

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

4-30-2012

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, April 30, 2012

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, April 30, 2012" (2012). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 163.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/163

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.





**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
APRIL 30, 2012
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Glenn McEvoy called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of April 2, 2012 was made by Robert Schmidt and seconded by Renee Galliher. The motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – GLENN MCEVOY

Glenn welcomed the new faculty senators. He also emphasized that only current sitting faculty senators are to vote on items presented at today's meeting.

Roll Call. Members are reminded to sign in today.

Open Microphones. Senate members are reminded that microphones are open and pick up whispers and side conversations.

Shared Governance Award. Glenn recognized the first award recipient Diane Calloway-Graham. He also recognized the other finalists: Rhonda Miller, Ed Reeve, Robert Schmidt, and Flora Shrode.

Faculty Forum Wrap-up. There were five major items. Post-tenure review, external letters, and integration of USU- Eastern are on the agenda today. Extra service compensation (overload compensation) was another issue and Provost Coward presented the existing policy and had a discussion in the January senate meeting. The last item was faculty involvement in campus planning and Dave Cowley was invited to address the senate at this time.

Dave stated that the major issue seemed to be greater faculty input when it comes to new capital projects. We have been looking toward some kind of architectural review committee to review the overall plans and also deal with the unit objectives, but we find there are multiple campus interests at play as well. This committee would have multiple interests represented in the early pre-planning stages so that all of the issues about building site, placement materials, and set-backs are consistent with the master planning principles and represent cross-campus interests. He anticipates both academic and administrative appointments to the committee.

UNIVERSITY BUSINESS - PRESIDENT ALBRECHT

The president thanked the senate for the opportunity of working with them this year. He said what Dave Cowley just did was an example of the president's team trying to be responsive to the issues that come up and he encouraged the faculty to engage administration in conversations about issues of concern so they can respond.

Sydney Petersen presented the commencement schedule. Friday is the graduate hooding ceremony. Line up in the Fieldhouse at 12:30 p.m., the procession starts at 1:00 and the ceremony starts at 1:30. For Saturday's undergraduate ceremony, line up on the quad at 8:30 a.m., the procession begins at 9:00 and the ceremony begins at 9:30 a.m.

The president said when the faculty returns for the new academic year in the fall there will be a College naming, and the conclusion of the capital campaign.

CONSENT AGENDA - GLENN MCEVOY

Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to approve the consent agenda and Mark McLellan seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion was passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Calendar Committee Report - Michelle Larson. The calendar is approved three years out and there is nothing unusual about the presented calendar found in your packets. The calendar does reflect the new summer schedule. This will hopefully give students the opportunity to put together a full summer schedule and build a more complete summer experience.

Continuing USU-Eastern Integration - Glenn McEvoy. The senate presidency made a trip to Price in February and talked with faculty who were in years 1 through 3 who were in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty who are in years 4-6 use their own USU-Eastern approach to promotion and tenure and those in years 1-3 adopted the USU model. These faculty (years 1-3) are working with their established P & T committees in their home departments on the Logan campus, but don't have any senior faculty to mentor them on their own campus as they attempt to understand how role statements and the promotion and tenure process work at Utah State. What we found are some concerns around role statements. Many are not used to role statements that are low in research, say 10%, and a high percent teaching, say 85%. Does that mean they have to meet a higher standard of excellence than someone who has a 50% teaching assignment? These kinds of questions are going to have to be worked through by P & T committees. USU-Eastern faculty also wanted to know if role statements can be re-negotiated. The code says yes they can be. On the visit the FS presidency also found that some deans, department heads, and P & T committees have really done a good job of reaching out to the untenured faculty at USU-Eastern, mentoring, encouraging, and helping them understand how the USU system works. Other deans and departments have not done as well. Thus, we need to encourage deans, department heads and P & T committees to reach out and have more frequent and more personal contact with the folks at USU-Eastern. Glenn encourages them to go down and visit and see what campus is like if they have not already done so.

The research versus teaching issue is hard and sometimes intimidating to faculty who are not used to being a part of a larger organization that is so heavily involved in research. Thus some faculty at USU-Eastern wonder if their focus on teaching is really going to be valued at USU. We need to assure them that the dissemination of knowledge is as important as the creation of knowledge at Utah State University.

Committee on Committees Annual Report - Flora Shrode. We need two more Committee on Committees members. Faculty members were encouraged to become involved in any committees that still need members.

