April 16, 2015

RE: Academic Information Technology Committee Annual Report

Faculty Senate,

Annual Report of the University of Wyoming Faculty Senate Academic Information Technology Committee (AITC).

During the 2014-2015 Academic Year the AITC met and corresponded via email to discuss the single charge for the committee.

**Committee Charge:**

“To explore the possibility/develop a process “in-house” for handling packets for reappointment, tenure and promotion electronically.”

**Committee Recommendation:**

The AITC Committee met to discuss this charge in Fall 2014 and the members then provided recommendations of other Universities who are currently using an electronic T&P system. A committee with representatives from AITC (Committee Chair), ECTL and IT was formed to follow up on the list of possible Universities, work out the technical aspects of the project and to make a recommendation to Academic Affairs. Currently this group is interviewing the recommended Universities.

Respectfully submitted;

Christine Noel Boggs

Christine Boggs

Chair AITC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Expires (Spring)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email . . . uwyo.edu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Virginia Vincenti</td>
<td>2016(2)</td>
<td>64079</td>
<td>vincenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Barbara Logan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>65057</td>
<td>blogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Shannon Albeke</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>66207</td>
<td>salbeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Management &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Mark Peterson</td>
<td>2015(2)</td>
<td>62054</td>
<td>markpete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elementary &amp; Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>George Kamberelis</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>63275</td>
<td>gkambere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Kim Buckner</td>
<td>2017(2)</td>
<td>65182</td>
<td>kbuckner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>Amy Weaver</td>
<td>2015(2)</td>
<td>65187</td>
<td>aweaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Tawnya Plumb</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65733</td>
<td>tplumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Administrative Office</td>
<td>Chad Hutchens</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65592</td>
<td>chutchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>American Heritage Center</td>
<td>Tyler Cline</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>65614</td>
<td>tcline3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Outreach Credit Programs</td>
<td>Christi Boggs, Chair</td>
<td>2015(2)</td>
<td>64238</td>
<td>cboggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUW</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Academic Planning Committee**

During the 2014 – 2015 Academic Year, the Academic Planning Committee was given two formal charges by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The first was to consider the impact on UW of the legislature’s decision to defund examination of the Next Generation Science Standards use in public schools. The Academic Planning Committee was charged with assessing this decision’s academic impact on UW in a variety of contexts. It was our consensus opinion that the institutional impact on UW and UW students on account of Legislative funding restrictions on the examination of the Next Generation Science Standards would probably be minimal in the short term. However, were this policy to continue, WYOMING students at UW would likely be impacted. Given that UW prepares students not just for Wyoming, but for the wider world, the biggest threat could be to the success of Wyoming K-12 educated students. It is not possible at this time to assess how UW academic programs and functions would be impacted long term.

The second was to consider reducing the minimum number of upper division credit hours required by the University of Wyoming in all bachelor’s level programs from 48 to 42. Arguments presented by a representative of UW’s administration were balanced against the discussion in 1996 of Faculty Senate Bill 271 (in which the minimum number of upper division credit hours was raised to 48). After weighing all of the material presented and considering institutional minimums among a relatively large group of comparators, it was our consensus opinion that the number of upper division credit hours could be reduced to 42 without loss of institutional integrity, as long as departments were still permitted to require as many upper division credit hours for their bachelor’s degree as deemed necessary and appropriate.

The Academic Planning Committee took it upon itself to consider an examination of UP4 during the comment period in October of 2014. As indicated in University Regulation 6-702 “the committee’s function (Academic Planning Committee) is to review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on matters related to the structure and organization of the academic activities of the University. This review will be carried out in the context of the University’s comprehensive development. The committee will recommend policies regarding priorities for long range development.” At no time during the development of UP4 was contact made with the Academic Planning Committee, was assistance solicited in its development, or was comment requested. It was the consensus opinion of the Academic Planning Committee to not become involved in any critique or consideration of UP4 at this late date in its development. The chair of the Academic Planning Committee took it upon himself to write an extensive critique of UP4 which was forwarded to the Faculty Senate Chair. He subsequently forwarded this critique to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. After a discussion with the VPAA, the chair of the Academic Planning Committee was invited and became involved in all discussion groups for UP4 as the representative of the Academic Planning Committee.

Stephen Bieber, Department of Statistics, was elected to Chair the Academic Planning Committee for the 2015-2016 Academic Year.

Submitted by Stephen Bieber, Chair

March 11, 2015
Annual Report

Faculty Senate Budget Planning Committee
2014-2015

Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>UW Extension</td>
<td>Warren Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Gregg Cawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Steve Bieber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Fred Sterbenz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Victoria Gillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Mark Garnich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>Dave Bruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Debora Person, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>Deborah McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>American Heritage Center</td>
<td>Ginny Kilander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>UW-Casper</td>
<td>John Kambutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Staff Senate</td>
<td>Rachel Stevens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year the Budget Committee updated our web site to ensure that the links were current, and additional information was reviewed and added, such as the salary information available from The Chronicle of Higher Education. The web site is available at [http://libguides.uwyo.edu/budget](http://libguides.uwyo.edu/budget).

