

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

11-1-2004

## Proceedings of the Faculty Forum November 1, 2004

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Proceedings of the Faculty Forum November 1, 2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 40.  
[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/40](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/40)

This Faculty Senate Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



## **Proceedings of the Faculty Forum November 1, 2004**

Derek Mason, President-Elect conducted the forum.

Items discussed at the Faculty Forum are as follows:

### **Direction of Utah State University**

President Hall's current proposal would result in a projected increase of 4% for faculty. President Hall is concerned that we are losing faculty members and top administrators due to salaries. One of the major issues is fuel and power costs. The year end projection for fuel and power is negative \$9.5 million. Faculty need to be aware of the situation and get the word out to students. A couple of questions were raised regarding the 4% increase. What is the long term plan in getting Utah State to the same level as peer institutions? What if the legislature doesn't come up with the 2%? What happens to the 4%? Does the increase take into account the cost of living? Is the increase based on merit? Will the increase be spread across merit over the past three years when there wasn't an increase? How does the legislature expect an institution to run without fuel and power? There needs to be protest down at the legislature on a regular basis and hit our legislature a little harder. The most effective lobbyist for Utah State is the students themselves. Students are very important in this process. There are a number of specific issues that need to be addressed before the senate should consider a resolution. Would it be possible to have these questions answered to this body? Faculty are appreciative of President Hall's efforts.

### **Benefits**

Post Retirement. Faculty would like the different Faculty Senate committees to look into post retirement options.

Domestic Partners Benefits. A brief overview of the Domestic Partners Benefits proposal was given. Many institutions are moving towards domestic partners benefits for all domestic partners. The proposal is to extend domestic partners benefits to same sex partners. There was concern of which battles to fight. There could be political costs. The proposal is currently being reviewed by the BFW committee.

Improve Information on Human Resources Webpage. It was suggested that the Human Resources webpage include the medical figures for dual career couples and the formula for figuring early retirement requirements.

### **Faculty Evaluations**

Faculty would like the Faculty Senate to pursue the issue of course evaluations posted on the web. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has asked the Faculty Evaluation Committee to produce a second opinion in regards to Craig Simper's letter. There is an issue of faculty privacy and potential employer's viewing the evaluations. It was suggested that there needs to be a standard procedure for Faculty Evaluations for online courses and distance education courses.

### **Advisor Evaluations**

Currently students advised by faculty can go to the Advising Office and fill out a survey on the quality of service received by the faculty member. The issue is whether or not this process is in the code. A faculty member suggested that John Mortensen present this proposal to the faculty senate and go through the correct channels.

### **Promotion and Tenure**

Faculty voiced concern that, in some areas, promotion and tenure policies contained in USU's Code are not being followed. One example given was a College asking for outside letters from reviewers at peer-institutions, while the Code calls for reviews by four peers of rank equivalent to or higher than that sought by the candidate. In addition, faculty also pointed to the need for adherence to USU Policy 4.05.2.2, which indicates that evaluation for tenure and promotion be guided by the role statement. The concern here is that if the University wishes to "raise the bar", it should do so through faculty role statements and not by administrative fiat

### **Faculty Union**

Faculty expressed interest in union representation. Several options were discussed (e.g., AFT, AAU), but it was pointed out that collective bargaining was prohibited by state statute.

The forum adjourned at 4:30 pm.

The meeting was attended by 78 individuals.