April 14, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Douglas Smith
Chair University Senate

FROM: Barbara Burch
Provost and Vice President
For Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: March 20, 2003 University Senate Minutes

I endorse, without exception the actions of the University Senate at its meeting March 20, 2003.

/ls
Chair Doug Smith called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M. The following members were present: Darlene Applegate, Ray Blankenship, Charles Borders, Debra Crisp, Robert Dietle, Claus Ernst, Joe Glaser, Elmer Gray, Kacy Harris, Michelle Hollis, Roy Howsen, Danita Kelley, Frank Kersting, Wilma King-Jones, Dana Lockhart, Shirley Lowman, Jessica Martin, Patricia Minter, Russell Moore, Lora Moore, Sharon Mutter, Kay Payne, Yvonne Petkus, Cassandra Pinnick, Matthew Pruitt, Sherry Reid, Roger Scott, Sherrie Serros, Vernon Sheeley, Fred Siewers, Nelda Sims, Dale Smith, Doug Smith, Judy Walker, Richard Weigel, John White, Mary Wolinski, Uta Ziegler. Alternate members present were: Keith Philips for Lawrence Alice, John Petersen for Barbara Burch, Malia Formes for Fred Murphy, Raymond Poff for Kathleen Sheldon. Members absent were: Christopher Antonsen, Jim Becker, Michael Binder, John Bruni, Thad Crews II, David Dunn, Yalcin Ertekin, Blaine Ferrell, Bill Greenwalt, Jeffrey Hackett, Richard Hackney, Robert Holman, Augustine Ihator, Daniel Jackson, Robert Jefferson, Jonathan Jeffrey, Pam Jukes, Bruce Kessler, Sean Kinder, Minwoo Lee, David Lee, Cynthia Mason, Kathleen Matthew, Michael May, John Moore, Jane Olmsted, Anne Onyekuwluje, Richard Parker, Sherry Powers, Ross Pruitt, Gary Ransdell, Troy Ransdell, Loren Ruff, Jo-Anne Ryan, Cliff Shaluta, Bryon Sleugh, Bill Tseng, Steven White, Stacy Wilson, Edward Yager.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of February 20, 2003 were approved as presented.

University Senate Action Approval

Dr. Barbara Burch, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, approved, without exception, the actions taken by the University Senate at its February 20, 2003 meeting.

Report from the Chair

1. Chair Smith said at the Executive Committee meeting the following faculty were appointed to various committees: Betsy Shoenfelt, will join Patricia Minter and Claus Ernst on the Benefits Committee. Enrollment Growth Committee: Patty Randolph, Roxanne Spencer and Karen Powell. Teachers Ed Committee: Jeff Butterfield. Chair Smith also said he needed a volunteer to replace Fred Murphy, on the Social Security Number Elimination Committee.

2. Chair Smith next referred Senate members to the COSFL's website for information on Senate Bill 152, which relates to member eligibility for those persons serving on Board of Regents of universities in the state. He said the website outlines the rules of eligibility.
3. Chair Smith said COSFL is gathering information from around the state on each college's tuition increase as well as and salary increase information. The information will be posted on the University Senate website once it is available.

4. Chair Smith said he is working on updating the University website, and if anyone has any problems, or suggestions to let him know.

**Standing Committee Reports**

A. **Report from the University Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darlene Applegate moved approval of the University Curriculum Committee’s Consent Agenda from the February 27, 2003 meeting.

Chair Smith asked if any Senator would like to remove any item from the University Curriculum Committee consent agenda to the action agenda. No such requests were made.

The University Curriculum Committee presented the following motions from its February 27, 2003 meeting for approval by the University Senate. Proposals marked with asterisks were action items by the UCC

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

One-Time-Only Course Offering [for information only]

- PSY 340     Sport Psychology

**COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

I. Change of Course Prefix [for information only]

- AHHS 290     Medical Technology (to AH 290 Medical Technology)

II. Revision of Program *

- Ref. No. 524  BS in Dental Hygiene [replace one required course]

**POTTER COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

I. One-Time-Only Course Offering [for information only]

- FLK 448     Visual Anthropology

II. Revision of Courses

- JOUR 321     Public Affairs Reporting [prerequisites] *
THEA 391  Children's Theatre/Creative Dramatics [prerequisites]  
THEA 392  Production of Theatre for Children [prerequisites]  
THEA 371  Directing I [prerequisites]  
THEA 423  Theatre Management [title]  

III. Suspension of Courses  
DANC 210  Intermediate Dance Technique  
DANC 324  Styles of Musical Theatre Dance  

IV. Creation of Courses *  
THEA 415  Directing Studio  

OGDEN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING  

I. One-Time-Only Course Offering [for information only]  
GEOG 204  Volcanoes and Earthquakes  
GEOG 206  Midlatitude Cyclones  
GEOG 208  Floods and Droughts  
ME 455  Advanced Fluid Mechanics  

