

MEMBERS - Listed Alphabetically

Eric Amsel
John Armstrong
Diego Batista
Thomas Bell
Tim Border
Bruce Bowen
Casey Bullock, Admin.
Cary Campbell – Thom Priest
Rex Christensen
Bruce Davis, Admin. Excused
Chris Eisenbarth
Jill Ericson, Student Success Center
Joseph Favero, Student Senator
David Ferro, Admin. - Excused
Alicia Giralt – Molly Morin/Spring15
Kirk Hagen
Ed Hahn
Alexandra Hanson
Sue Harley
Frank Harrold, Admin.
Jeffrey Henry, Student Senator
Kathy Herndon
Brent Horn - excused
Joan Hubbard, Admin. - Excused
Colin Inglefield
Gary Johnson
Kerry Kennedy
David Matty, Admin.
Marek Matyjasik – Adolph Yonkee
Kami May, Student Senator - Absent
Madonne Miner, Admin.
Brad Mortenson, Admin. - Excused
Carol Naylor - Shelly Costley
Kathy Newton
Matthew Nicholaou - Kathleen Cadman
Tanya Nolan
Craig Oberg
Jenn Ostrowski
Carrie Ota
Clay Rasmussen - Excused
Jack Rasmussen, Admin. – Chloe Merrill
David Read

Rob Reynolds - Excused
Scott Rogers
Shane Schvaneveldt - Mark Stevenson
Yas Simonian, Admin. - Kraig Chugg
Jeff Steagall, Admin. – Excused
Brian Stecklein, Admin.
T H Steele
Sarah Steimel
Doris Stevenson
Norm Tarbox, Admin. - Excused
Ryan Thomas, Admin. - Excused
Michael Vaughan, Admin.
Drew Weidman
President Chuck Wight, Admin.
Mary Beth Willard
Kristiann Williams
Josh Winegar
Jan Winniford, Admin. - Excused
Liese Zahabi

15-16 Senators

Nicole Beatty
Fred Chiou
Matthew Denning
Electra Fielding – John Trimble
Robert Fudge
Becky Jo Gesteland
Afshin Ghoreishi
Pepper Glass
Michael Hernandez
Tim Herzog - Excused
Brandon Koford
Casey Neville
Julia Panko

Guests:

Sally Cantwell, University Curriculum Chair
Leigh Shaw, GEIAC Chair
Drew Weidman, ARCC Chair
Laine Berghout, SBBFP Chair
Mark Stevenson, Graduate Council Chair

Brenda Stockberger, Secretary

All items from the minutes can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Webpage. Go to the 19 March 2015 Meeting and click on the links.

1. ROLL CALL
2. Approval of the minutes from 19 February 2015 meeting.

MOTION Motion to approve the minutes from 19 February 2015 meeting as corrected in discussion below by John Armstrong.

SECOND Alexandra Hansen

OUTCOME Unanimous

Discussion – Correction on minutes – Sue Harley was left off the attendance – will be put back on. Misspelled word on page 2, Item 3, second paragraph – Sentence beginning with “Split”. “intutions” should be “tuitions”. The Minutes were corrected.

Information Items

3. Update on Weber State University Activities – President Chuck Wight

The monies from the legislature were very thin for Higher Education, but it is better than a cut. We are looking at a two percent increase in compensation and more or less wholly funded increase in benefits medical and dental. State regulation that employees have to pay 10 % of benefits costs on medical and dental that will be going up a little bit. About 5% -- we don't know the exact number yet, that is up to what PEHP decides.

Be sure to sign up for the Wellness pays that will get you the most money ever for this year in savings on your medical and dental.

Things are on an even keel. We had to make a decision earlier on Tier 2 tuition and we made a commitment to take zero Tier 2 tuition increase for next year. The Regents haven't finalized their decision, but there is an early indication that they will call for a three percent Tier 1, tuition increase. Very little ongoing money for non-personnel expenses for next year.

Are we going to do the Performance Compensation? The answer is yes. We are going forward with it. We found the money to do it and we are committed to it.

Will the 2 % going to be broken evenly between cost of living and merit? You will hear more about that from Laine Berghout later in the meeting. I believe the recommendation will be to make it across the board. Two percent is not a lot to play with.

4. Provost Screening Committee Update – Craig Oberg, Faculty Senate Chair

The committee is heavily engaged at this time. We have seven candidates that we are conducting airport interviews with. Once that is completed within the next week, then the committee will meet and make recommendations for approximately three to come onto campus. Then everyone will have an opportunity to interact with these candidates and get a sense on what they are about. At the conclusion of that, those three names will go forward to the President. The committee will have input, the major step right now is getting the three main candidates on campus for everyone to meet. Everyone on the committee, particularly Brad need to be commended. It has been a lot of work. We have moved fairly rapidly so that a decision can be made.

