about a social phenomenon and understand alternative explanations.

MOTION   Motion to move the Social Sciences Learning Outcomes to Faculty Senate by Eric Amsel.
SECOND   Ed Hahn
OUTCOME   Unanimous

DISCUSSION – Gen Ed Chair charged the GEIAC subcommittee to come up with new Social Sciences Learning Outcomes. They made this recommendation that was approved by GEIAC in January 2015. They look great. A big improvement.

6. Academic Resources and Computing Committee(ARCC) – Drew Weidman, Chair

ARCC Report – Fall 2014
Project Title: Use of 3 Dimensional Motion Analysis Technology In Health Promotion and Human Performance (HPHP) courses.
Members: Matt Denning, Molly Smith, and Tim Ruden
College: Education

Project Title: Modernization of General Chemistry Laboratory
Members: Tim Herzog, Tracy Covey, and Michelle Paustenbaugh
College: Science

Project Title: Modernizing the Upper-Division Physics Labs
Members: John Sohl, Colin Inglefield, and Michelle Arnold
College: Science

Project Title: Massive Robot Throw-Down
Member: Garth Tuck
College: COAST

Project Title: Pronunciation Development in Hybrid First Semester Spanish
Members: John Trimble and Diego Batista
College: Arts & Humanities

DISCUSSION – There was some money left over from Spring 14 ARCC Grants so a call for proposals went out Fall 2014. We selected the top four proposals and had a small amount left over that was able to partially(80%) fund a fifth proposal. Those that didn't get funded were going to resubmit this spring.

DISCUSSION ON PORTFOLIOS AND ARCC – David Ferro, Dean of COAST, and Bret Ellis, VP of Information Technology

Discussion on portfolios and policies from IT and how to involve ARCC in that process.
The Cloud policy from IT came through and was sent back to the team. It has not come back to Executive Committee yet. Maybe the IT policy team should be working more closely with a Faculty Senate committee like ARCC so that when IT policies come to the Senate it has been vetted by faculty and then presented by a member of the faculty to the Faculty Senate. As a way to better communicate to faculty about the policy to help faculty understand the importance of the policy and to get more buy in so we are here to talk about changing the mission or at least adding some charges to ARCC to begin to work and figure out a way to work with the IT policy team and the portfolio project.

There are four types of portfolios – Academic, Administrative, Student, and Web. The Provost put David Ferro and Madonne Miner were put in charge of the Academic Portfolio. One of the things that we have noticed is that there isn't much input from faculty on this portfolio. One idea is to select some faculty and have meetings at least every semester and have smaller meetings with just the executive team. Not getting contributions about the kinds of things for academic technology. The hope is to get help from ARCC in suggesting what kinds of equipment and software are needed or how to modify existing software to accommodate faculty needs. It was suggested that the members of ARCC could join with the Academic Portfolio group once or twice a year to brainstorm and think about the kinds of things that would benefit academic technology.

There is a vast amount of conversation going on about the technology that faculty are not a part of. We need to be more involved. Drew Weidman has attended portfolio meetings. The impression was that we have projects but there were no tools or programmers that could work on them.

ARCC's key role was to represent faculty needs to IT. Hoping to bring this back. Academic Portfolio doesn't have devoted resources in terms of programming staff. Other portfolios have been successful in promoting their projects and gathering those resources to them. Can we move these resources to where the needs are? This isn't impossible.

With more contribution and collaboration from faculty, we get the ideas, buy in from faculty we raise the profile of the portfolio and the needs are expressed more adequately and that would help us in terms of getting resources.

Additional Charge – Draft
ARCC to bring back to faculty Senate a role that they would think would be appropriate to play on the portfolio project. To represent the faculty in the discussions about the Academic Portfolio and the direction that it would go.

Additional Charge - Draft
ARCC to decide what role would be appropriate to play on the IT policy team to review and vet IT policies and bring them forward to Faculty Senate.

Another policy that is in the works is on Video Surveillance systems- there are cameras everywhere and no policy on how they are used. This doesn't directly impact academics, but in many ways this is the world we live in. Cameras are everywhere. Would like to have some faculty input on this policy coming up.

Cloud policy isn't an academic policy, they care. President's Council wants to know that all of our constituents have heard about it and have given their okay with it. They can appreciate being informed since the beginning.

7. Vacancy in the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee - Craig Oberg, Chair

    Nominations from Arts and Humanities Senators to fill in for Alicia Giralt(on FMLA) for Spring 2015 Josh Winegar and Scott Rogers are the nominees.

8. Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee – Craig Oberg, Chair

    Replacement on TLA Committee - Spring 2015 – Hailey Gillen, A&H replaces Ann Bialowas, A&H on FMLA.

    TLA Liaison, Alicia Giralt (replacement to be determined) for Spring 2015.

9. Other Items –

A. Salary Benefits, Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee – Laine Berghout, Chair
    Discussion on Charge 3. *Review campus salary levels using CUPA data, turnover data, and data from regional peer institutions. (Spring)*

The committee needs clarity on this charge. There was a request to make more detailed data be provided to faculty on salary levels. Uncertain how to proceed with this request. The data isn't secret, but it isn't open data. Betty Kusnierz was consulted last fall about it. There was some licensing issues with the CUPA numbers, this cannot be distributed. As they apply specifically to individuals and their salaries, it is somewhat vague.

If we were to make this available to faculty: what is the goal, what do we want to accomplish? What do the faculty gain from this? Based on the answer to the above question, talk more about what is reasonable to provide to faculty or generally what kind of information might be useful.

Department chair shares this with individual faculty. Your dean has access to that. Information shared depends on the College.

Salary isn't as bad as they think. It is for some, but not for all. Depends on the college and there is a lot of variables. The more clarity that is brought around salary the better it is. Making that information available is broadening the conversation and allowing more arguments to be made for and against where we are with salary. One of the things that you should do is make a distinction with regards to the CUPA data and as opposed to the results that we get from the CUPA data. Only to reveal individual numbers to that individual. Not all information to everyone.

We could ask the Deans to share those numbers during review interviews with faculty on an individual basis. If the faculty want this information, they should go their Chair or Dean for the information.

Meet with the Salary Committee first and discuss this with them, then bring forward to Executive Committee and Faculty Senate in March.

B. Report on Trustees Meeting   –   Eric Amsel, Vice Chair
Issues from Faculty Senate Retreat –
1) Faculty Compensation; 2) Academic freedom and student due process; 3) Inconsistencies in policies and practices across campus; 3) Concerns about Developmental Mathematics:4) Concerns about General Education.
     Report this information to the Faculty Senate to give them an update on how they are progressing.

C. Upcoming Election for 15-16 Executive Committee: 23 – 25 February.

D. New Senators for 2015-16 Faculty Senate have been reported to the Faculty Senate Office.

E. Update on Ombuds Position Submissions: No submissions so far.

F. Faculty Governance Award Nominations: No submissions so far.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Next Meeting: Faculty Senate, 19 February 2015 at 3:00 pm WB206-207

Next Meeting: Agenda Setting – Executive Committee, 5 March 2015 at 2 pm in MA211K