II. Deletion of Courses  
AGED 490  Student Teaching  
ME 340  Kinematics and Dynamics of Machinery  
ME 375  Machine Elements II  

III. Revision of Courses  
EM 221  Statics [catalog]  
EM 302  Mechanics of Deformable Solids [prerequisites]  
EM 313  Dynamics [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 101  Mechanical Engineering Freshman Experience [prerequisites]  
ME 200  Sophomore Design [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 220  Engineering Thermodynamics I [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 240  Materials and Methods of Manufacturing [catalog]  
ME 241  Materials and Methods of Manufacturing Lab [catalog]  
ME 300  Junior Design [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 321  Engineering Thermodynamics II [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 325  Elements of Heat Transfer [prerequisites, catalog] *  
ME 330  Fluid Mechanics [prerequisites, catalog] *
ME 331  Strength of Materials Lab [catalog]
ME 344  Mechanical Design [catalog]
ME 362  Thermal-Fluid Sciences  [prerequisites, catalog] *
ME 400  Mechanical Engineering Design  [prerequisites, catalog] *
ME 412  Mechanical Engineering Senior Project  [prerequisites, catalog] *
ME 420  Senior Mechanical Engineering Lab I  [prerequisites, catalog] *

IV.  Revision of Program *

Ref. No. 534  BS in Civil Engineering [delete one required course]

GRADUATE COUNCIL

I.  Deletion of Courses

THEA 422G  Stage Lighting Design
THEA 423G  Theatre Management
THEA 424G  Special Problems in Technical Theatre
THEA 431G  Musical Theatre
THEA 441G  Costume Design
THEA 442G  Historic Décor
THEA 445G  Research in Theatre and Dance
THEA 455G  American Drama
THEA 456G  Elizabethan Drama
THEA 459G  Modern Drama
THEA 461G  Theatre Practicum
THEA 482G  Shakespeare
THEA 550  Seminar/Theatre
THEA 553  Restoration and 18th Century Drama
THEA 583  Shakespeare II

II.  Revision of Course *

MATH 409G  History of Mathematics  [prerequisites, catalog]

The motion carried.

Next Senator Applegate presented a proposal and moved approval to revise the routing procedure for proposals to create or revise a 400-level course with a graduate (G) component.

Proposal to Revise Proposal Routing Procedure for Proposals to Create or Revise a 400-level course a with Graduate (G) Component

Present Proposal Routing Procedure
(see UCC Guidelines and Operating Procedures Manual, p. 3.01)
“From the college undergraduate and/or graduate curriculum committee, curricular proposals that require approval by the University Teacher Education Committee (see Appendix p. A08 for guidelines) and/or the Graduate Council are routed to those organizations prior to the University Curriculum Committee.”

(see UCC Guidelines and Operating Procedures Manual, Appendix, p. A08)
“After the University Teacher Education Committee has endorsed (or declined to endorse) a course or program proposal, the proposal is returned to the academic unit responsible for developing the proposal; the dean of the appropriate college (or, in the case of graduate courses and programs, the graduate studied dean) will present the proposal to University Curriculum Committee.”

(see p. 3.02, flow chart for Curriculum Approval Process)
The flow chart shows that proposals from UTEC are returned to the college curriculum committee, whereas proposals sent to Graduate Council are forwarded directly from it to the University Curriculum Committee.

**In summary:** at present, proposals to create or revise a 400-level course with a graduate (G) component are routed as follows:

400-level (undergraduate):
  - Departmental Curriculum Committee
  - College Curriculum Committee
  - University Teacher Education Committee (if appropriate)
  - University Curriculum Committee
  - University Senate

400G (graduate component):
  - Departmental Curriculum Committee
  - College Graduate Curriculum Committee
  - University Teacher Education Committee (if appropriate)
  - Graduate Council
  - University Curriculum Committee
  - University Senate

Note that the 400/400G course is thus presented to the University Curriculum Committee and University Senate twice, once by the college curriculum committee and once by the Graduate Council.

**Proposed Proposal Routing Procedure**

From the college undergraduate and/or graduate curriculum committee, curricular proposals that require approval by the University Teacher Education Committee (see Appendix p. A08 for guidelines) and/or the Graduate Council are routed to those committees prior to the University Curriculum Committee.
However, if the proposal concerns the creation or revision of a 400-level course with a graduate component, the routing procedure is as follows:

- After approval by the college curriculum/graduate curriculum committee, the proposal is forwarded to the University Teacher Education Committee (if appropriate) and/or the Graduate Council.

- After these committees endorse (or decline to endorse) the proposal, it is returned to the academic unit responsible for developing the proposal; the office of the dean of the appropriate college will then submit the proposal to the University Curriculum Committee within that college’s set of proposals.