We reviewed the legislative audit report of the university and came up with a list of budget issues that the Committee could be working on with the administration. Our list consisted of comparator institutions (the legislative report suggested comparing the University of Wyoming to more modest institutions in the region than those institutions that we currently use), salaries, and establishing a budget for Academic Affairs. Unfortunately the university’s administration did not respond to our requests to be involved in these areas.

Fred Sterbenz has agreed to serve as the Committee’s chair next year.
Committee on Committees

2014-15 Academic Year Annual Report

Membership:

AG Molecular Biology                      Jay Gatlin
AS Communication & Journalism             Eric Wiltse
AS Sociology                               Malcolm Holmes
BU Economics & Finance                     Owen Phillips
ED Elementary & Early Childhood Education  Michelle Buchanan
EN Chemical & Petroleum                    Shunde Yin
HS Communication Disorders                 Teresa Ukrainetz
LA Law School                              Jacquelyn Bridgeman, Jim Delaney (mid-year)
LI Research & Instruction                  Cheryl Goldenstein
OS Outreach Credit Programs                Jeff Miller
AHC                                        Vacant

The Committee on Committees met April 7 to nominate and vote on representatives from our respective units to fill expiring terms on standing Faculty Senate Committees for 2015-16. We addressed other vacancies by email as they occurred throughout the year. Nominations were forwarded to Faculty Senate for ratification. We anticipate filling a couple of remaining vacancies before committees begin their work in the fall. Cheryl Goldenstein was re-elected as chair for 2015-16.

Other business this year included approving changes to language in UW Regulation 6-702 related to voting membership of the University Studies Committee before the revision went to Faculty Senate.

The Committee thanks the many faculty and lecturers who responded to our calls for volunteers, and we thank Amy Kopp for keeping track of volunteers and committee rosters.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Goldenstein Chair, Committee on Committees
TO: Dr. Edward Janak, Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Tim Collier, Chair  
Faculty Academic Standards, Rights & Responsibilities Committee

DATE: April 13, 2015


The FASRR Committee did not receive a charge this academic year. In our only business of the year, I solicited volunteers to chair the FASRR committee in 2015-2016, as my term is ending spring 2015. Michelle Hilaire, who has served very well on this committee for several years, volunteered to serve as chair. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Sincerely,

Timothy Collier
Faculty Development Committee Chair, Jennifer Petrie, up until her departure from UW in November 2014. Dr. Kelly Visnak agreed to fill in as Chair for the remainder of the academic year.

Annual FDC Activities

**Flittie Sabbatical Augmentation Award**

Application deadline: November 18, 2013

Two applications received

One awarded

Additional Process Considerations:

Two applications were received, the FDC expressed concern and it was discovered that in the recent past couple of years one of the colleges decided to choose one applicant to forward to the committee. There is no need for pre-selection to take place.

This process was clarified by the Provost for next year. A note at the time of the award announcement stating that colleges need to forward on all applications to the FDC would be beneficial.
Faculty Awards
Application deadline: January 17, 2014
- John P. Ellbogen Meritorious Classroom Teaching Award
  Five applications received
  Three awarded

- George Duke Humphrey Distinguished Faculty Award
  Two applications received
  One awarded

- Hollon Family Award for Teaching Excellence in Off-Campus Programs
  Two applications received
  One awarded

- John P. Ellbogen Lifetime Teaching Award
  Three applications received
  One awarded

- CASE U.S. Professors of the Year Award
  One nominee recommended by the FDC

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Charges
Statewide Engagement Inventory (charge attached)
FDC was asked to develop a list of UW-led community outreach activities currently ongoing across WY. The purpose of this is to assess the need for the potential development of a subcommittee that would encourage and provide resources for future outreach activities, if the need exists.

Outcome – FDC took information shared by Anne Alexander and Arley Williams regarding documented community outreach projects from 2014, and Jennifer Petrie create spreadsheets for each college, Libraries, AHC, and Outreach. The focus was refined and it was determined to survey our community. Anne Alexander then worked with Project Coordinator Matthew Sholty. The survey was made available online the end of February with a deadline of March 31st. At this time A handful of community members have asked for additional time to respond and Mr. Sholty is out of the office for an extended time due to medical issues. It is likely that a report providing analysis of the survey data will likely be forthcoming this summer.

Selection of FDC Chair for 2015-2016: Jeff Miller
Graduate Council of the University of Wyoming
Annual Report, 2015-16

Submitted by Caroline McCracken-Flesher,
Chair of the Graduate Council 13 April 2015

Council Membership 2014-15:

Voting members: Caroline McCracken-Flesher (Chair); Ann Hild (F14), replaced by David Fay (S15); Carolyn Pepper (F14) replaced by David Estes (S15); Robert Mcgreggor Cawley; Klaas Theodoor Van ‘t Veld; Kelly Tian (F14), replaced by Jose A. Rosa (S15); Peter William Moran; replaced by John F. O'Brien (S15); John O’Brien (F14) replaced by Michael A. Urynowicz (S15); Sreejayan Nair; Mark Brandon Glover; Baskaran Thyagarajan; Benjamin Rashford; Mary Alice Bruce; David S. Fay; Rachel Sailor (F14), replaced by Peter C. Fine (S15).