Post-Tenure Review Task Force, Report #2 - Glenn McEvoy. A month ago we presented the diagnosis of problems and issues gathered from meetings with college administrators and the open forums held with faculty. This report identifies some generally suggested guidelines on the following issues:

- *Issue #1* - The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities encouraged review for possible revision noting inconsistent implementation in our post-tenure faculty evaluation policies and procedures. The task force confirmed the problem and encourages colleges to engage in the post-tenure review process as required by current code.
- *Issue #2* - The review process required by current code is time intensive and typically focuses on faculty who are meeting or exceeding expectations, so little is gained. The task force suggests re-defining the annual performance reviews of tenured faculty conducted by department heads as

“post-tenure reviews.” Peer review would be reserved for cases where faculty performance does not meet department head expectations for two years in a row. This would be a better use of time and human resources.

- *Issue #3* - The financial reward for superior post-tenure performance is difficult to deal with given the vagaries of legislative funding. In any year where monies are available, merit, retention, and equity pay allocations are typically made.
- *Issue #4* - Substandard faculty performance should be addressed more quickly than every five years. If the annual performance review also serves as the post-tenure review then issues are dealt with on an ongoing basis.
- *Issue #5* – Current code requires the use of a peer review committee that is created for each tenured faculty member undergoing review. The use of a standing college committee may improve objectivity in such peer reviews and perhaps help alleviate some of the problems that occur in departments when senior faculty are required to evaluate each other's performance.
- *Issue #6* - The task force supports and endorses the idea of checks and balances. If a tenured faculty member's performance is to be judged deficient, that judgment should be agreed to by more than just the department head.

A question was asked regarding the next step in implementing the ideas and suggestions made by the task force. If the faculty feels that the task force has identified what needs to be addressed, then someone needs to draft some specific code language and take it through the approval process. Glenn asked for a straw poll on whether the task force was headed in the right direction. Senators seemed to agree that they were. A senate member was worried that if the five year review was not a part of the codified process that the state legislature might not be satisfied. A suggestion was made, by a task force committee member, that the annual reviews could be made more transparent and thus satisfy legislative needs. Legislators want to see the process not the reviews. The sense of the task force is that annual reviews are occurring across campus. Another suggestion was made that due to vagaries of review and publication cycles, that annual reviews should cover the last three to five years rather than the last twelve months. A question arose about evaluator bias and how to deal with it. A committee member suggested that a faculty member has the right to ask that someone else review their work in these cases to balance the evaluative situation. We need to think about appropriate rewards to avoid salary compression and inversion. It was also suggested that the various Faculty Senate Standing Committees review and make suggestions to any proposed code changes as part of this code modification process.

ACTION ITEMS

Open Access Policy - Flora Shrode. Flora passed out a procedures list for the policy found in the agenda packet. The purpose of the policy is to protect author's rights to the scholarly articles that they produce, so that they can be made available through the digital commons online repository. A policy can help protect faculty from signing away their rights to publishers if they so choose. Authors may choose to waive the policy and proceed to publish as they please. After feedback from the Human Resources Office it was determined that the policy actually fits better in Section 500 of university policy. The policy is shorter because the policy was separated from its procedures, since procedures may change when policy usually stays the same. A senate member who is an editor reminded faculty that if they do give up their copyright and put it up on open access they may also be giving up their royalties as well. Also some publishers might not want to re-publish articles if they know they are in open access. The issue of embargo's came up as it relates to the policy and faculty were encouraged to check with library staff to determine what that may mean for them. A motion was made and seconded that the faculty senate approve policy 535, the motion passed. After the policy leaves the senate it goes to Human Resources and then to Vice President Cowley and the Executive Council and subsequently it needs presidential acceptance and lastly approval by the Board of Trustees.

PRPC Code Changes Section 405.7.2(1) and 405.8.3(1) Second Reading. A comment was made that AFT had submitted some code changes dealing with this section and wondered where those were in the process. They have been sent to the PRPC and they will review those next year. This part of the code needs to be changed now because it is critical for external review letters that will be requested this coming fall. Mike Parent moved to accept the second reading of the code changes. The motion was seconded by Vince Wickwar. There was some discussion as to when the secondary area of emphasis would be evaluated. The proposed revision to the code leaves that decision up to the candidate, department head, and P & T committee. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Nominations for Committee on Committees members - Flora Shrode. Yanghee Kim was nominated to the Committee on Committees for a one year term. No-one else was nominated to fill the second vacancy. If we don't have a full slate to fill the positions we can bring it back in the fall since the Committee on Committees work happens mostly in the spring.

CONCLUDING REMARKS - GLENN MCEVOY.

Glenn presented Vince Wickwar, as outgoing Past President, a certificate and a gift. The gavel was turned over to Renee Galliher who will be the Faculty Senate President next year. Renee in turn presented Glenn with a plaque and a gift as outgoing President of the Faculty Senate.

College senators were asked to caucus to choose their Faculty Senate Executive Committee members.

ADJOURNMENT 4:10 P.M.