5. Academic Resources and Computing Committee (ARCC) - Drew Weidman, Chair

IT Cloud Policy **All items from the minutes can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Webpage.**

Go to the 19 March 2015 Meeting and click on Agenda Item 5 for IT Cloud Policy.

DISCUSSION - There is an IT group on campus. This group recommends policies related to IT and as an Executive Committee and Faculty Senate felt like we needed to have more input and buy in and input from the faculty on these policies, particularly the ones that have an impact on us. We asked IT group to bring the

policy through the ARCC committee for input. Then be brought to the Faculty Senate as an informational item.

The policy is needed for Audit procedures. What to do with information that we are storing on the cloud on the internet. The university has interest in protecting its data and ensuring that it is being stored properly. They have contracted with both Google Drive and Box as the providers for the university for information available to faculty, staff and students at no cost. Any university owned data is to be stored in Box or Google Drive. But that doesn't include information used for Teaching in the classroom. Grades should be stored in Box. If it is your presentations for teaching a class, this is not required to be stored in Box. Research information is your data and you can store it in another storage application. The main goal is the protection of sensitive data.

Are there plans to update Canvas to import grades directly to Banner? This is a project in work, but do not know when this will be activated. Casey Bullock commented that it is in the Testing phase and cannot say that it will be ready by this grade cycle, but we are hoping for that. There was a comment that it might not be a good idea for faculty to put their research data anywhere they want. Some research can be very sensitive information. There is a lot of research that deals with medical research. This information should be in a secure storage. Faculty are supposed to follow the policy based on that particular research.

6. Graduate Council - PPM 11-1 Graduate Programs - Mark Stevenson, Chair

Update on the policy on Graduate Programs. **All items from the minutes can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Webpage. [Go to the 19 March 2015 Meeting and click on Agenda Item 6 for PPM 11-1 Graduate Programs.](#)**

DISCUSSION – Changes to document are clarifying some wording, grammar, restoring the original outline format that was lost when uploaded to the web. The real change to the document is Section 13, where new language was put in that reflecting the new structure of the Graduate Council that has been in place since last July. We basically created an Office of Graduate Studies with Mark Stevenson in the position of Director of Graduate Studies who also then is the Chair of the Graduate Council. The functions are the same in terms of what the Graduate Council is expected to do and the procedures for selecting the Director are outlined in this new section of the PPM. This was approved by the office of the Provost – July 2014.

Questions - A discussion of the policy took place before the Senate met and an issue was raised that should be discussed at Senate today. For example, a Graduate Program gets a change approved through the Curriculum Committee and then be sent to the Graduate Council for further approval. Under what conditions would Graduate Council reject a change that was accepted by the Curriculum Committee? Issue is overlapping control for Graduate Programs and which would take priority and under what conditions would a change that was accepted by one body be rejected by Grad Council. Right now the chain of approval is Department/Program level, College Curriculum Comm, Graduate Council and then University Curriculum Committee and then Senate. We see our role as facilitative and advisory. We see something that we think will get flagged, our job, as we see it, is to suggest some changes to that. Are there examples where there might be overlapping control over policy that could be accepted by one body and rejected by another? I do not know of any instances where that has actually happened. It is possible. A suggestion was made to identify those points of overlap for further clarity. There are three different levels of approval essentially. Certainly can be looked at.

Additional comment given was that they were impressed at the Graduate Council and how they were another level of rigorous examination of the proposal. I didn't think of it as overlap of authority in any way. Graduate Programs have the right to police themselves. A Graduate Program is as strong as the weakest one. So far the feedback from Programs I've received has been that they have found it helpful and it has strengthen the proposals.

7. General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee(GEIAC) – Leigh Shaw, Chair and Eric Amsel, Liaison

Curriculum Policy and Procedure Manual Change to New and Renewal of General Education Courses.
All items from the minutes can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Webpage.
Go to the 19 March 2015 Meeting and click on Agenda Item 7 for the document.

There are a number of ways that policies get enacted at Weber State. This body does most of the enacting of policies, President's Council does some of enacting. University Curriculum Committee will be voting on this policy next Wednesday. You are being informed about this Curriculum Policy and Procedure change to New and Renewal of General Education Courses. GEIAC has created a proposal that will be voted on by the University Curriculum Committee for a change in Curriculum PPM. We thought that it was substantial and significant enough that we wanted to inform this body of the changes. If you have any concerns about it, you should take them to your University Curriculum Representative in your college to vote against it.

Action Items

8. Faculty Senate Chair and Vice Chair – Craig Oberg, Chair

Craig Oberg, Chair and Marek Matyjasik, Vice Chair for 2015-16

No vote was taken as Craig and Marek were the only candidates left on the ballot for each position. A vote of affirmation was taken of the Faculty Senate.