Graduate Representatives (voting): Kristen Elizabeth Gunther; Gregory R. Sandman

Ex-Officio: Ann Hild, Interim VP for Graduate Education (from November 14); Bill Gern, VP for Research and Economic Development; Susan Frye, Dean of the Outreach School; Maggie Farrell; Dean of Libraries; Mark Green, Director of the American Heritage Center; David Jones, VP for Academic Affairs

The Council met on 13 occasions during the academic year. We also conducted considerable business led by sub committees.

Senate Charges:

Assess if the Graduate Council’s locus of control is negatively impacted by the (then) State Science Standards.

We provided the document “State Funding for Next Generation Science Standards” to the Senate Executive to assist in its forward planning.

Our work was led by a subcommittee of Mary Alice Bruce, Pete Moran, Klaas van’t Veld.

The Executive decided on no further action at that time.

(See appendix 1)

Develop guidelines to re-establish a Graduate School at UW.

The Council developed a “Resolution on Graduate Education.”

This resolution culminates two years of exploration and discussion about graduate education administration. The Council consulted with relevant parties at UW and elsewhere, and in process of developing this document also advised VP Gern and Interim Associate VP Hild on the graduate education parts of UP4.

Our work was led by a subcommittee of Ben Rashford, Greg Cawley, Greg Sandman,
Caroline McCracken.
The resolution is presented for endorsement at the Senate’s April 27 meeting.
(See Senate agenda and attachments for meeting of April 27)

Business from the Interim Associate VP for Graduate Education:

Advise on +/- grading in graduate classes.

The Council solicited information from graduate programs across campus, and shared that information with the interim VP for Graduate Education.

We anticipate an ongoing consideration of the practices, implementation and effects of +/- grading.

Advise on procedures for forming new graduate degree programs, options and certificates.

The Council developed the document: “Procedures for Updating Approval Process for New or Revised Graduate Programs.”
Our work was led by a subcommittee of David Fay, Kristen Gunther, Mary Alice Bruce.
(See attachment.)

Advise on revisions to Admissions Guidelines.

A sub-committee of Michael Urynowicz, David Estes, Sreejayan Nair has begun review of available materials.
This discussion will be taken up by the entire Council in Fall 2015.

Advise on revisions to the Recruitment Initiative.

With Council advice, a subcommittee of Ben Rashford, Klaas van’t Veld and Ann Hild worked with Michele Peck to redraft the solicitation document.

Publicize Assessment of Graduate Programs.

The HLC will make its next site visit in 2018. Assessment must include graduate campus and distance courses. In the future, too, assessment tier status will impact GA allocation. Each program should be defining an assessment project, gathering and reporting data, and applying the results.

Student and faculty data will help Ann Hild indicate the stature of our programs in publicity materials. Programs should send indicators of faculty success, and give examples of faculty honors and extraordinary achievements that can be used to demonstrate activities, success, and academic leadership in individual programs.
Graduate Awards:

The Council recognized faculty and student achievement through the Graduate Faculty Mentor Award, Ellbogen Graduate Teaching Awards, the Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Award and the Outstanding Masters Thesis Award.

Winners receive their awards at the April 23rd Graduate Awards luncheon.

New and Revised Graduate Programs considered by the Council:

Approved: College of Arts & Sciences, Political Science BA/MA
Approved: College of Education, Community College Leadership Certificate
Approved: College of Health Sciences, MS in Health Services Administration
Approved: Criminal Justice MPA concentration

The Executive advanced to the Senate A Bill to Revise UW Regulation 6-805(3.)(d.) Regarding Joint Degrees Awarded by the College of Law. The Council subsequently considered this bill and advised the senate on recommended actions.

Current Business for 2015-16

Review of “+1” graduate degrees:

The Council has undertaken an investigation of trends at UW and nationally, having received a number of requests to approve such programs. We recognize a need for guidelines and procedures for such degrees at UW to allow flexibility but ensure appropriate standards.

A subcommittee of Ben Rashford and Klaas van’t Veld is leading our discussion.

A preliminary report has been submitted to the Council.

Advise on revisions to Admissions Guidelines.

A sub-committee of Michael Urynowicz, David Estes, Sreejayan Nair has begun review of available materials.

This discussion will be taken up by the entire Council in Fall 2015.

+— grading

The Council anticipates gathering further data and perhaps making further recommendations.

Chair 2015-16

The Chair of the Council for 2015-16 is Ben Rashford.
Appendix:

Statement on State Funding for Next Generation Science Standards:

On the matter of State Funding for Next Generation Science Standards in Wyoming schools, the Graduate Council advises as follows:

The National Assessment of Educational Progress has previously found Wyoming school students as outperforming the national average in science. Tracking statistics from 2009 to 2011, Wyoming students continue to widen that gap. NAEP in future will assess progress according to the Next Generation Science Standards. If not taught Next Generation standards, Wyoming students will lose their advantage and Wyoming likely will drift in national ratings. In this context, the Graduate Council notes that the state’s current legislation on Next Generation Science Standards:

1. Undermines UW’s ability to prepare graduates in Education to teach according to disciplinary standards.

2. Undermines the state’s ability to retain graduates to teach in Wyoming.

More broadly, the Graduate Council is concerned that if Wyoming is perceived as a state where scientific inquiry is neither valued nor protected, this could:

3. Undermine the University’s reputation, and thereby all graduate programs’ ability to attract top-notch students and faculty.