- If the University Teacher Education Committee or the Graduate Council declines to endorse the proposal, the unit responsible for submitting the proposal may withdraw the proposal, make revisions, and re-submit it. The unit also has the option of sending the proposal to the University Curriculum Committee without the endorsement; however, courses not approved by the University Teacher Education Committee may not be counted toward a program approved for teacher certification, and 400-level courses not approved by the Graduate Council may not be offered for graduate credit (i.e., no “G” component may exist without Graduate Council approval).

- When the proposal is voted on by the University Curriculum Committee, separate votes must be conducted for the 400-level course and the graduate (G) component of the course. Only those members of the University Curriculum Committee who are graduate faculty may vote on the graduate component of the course.

(Note that flow chart for Curricular Proposal Routing will also need to be revised. A set of two arrows, similar to the two arrows connecting the College Curriculum Committee box with the University Teacher Education Committee box, will need to be added to connect the College Curriculum Committee box with the Graduate Council box. The new set of arrows will indicate the routing of proposals for 400G courses, while the existing arrow will indicate the routing of proposals concerning 500 or higher-numbered courses and proposals to create or revise graduate programs.)

The motion was seconded. The motion carried.

**B. Report from the General Education Committee**

Senator Patricia Minter presented the General Education consent agenda and moved approval.

Chair Smith asked if any Senator would like to move any General Education item from the consent agenda to the action agenda. No such requests were made.

The consent agenda from the General Education committee is below.
I. Addition to General Education

Category C:
GOVT 267 Introduction to East European Studies

II. Deletions from General Education

Category C:
SOC 240 Contemporary Social Problems
SOC 363 Population and Society

The motion carried.

C. Report from the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee

Senator Claus Ernst reported on the faculty "Morale Survey" which has been done each year. This year it was added to a web-based survey conducted by Senator John White which focused on receiving feedback about the president’s evaluation. He said of the approximately 240 people, who responded,

- about 30% reported morale to be "poor to very poor";
- approximately 30% reported working conditions to be "poor to very poor";
- approximately 80% reported job satisfaction to be "good to very good";
- only about 11% rated the President’s performance over the past year as "poor to very poor";
- about two-thirds rated the Provost’s performance as "good to very good."

Next Senator Ernst presented and outlined the analysis of the Department Head Survey, as well as the analysis of the second part of the The Faculty Worklife Study. The Department Head Survey seems to show a trend over the last five years towards hiring less tenure-track faculty. Senator Ernst detailed each report extensively. He noted that these reports accompanied the Senate's agenda materials, and each report is also listed on the University Senate's website. (Hard copies of each report are included in the official records of the University Senate's minute book.)

Report from the Budget Committee

Senator Mel Borland explained some of the processes used by the budget committee. The additional tuition revenue available for distribution is calculated in the following way: (tuition cost for 2003-04 * enrollment in 2002-03 - tuition in 2002-03). This is a conservative estimate of the additional tuition, since enrollment is expected to increase in 2003-04. The "unexpected" increase due to higher enrollment is disbursed without getting additional input from the committee. This year the committee made recommendations how to use such unexpected increases, which are estimated at $800,000 which is equal to about 1% of faculty salary raise. Senator Borland suggested a better approach would be to use an unbiased estimate,
budget based on it and to create a reserve account in size equal to the differential in revenue that would be available under the two different estimates (unbiased and conservative).

In addition, Senator Borland said not all tuition money is available for consideration due to numerous tuition-restricted accounts that used to be fee accounts: Approximately $213 of each student’s payment is restricted to various areas (title IX, DUC renovation, deferred maintenance, …).

The budget committee suggested to use $1,000,000 for permanent faculty positions to cover enrollment growth. Also, as a contingency, if enrollment increases to a greater extent, and additional $150-200,000 are available for faculty positions. Senator Borland said that the budget committee recommended a salary pool of 3 ¾%. Salary increases of less then 2% or of more than 6% must be justified. The budget committee also recommended to increase the university’s contribution to health insurance by an average of $20.- per employee.

**New Business**

**Regents Survey**

Senator John White reported on the request from the Faculty Regent to solicit input from the faculty on the Regent’s survey of the President's performance. He distributed an eight-page survey listing the results of this survey. Senator White said this survey will be available on the University Senate website, and there is a copy of this survey is attached to the University Senate's official minutes. Senator White said there were 243 responses to the survey this year. (220 responded last year to the President's Evaluation survey.)

Regent Robert Dietle said the survey was done under time constraints and too late to have a big influence on the regents discussion of the President’s performance; comments made were forwarded to the regents. Regent Dietle said he hoped by the next cycle of the President's evaluation the University Senate can create an online survey without the positive bias of the current evaluation instrument and with more security measures which would encourage more responses. The survey should be conducted such that its results are available to the regents when they discuss the President’s performance. Regent Dietle said he would attach this survey to his evaluation of the University President.

No other business was brought before the University Senate at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

_______________________________
Uta Ziegler, Secretary

_______________________________
Lou Stahl, Recorder