MOTION Motion to accept Craig Oberg, Chair and Marek Matyjasik, Vice Chair for 2015-16 by Drew Weidman.
SECOND Mary Beth Willard
OUTCOME Unanimous

9. University Curriculum Committee – Ed Hahn, Liaison, for Sally Cantwell, Chair

Curriculum approved at University Curriculum Meeting on 25 February 2015

All items from the minutes can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Webpage.

Go to the 19 March 2015 Meeting and click on Agenda Item 9 for all the Curriculum Listed.

EDUCATION

Health Promotion and Human Performance - Laura Santurri
Program Change Proposal - Health Promotion Teaching Minor

Master's in Education - Peggy Saunders
New Program Proposal - Graduate Certificate in Elementary Teaching
New Program Proposal - Graduate Certificate in Secondary Teaching

Health Promotion and Human Performance - Chad Smith
Program Change Proposal - PE Major
Program Change Proposal - PE Minor
Course Proposal Change - PEP3280 Methods of Teaching Strength and Conditioning
Course Proposal Change - PEP3290 Methods of Teaching Fitness for Life
Course Proposal Change - PEP3630 Methods of Teaching Elementary School Physical Education

New Course Proposal - PEP4700 Methods of Teaching Junior High School Physical Education
New Course Proposal - PEP4710 Methods of Teaching High School Physical Education

SCIENCE

Zoology – Nicole Berthelemy and Chris Hoagstrom
Program Change Proposal – Zoology Bachelor of Science Degree

MOTION Motion to approve the Curriculum listed above as a package by Kathy Herndon.

SECOND John Armstrong

OUTCOME Unanimous

No Discussion on proposals.

10. Salary Benefits, Budget and Fiscal Planning (SBBFP) – Laine Berghout, Chair

The Provost's office each year from the CUPA survey data generates a faculty compensation model worksheet that takes in account the CUPA numbers – years at rank, years in service, degrees, etc. Comes up with a modified target value for each member of the faculty. Faculty can login to the eWeber portal and see this table.

Recommendation from SBBFP Committee -

Current faculty salary information and standing relative to CUPA as calculated in the faculty equity model tables shall be made available to faculty members. To facilitate making this information available, we recommend that a link to the current faculty equity model table be maintained in the eWeber Portal.

3-4-2015 Salary Committee Approved

3-5-2015 Executive Committee Approved

OUTCOME Unanimous With one Abstention noted.

DISCUSSION- One of the concerns was that this data would be made secure enough, but allow faculty access to it. We would ask that you don't share it. CUPA is only one comparison for salary. Some fields have better mechanisms to compare against other fields nationally. What is the objective to publicize the report? It was in response to a request from faculty to have more clarity and availability of how our salaries are being measured.

Compensation and Benefits for 2015-16

A meeting of the SBBFP committee met earlier today reviewing the proposal coming forward from a subcommittee regarding the disposition of the two percent increase. Benefits are increasing also, but do not have the figures at this time. More information will be coming out on this cost to employees. The Utah Legislature provided a 2 % increase in compensation for base salary and allows that money to be divided between merit and cost of living at the discretion of the university.

Recommendation from SBBFP Committee – regarding the disposition of the 2% increase in monies available for compensation is 1) The full 2% increase in salary funding shall be applied as a cost of living increase to all faculty with the caveat that Dean's may exclude faculty with documented unsatisfactory performance from this salary increase. 2) Because of the small approximately matches the Social Security Cost of living adjustment, none of the 2% base salary increase funding will be assigned to merit increases.

MOTION by the SBBFP committee.

OUTCOME Unanimous with 2 nay votes noted. (no abstentions)

DISCUSSION – It isn't a good idea to go across the board with this increase. A lot of time is spent on evaluating faculty. Is there a way to create an average or a certain percentage on increases? Something to make it more consistent. Placing the bar is a challenge. Use a rubric every year for the raise on whatever it is - .5% or 5%. Do it the same way every year. Make it a policy maybe. We don't have complete flexibility on this and it depends in part on what the legislature intends when the money is appropriated and in part it is based on decisions that are made at the Regent level. Whatever we do has to be consistent with those two things. We don't always get to decide the rules of the game. Do you know any other institutions that are making the 2% across the board? No final decisions. There was wide agreement that they would probably take across the board raises. Need to have help with faculty incentive. Someone who has worked hard all year, but doesn't get recognized due to no merit increases. If there was a running average of funding for this, then when a merit increase does come along faculty can get compensated. Eric Amsel made the call to question.

11. Other Items - There were no other items discussed.

Motion to adjourn by Drew Weidman,
Second John Armstrong
Outcome Unanimous
Meeting adjourned at 4:08 pm.

Next Meeting: Faculty Senate, 16 April 2015 at 3:00 pm WB206-207