Presented to the Executive by Carolyn Pepper, on behalf of the Graduate Council. The Executive determined on no further action at this time.

Attachments:

Procedures for updating approval process for new and revised graduate programs.

For the Council’s proposal on Graduate Education, see attachments to Faculty Senate Agenda, April 27 2015.
Proposal for Updating Approval Process for New or Revised Graduate Programs

A number of new graduate programs have been brought to Academic Affairs and the Graduate Council over the course of this academic year. Some of the reviews associated with these programs have raised important questions about the conceptual underpinnings or logistical execution associated with their implementation. In order to ensure that departments seeking to build new graduate programs at the University have addressed the common questions raised during this process, the Graduate Council proposes a revision of the current structure, including a suggested timeline of meetings that will guide departments in navigating the design and approval of programs.

Summary of Action

The Graduate Council proposes a two-stage process for program approval in which departments first demonstrate the rationale and conceptual viability of a new program before designing the program structure and logistics. The process is estimated to take up to a year to complete – approximately four months for the first stage and eight months for the second stage. Installing a longer time frame for program approval will ensure that all parties involved in reviewing programs have ample time to comment on the proposal before final approval is sought.

The Graduate Council proposes that existing regulations be updated to reflect this timeline and the new approval process.

Stage One: Conceptual Foundations

At the initial stage of new or updated program design, the proposing faculty and/or department(s) must document the rationale and conceptual validity of the proposed program. Key questions that must be answered are:

- Are you submitting a new graduate program, or a revision to an existing program?
- In what way will this program serve a documented/recognized need among students or potential students?
- What is the expected career trajectory of students completing this degree program?
- Is this degree program novel, or is it a program that has been implemented at other universities?
- How does this proposed degree program address the changing landscape of the existing field/profession?
- What are the benefits that the University of Wyoming will gain by adding this program? How will this program serve Wyoming and/or national needs?
- Will the outreach program be involved and how?

After crafting a proposal that addresses these questions, departmental representatives must meet with their college’s dean (in the case of cooperating departments in different colleges, each college dean must be consulted). At this meeting, the deans will be informed of the intention to create a new program; if deans have feedback or suggestions at this time, they will share it with the faculty before the process continues. If the Outreach School will be involved, Outreach administrators will also be consulted at this time.

Following consultation with college deans, the proposal must be separately presented to the Dean or Vice President for Graduate Studies and then the Graduate Council. The Dean/VP for Graduate Studies will
meet with the Graduate Council after these presentations to solicit input and render a decision whether the proposed program, with any suggested changes, should proceed to the next stage of the process. Input from affected college deans will be welcomed at this time.

Based on the perceived merit of the proposed program, the proposing faculty will be informed that they may proceed to Stage Two and complete a full program proposal. It is important to emphasize that approval at Stage One does not constitute or indicate final program approval.

**Stage Two: Program Development and Approval**

After receiving approval to present a full proposal, departments may proceed with program development. At this stage, the logistical questions concerning program implementation must be answered. Areas that we propose to especially emphasize in this proposal are:

**Program structure**

- What are the program requirements? What timeline do you anticipate for students proceeding through the program? A two/three-year course rotation map must be included.
- Will any new courses be added in order to implement this program?
- What kind of oversight will this program have? What are your benchmarks for short- and long-term program success?
- If your proposal requires external educators, how will you ensure academic rigor in these courses?

**Resources**

- What new resources (GAs, administrative support, staff, etc.) will be required to implement this program? How do you propose to supply these resources?
- Which faculty will be required to serve the teaching duties proposed? Are the identified faculty currently teaching on-load? If faculty sabbaticals or retirements are anticipated within the next 5 years, what are the plans for accommodating them? What modifications in current instruction will be required?
- If your proposal requires external educators, what funding will support these hires?
- Does Outreach play a role in your proposal? If so, what are the financial break-even points for enrollment?
- What Library resources will be necessary for the implementation of your proposal?

**Student admission, enrollment, and assessment**

- What is the anticipated enrollment in this program, and what data provide the basis for this estimate?
- What will your admissions process and criteria be? If you anticipated a significant need for this program in your conceptual proposal, do you have a plan in place to address potential high demand (e.g. enrollment caps)?
- How do you plan to monitor student success throughout the duration of their studies? Do you have an assessment plan in place?

**Departmental and College cooperation**

- Have you formed Memoranda of Understanding between cooperating departments and programs?
- Will you be altering the structure of existing programs, or eliminating programs, in order to accommodate this new program?
Once a full proposal addressing these questions has been prepared, it will first be shared for comment within participating departments/programs, and then brought to the appropriate college dean(s). Once it has received comments at both levels, the proposal proceeds to the Graduate VP/Dean and the Graduate Council for discussion and final approval. Academic Affairs must approve the proposal before it travels to the President and Trustees (if appropriate). The final proposal presented to the President and Trustees must include the proposal elements from Stage One and Stage Two.
Meeting agenda and documents are available at:
http://www-lib.uwyo.edu/about/library_council/minutes.cfm.

Meeting dates and minutes:
The Council met on October 20, November 17, February 9, and April 6th.

Purpose of the Library Council:
To advise and assist the libraries on issues and policies related to strategic planning, organization, operations, and resource allocation. It reports to the Dean of Libraries and Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

Council members for 2014-2015:
- Agriculture (Veterinary Sciences) – Kerry Sondgeroth
- Arts and Sciences (Statistics) – Shaun Wulff
- Arts and Sciences (History) – JoAnna Poblete
- Business (Management and Marketing) – Bob Sprague, Chair
- Education (Secondary Education) – Andrea Burrows
- Engineering (Electrical & Computer Engineering) – Margareta Stefanovic
- Health Sciences (Pharmacy) – Melissa Hunter
- Law School (Law Library) – Debora Person
- Libraries (Collection Development) – David Macaulay
- American Heritage Center (Toppan Rare Books Library) – Anne Marie Lane
- Graduate Student – Taylor Schmick
- Undergraduate Student – Alex Krysl
- Non-University (Albany County Public Library) – Cindy Moore

OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSIONS
(in no particular order)

Libraries’ Budget: Library Council received updates at every meeting regarding the collection budget total, possible tuition increases that will restore collection funding from the recent budget reductions, and how the collection funds are used for journals, books, media, and divided by format and board subject areas. Collection Development and Library Administration keep a close watch on collection funds to ensure faculty and student research and teaching needs are met.

Collection Budgets and Journal Review: Sandy Barstow, Head of Collection Development, provided regular reports on the collection budget. Sandy provided detailed information on the collection budget allocation and statistics on previous purchases. Sandy discussed a new program that provides startup funds for new faculty to build library collections in their disciplines and while many are not taking the Libraries up on their offer, this is a positive public relations strategy that the Libraries will not only
continue but hope to increase participation. In addition, the Libraries conducted a journal review in the spring 2015 and Sandy asked for Council members to encourage comments from colleagues in their departments.

**Liaisons:** Lori Phillips, Associate Dean, provided an update regarding the transition from Librarian Bibliographers to Librarian Liaisons. The emphasis on instruction and research support is a result of changes in selection processes for library materials. Journals are typically purchased as part of large packages, ebooks are purchased as a group, and English language materials/western publishers distribute through book jobbers via approval plans. The changes in how materials are reviewed and selected have resulted in changes in how academic libraries select and purchase materials. At the same time, increased emphasis on student success and information literacy is demanding more time of our librarians working side by side with teaching faculty in creating course content. Librarians can contribute to the research process through assistance in grant writing, data management, deposit of federally funded research, copyright, and open access publishing. By restructuring our Research and Instruction Department, the Libraries are better able to contribute to university instruction and research goals.

**EScience Project and STEM Initiatives:** Lori Phillips, Associate Dean, and Larry Schmidt, Head, Brinkerhoff Geology Library are participants with Jeff Hamerlinck, Director, WyGISC, in an EScience course that will inform the Libraries as well as other UW departments in understanding the research and teaching needs for the sciences especially in the area of online resources and services. The three will share their insights with academic and research units.

**Interlibrary Services:** William Van Arsdale, Head, Access Services, provided informative updates regarding the availability of resources from other libraries around the globe. Most faculty know about interlibrary loan services which is a sharing of materials between libraries. But in addition, UW participates in Prospector that is a sharing and courier service between Wyoming and Colorado. This speedy service provides access to millions of materials and recently was connected with MOBIUS increasing access to materials in Missouri. This service is quicker than traditional interlibrary loan and has been a huge benefit for UW faculty and students. In addition, Access Services maintains Request It! which helps faculty with quick access to UW and other materials without deciding which service is best for their request.

**Digital Initiatives:** Chad Hutchens, Head, Digital Collections, Stephen Boss, Head, Library IT/Systems, Kelly Visnak, Scholarly Communications Librarian, and Larry Schmidt, Head, Brinkerhoff Geology Library provided a comprehensive overview of the various digital initiatives within the Libraries. In order to bring national attention to UW unique collections and to assist faculty and students with their research, the Libraries are actively expanding digital operations. In addition, the Libraries are building an infrastructure to host a variety of scholarship including presentations such as Saturday University, summaries of conferences such as Undergraduate Research Day, unique collections such as the Herbarium, special collections such as maps, and faculty publications. Digital collections and more information is available at: [http://uwyo.coalliance.org/](http://uwyo.coalliance.org/).
Informative presentations to the Council by various library faculty:
  Collaborative Spaces – Kaijsa Calkins, Research & Instruction Librarian
  Interlibrary Loan Tour – Diane Trotter, ILL Unit Head
  Frozen Pipes in Coe Library – Maggie Farrell
  Proposed Endowed Positions - Maggie Farrell
  ClimateQual - Lori Phillips
  UP4 and Libraries’ Planning – Maggie Farrell and Lori Phillips

Special library events in which Council members were invited to participate:
  The University Libraries 2015 Author Luncheon: Andrew Solomon, April 22nd

Selection of Council Chair for 2015-2016: Dr. Andrea Burrows, College of Education
April 14, 2015
Larry Schmidt, 2014-2015 Chair, Research Advisory Committee Faculty Senate

Annual Report of the University of Wyoming Faculty Senate Research Advisory Committee (RAC).

During the 2014 – 2015 Academic Year the RAC met once to discuss the Faculty Grant In Aid proposals to decide on this year's grant recipients. This meeting took place on Wednesday March 4, 2014. We also discussed and changed the Faculty Grant in Aid ranking form for proposals to address problems with using a ranking scale for some of the evaluation criteria. We used the new system this academic year and believe it has proved to be a better system.

FGIA Awards
The following recipients were awarded Faculty Grant In Aid (FGIA) awards by the Research Advisory Committee.

**Name – Department – Amount**
Minear, Meredith – Psychology - $7500
Fonseca, Vanessa – Chicano Studies - $7500
Penningroth, Suzanna – Psychology - $7500
Thyagarajan, Baskaran – Pharmacy - $5000
Belmont, Erica – Mechanical Engineering - $7500
Cammack, Kristi – Animal Science - $7500
Guo, Wei – Animal Science - $7500
Arulsamy, Navamoney – Chemistry - $2500

Total Awarded -- $52,500

We also considered and addressed the following charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate charged the Research Advisory Committee to assess if the "committee’s locus of control is negatively impacted by this decision [the Legislature’s decision to defund the review or adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards] and, if so, draft a resolution for consideration by the Faculty Senate."

The Research Advisory Committee determined that the impact of defunding the NGSS by the Legislature does not affect the work that we do or the strength of the research enterprise at the University of Wyoming at this time. We are open to revisiting this issue at a later time as more information becomes available on the affects that the Legislature’s stance has on the University of Wyoming research enterprise and academic standing.
Research Advisory Committee - 2014-15 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Expires (Spring)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Applied Economics</td>
<td>Ben Rashford</td>
<td>2017(2)</td>
<td>66474</td>
<td>brashfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Anna Zajacova</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>63342</td>
<td>azajacov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Geology &amp; Geophysics</td>
<td>Kenneth Sims</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>63306</td>
<td>ksims7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>Charles Mason</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65336</td>
<td>bambuzlr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Elementary &amp; Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Jennifer Forrester</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>268-2274</td>
<td>jforres5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Suresh Muknahalliapatna</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>63174</td>
<td>sureshm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>Douglas Petersen</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66405</td>
<td>dpeter39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Diane Courselle</td>
<td>2015(R)</td>
<td>63118</td>
<td>dcourcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff Geology Library</td>
<td>Larry Schmidt, Chair</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62844</td>
<td>lschmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>American Heritage Center</td>
<td>Leslie Waggener</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62557</td>
<td>lwaggen2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>UW-Casper</td>
<td>Dagmara Motriuk Smith</td>
<td>2016(2)</td>
<td>268-2542</td>
<td>motriuk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)=second consecutive term
(R)=replacement for an unexpired term

Larry Schmidt will be chair for the 2015 -2016 term.

Respectfully submitted:

Larry Schmidt
Chair FA
Monday, April 13, 2015,

Student Interaction Committee Annual Report

At the November 10, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a proposal was brought forward calling to reduce the number of upper division hours mandated at UW from 48 to 42. This requirement can be found in UW Regulation 6-404, Section IV.A. ([http://www.uwyo.edu/generalcounsel/_files/docs/uw-reg-6-404.pdf](http://www.uwyo.edu/generalcounsel/_files/docs/uw-reg-6-404.pdf)). At that time Senate Executive determined that more information would be required before deciding whether to revise the pertinent UW Regulation.

The Student Interaction Committee consists of 10 committee members. Out of the 10 members 6 provided feedback on the aforementioned charge. 1 out of 6 members (fully) supported the reduction of upper division courses from 48 to 42 hours.

1. A rationale—what is the validity of 48 hours? How would a reduction impact this rationale? What is the rationale for reducing?

General thoughts from the committee:

- Reducing hours from 48 to 42 only benefits transferred students from community colleges—transferring lower-level credits and taking fewer courses at UW
- 48 out of 120 credits (40%) from upper level courses for a bachelor’s degree is not unreasonable
- Reduction in upper division credits may compromise the diversity gained or full content knowledge needed for success after graduation
- 42 hours would preserve rigor while at the same time allow students to complete requirements earlier
- Departments should be allowed to set curriculum hours
- Reducing hours cannot be to improve the quality of the degree, but to increase the flexibility of the degree earning process
- Reduction could lead to watering down of the quality of some degree programs or the replacement of upper division UW hours with lower division community college hours
- Students must take a relatively rigorous courses to graduate- otherwise we devalue the degree
- If reducing the requirement does not affect the number of credit hours taken, there is only a weak rational for reducing it
- If upper division requirements results in superfluous courses being taken, there is a good rationale for reducing the requirement
- Easier to preserve proper levels of academic rigor at the department level rather than at the University level, which in and of itself is a rationale.

2. How will this impact/be impacted by ongoing programs at UW:

The new USP;

- The new USP would seem to remove some lower division hour requirements
- Not sure that the reduction in upper division hours would have an additional impact other than making students search and take more 2000 level courses than in the past
• Could affect new USP with more faculty availability and make it easier for transfer students to graduate on time
  a. The new 2+2 60x60 plans in conjunction with our Community College partners; and/or
• The reduction should have a significant impact on community college partners as more students will likely take more community college hours and transfer them in without taking those UW hours
• Will lead to a reduction in UW course demand
  b. The new ongoing tuition increases.
• Likely lead to more community college transfers and lower demand for UW courses
• Cutting down classes would benefit UW budget, because when adding classes, additional revenues from tuition are offset by additional and larger liabilities which require more state money which can be hard to get

3. Might departments/programs be able to better balance out course offerings at the 1000/2000 level as opposed to the 3000/4000 level?
• Could lead to dilution of quality of degree programs if the 1000/2000 level do not add quality at a lower level

4. Might this reduce the number of artificially inflated course numbers offered to satisfy the upper division requirements?
• If there is already an existing problem with this on campus
• Most likely not- departments are eager to demonstrate that they are adding rigor to a class by bumping it from 2000 to a 3000 and don’t want to be seen as making their respective majors or classes easier
• Decent incentive to bump up numbering as that may attract more students who need to fulfill the 48 upper division credit hour requirement
• By reducing, we don’t create a separate incentive to add lower division credit hours and won’t see much of a change

5. How will this impact minors, double majors, areas of concentration, and endorsements?
• Likely lead to reductions in minors and double majors
• As Fewer courses from other departments will be taken the incentive to “take one more” and complete the minor or double major will be reduced
• Could lead to a quality reduction in the degrees offered by UW
• Do not see much of an impact in this area

Kim Miller will be chair of the committee for the 2015-16 academic year.

Kim Miller, Chair Student Interaction Committee

Kimberly D Miller, Ed.D
University of Wyoming
Elementary and Early Childhood Education
College of Education
309 McWhinnie Hall
Laramie, WY 82071
307-766-4006
Kmiller1@uwyo.edu
TO: University of Wyoming Faculty Senate

FROM: **Course Review Committee**

RE: Annual Report

The University Course Review Committee has met five times during the 14-15 academic year (last meeting of the year is scheduled for April 15). In total the committee approved 215 course action items. The breakdown and classification by college/school is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources</th>
<th>Courses Modified</th>
<th>Courses Added</th>
<th>Courses Discontinued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWYO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee member included Bruce Cameron (AGNR), Audrey Shalinsky (A&S), Kent Drummond (BUS), Leslie Rush (ED), David Whitman (ENG), Rex Gantenbein (HS), Jacquelyn Bridgemon (LAW). Ex-officio members, Susan Frye (Outreach School), _______________ (ASUW).

Respectfully submitted

Bruce A. Cameron, Chair (14-15).
Committee Membership
Treva Sprout Ahrenholtz, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Jennifer Deckert, College of Arts and Sciences
Cindy Price-Schultz, College of Arts and Sciences
Robert Godby, College of Business
Samara Madrid, Chair, College of Education
Cameron Wright, College of Engineering and Applied Science
Mark Byra, College of Health Sciences
Cassandra Kvenild, University Libraries
Rachael Dreyer, American Heritage Center
Jason Katzmann, UW Casper
Tyler Wolfgang, ASUW

Ex Officio Members
Jo Chytka, Advising and Career Services, Student Affairs
Alyson Hagy, University Studies Coordinator
Joe Jensen, Athletics, Academic Planning Committee

Purpose of Committee
The committee is primarily charged with setting policy and approving courses for the 2003 and 2015 University Studies Program. Committee members met weekly (either in-person or electronically) throughout the 2014-2015 academic year.

Course Approvals/Rejections
Departments offering USP courses submit syllabi and other supporting materials to the USP Committee as part of the approval process.

The committee reviewed over 100 new course proposals. No courses were rejected for their proposed designations. The following chart shows approvals for each USP category:
## Summary of USP Courses Approved/Rejected (by component)

### 2015 Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>FYS</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>PN*</th>
<th>H*</th>
<th>Q*</th>
<th>V*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Approved</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Withdrawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Committee does not to review PN, H, Q or V courses for the 2015 program. Those courses are reviewed and approved at the college level. If the program does not fall under the umbrella of a college than the USP committee gave final approval.

**At the time of this report the committee had 12 courses that were waiting to be approved.

### 2003 Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>QA</th>
<th>QB</th>
<th>S, SB, SP, SE</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### USP Embeddable Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Approved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Chair for 2015-2016 Academic Year – Cassandra Kvenild
Committee membership: Steve Smutko (Chair), K.J. Reddy, Jeanne Holland, Dean Roddick, Narina Nunez, Margaret Wilson, Sherrill Shaffer, Stacey Baker, Deborah McGriff, Steve Bialostok, Suresh Muknahallipatna, Khaled Ksaibati, Diane Boyle, Tristan Wallhead, Michael Duff, Sandy Barstow, Anne Marie Lane

The University Review, Tenure and Promotion Committee met in 2014-15 to conduct two items of business: (1) address changes proposed by the Faculty Senate to University Regulation 5-803 pertaining to Year 1 appointment reviews; and (2) review reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases.

I. Faculty Senate Charge to Review University Regulation 5-803
Faculty Senate requested the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee (RT&P) to address proposed changes to UW Regulation 5-803 pertaining to Year 1 appointment reviews. The RT&P Committee was asked by Faculty Senate to consider the following questions:

1. Should the process for reviewing year 1 candidates be revised as proposed?
2. Should the review process be revised, as is proposed, but additional changes and/or edits be made for clarification purposes?
3. Should the process remain the same, and thus no changes be made?
4. Should the first-year review be eliminated?

The URT&P committee convened on November 10, 2014 and December 15, 2014 to discuss the proposed changes to 5-803. There was considerable debate about the value of first-year reviews, given the current timing and structure of those reviews (e.g., evaluating teaching before end-of-semester course/student evaluations could be made). It was concluded that first-year reviews would be beneficial if they were conducted in such a way that relevant and meaningful feedback about the candidates current and future performance could be provided.

The committee determined that the review process outlined in UW 5-803 should be revised and requested Chair Steve Smutko and Interim Associate VP Tami Benham Deal to make additional changes/edits that would clarify the process (see Recommended Changes to 5-803, below).

The committee also requested the Office of Academic Affairs to provide guidance to academic units on ways to make first-year reviews more meaningful. In response to this request, a supplemental document to the reappointment, tenure and promotion memo (that is distributed to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads in late summer and posted on the AA website) will be developed.
Recommended Changes to 5-803.

e. Review of Probationary Faculty

i. Mandatory review of probationary faculty for reappointment shall occur in the spring of the first, second, and fourth years of employment.

ii. First Year Review. The review in the spring of the first year of employment will have one of two consequences: 1) after completion of the procedures described below, the Board of Trustees may authorize a probationary faculty member to proceed to the second year review, in which case the employment of the faculty member may continue through the third year; or 2) the Board of Trustees may terminate the faculty member's employment at the end of the first year.

   (1) The review in the spring of the first year of employment shall be initiated by the department head and shall follow the procedures described for reappointment, tenure and promotion in section 3.a.iii.-ix. Departmental Level above.

   (2) After review at the departmental level, and if the dean concurs with the positive recommendations of the department and department head, the dean will forward his/her recommendation along with supporting data and ratings directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If desired, the dean may include comments along with his/her evaluation.

   (3) The folder of a faculty member who has not been recommended for a subsequent review by departmental colleagues or the department head shall be referred by the dean to the college reappointment, tenure and promotion committee for review and vote. When a candidate has received positive recommendations from the department and but the dean is not in a position to make a positive recommendation wants additional input, the case shall be referred to the college reappointment, tenure and promotion committee, with comments from the dean, for review and vote.

   (4) Insofar as termination is a tenure-bearing issue, candidates not recommended for subsequent reviews shall be reviewed by the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee if the decision of one of the lower units, i.e., departmental colleagues, department head, college reappointment, tenure and promotion committee, or dean, is in conflict with that of another. After discussion, each member shall cast a written ballot containing reasons for the vote.

   (5) Upon completing deliberations, the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee shall communicate its recommendations in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the reasons for its recommendations.

   (6) The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall deliberate each case and make his/her recommendation to the President of the University. The recommendations of the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be made available to the candidate. For any case where the Vice President for Academic Affairs recommends termination, the candidate shall have the right to add a
statement of response. In all cases, the candidate shall initial and date the recommendations to indicate having seen the final compilation of papers.

II. Review of Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Cases

Per University Regulation 5-803, the University Review, Tenure, and Promotion Committee reviews cases that are conflicted, that is, cases in which the decisions by the department, college, department head, or dean conflict; early promotion cases; and cases referred by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for additional faculty review. The Committee reviewed nine conflicted cases, two early promotion cases, and four discretionary cases. The Committee met on March 20 and 31 to meet with candidates and discuss their cases. The committee voted and commented on the nine conflicted cases and the two early promotion cases, and provided comments on the four review cases. Comments and votes were due to Academic Affairs by April 5, 2015.

The Committee also discussed items of procedure that emanated from this year’s review. Two items of note are worthy of the Faculty Senate’s attention:

1. Joint Appointments Across Departments and Schools. The Committee was challenged by a lack of clarity in the process where faculty have responsibilities in an academic department and a School (i.e., the School of Energy Resources and the Haub School of Environment and Natural Resources) and are being reviewed by faculty in the candidate’s department and college, and the school. The evaluation process is in this case is not consistent with the process outlined in University Regulation 5-803 3.b.xiii. The Committee recommends that University Regulations and/or Academic Affairs policy on these matters be clarified.

2. Letters from Outside Reviewers. Candidates had received incorrect advice from department chairs regarding their right to review and comment on redacted copies of letters from outside reviewers pertaining to tenure and promotion recommendations. Some candidates had been informed that they had no right to see redacted copies of those letters.

III. Other Business

The Committee elected Sandy Barstow (University Libraries) as Chair of the 2015-16 URT&P Committee.

Respectfully submitted by

L. Steven Smutko (Chair)

April 15, 2015