Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

11-5-2012

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, November 5, 2012

Utah State University

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

Utah State University
MERRILL-CAZIER LIBRARY

USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 5, 2012
Taggart Student Center Auditorium

The Faculty Forum is convened in lieu of the regularly scheduled November meeting of the Senate. This annual scheduled meeting of the Faculty Forum is open to all faculty members to attend and speak, with the exception of the President of the University, the Provost, the presidential appointees, deans and department heads, or the student members of the Senate, unless specifically requested by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum…Participants may discuss subjects of current interest, question and debate any policies and procedures, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate…The Faculty Forum Executive Committee sets the agenda for the November meeting…The agenda includes all items raised by the petition(s) of faculty, together with items deemed pertinent by the Executive Committee. (Code Section: 402.9.1 & .9.2)

Renee Galliher called the forum to order at 3:00 pm.

Welcome and review of the outcomes of last year's forum discussion.

Follow-up from Faculty Forum 2011

- **Post-tenure review**. A task force convened last year to gather information on the post-tenure review process, and is ready to produce recommendations that will be presented to the senate in the coming months. The task force recommends an evaluation process that addresses concerns raised in last spring's information gathering meetings, recognizes performance, and supports faculty who are struggling to meet expectations.

- **Faculty involvement in campus planning**. Recently an Architectural Review Committee headed by Dave Cowley has been developed with faculty representation to engage faculty in campus wide planning.

- **Extra-service compensation**. The BFW Committee is working on this issue and solicited comments from across campus. They are currently in the process of summarizing their findings and will be presenting a proposal to the faculty senate in the near future.

- **Integration of USU-Eastern.** Each spring the Faculty Senate Presidency has traveled to USU-Eastern to have an informal meeting with our colleagues to facilitate communication and find solutions to problems that have arisen. The sense is that every year, things are improving. Communication is vitally important as we integrate our colleagues into our colleges and departments. The smoothest integration has been by those department heads and deans who actively reach out to CEU-Eastern faculty members and integrate them fully into department decision making.

Introduce the six chairs of the standing university committees.

- Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)
    - o Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFT) Bryce Fifield, Chair (excused)
    - o Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee (BFW) Carol Kochan, Chair

---

- o [Committee on Committees (CoC)](#) Cathy Bullock, Chair (excused)
- o [Educational Policies Committee (EPC)](#) Larry Smith, Chair
- o [Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)](#) Karen Mock, Chair
- o [Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC)](#) Terry Peak, Chair
- o [Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee (FDDE)](#) Kevin Brewer, Chair

Forum Discussion Items:

- **Opinions and concerns regarding the implementation and interpretation of results of the IDEA faculty rating system.**

  Comments on the IDEA Evaluation system included concerns that the evaluations are too long, complex and possibly unnecessary. There were also comments made in support of the IDEA system. One faculty member stated that although it does take more time and effort to implement this system, if done correctly it will benefit students and encourage quality teaching. It was stated that the continued focus needs to be on: helping faculty understand and implement the evaluation, educating faculty on how to select objectives, and educating administrators on the use and interpretation the results. Concerns were raised about maximizing response rates. A faculty member stated that Michael Torrens in the office of Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation (AAA) is happy to help faculty and department heads with any of these issues. The FEC committee will be working on these issues throughout the year as well. Please contact your senators or the FEC committee directly if you have further questions or comments on this topic.

- **How to successfully achieve tenure and/or promotion with a heavily teaching oriented role-statement.**

  The Senate President asked several faculty members with high teaching loads, who were recently tenured and/or promoted, to take a few seconds to discuss their individual experience with the process. The focus of their comments follow: one faculty member engaged in the teaching side of their discipline vigorously; this involved volunteering for journals and attending conferences that were teaching oriented. Another's strategy was to increase his teaching load from two to five courses and do whatever possible to engage in service at the state and regional level and focus any research efforts on the scholarship of teaching. Another faculty made the research and scholarship agenda about teaching, and how to make distance education effective by writing and publishing on that topic. A member of the Central P&T Committee stated that the committee uses the role statement as their guide and looks at the context given by the supporting documents in the binders.

  Another faculty member made the comment that teaching loads and percentage of time in role statements are not standard across the university system. The Senate President used this question to segue into the next topic of the forum.

- **Fairness and consistency in allocating teaching assignments**.

  This topic began with a discussion as to whether the specified area of excellence must be the highest percentage area in the role statement. The Central P&T Committee representative stated that a person may negotiate this with their department head. A faculty member commented that at a previous institution where she taught, percentages were standardized and clear; for example a class represented 10% towards their role statement; however, at USU she has had 3 or 4 different explanations of how teaching load translates to the percentage on her role statement. Another faculty commented that there seems to be a consistent lack of following the role statements when the code says "excellence for your major area".

  A question was raised regarding role statements for Assistant Professors that include only teaching and service components; is there any precedent for an assistant professor being

evaluated on this type of role statement, and can we have a definition of what should be included in the P&T binders?

Another faculty member asked a question about what the procedures are for bringing issues to administration that are not necessarily a grievance. The Faculty Senate President explained that in the past the Faculty Senate had convened an ad hoc Code Compliance Committee to deal with such situations and stated that perhaps the senate will need to consider this option again.

- **Faculty involvement in the appointment of upper level administrators.**

  There were no comments specifically on this issue.

- **Open forum.**

  A faculty member commented that the thing most faculty members gloss over in the code is the idea of shared governance. It was suggested there be an evaluation of administrators. For example if an administrator receives a review and has less than 50% of support from the faculty, he has one year to improve or he would return to the faculty. He wanted a change in the code that specifies that faculty is not advisory to the president, but rather retains decision making authority with regard to university policy. The same faculty member said that interpretations of the code tend to be used as a hammer if it favors the administration; but if it does not favor the administration it is ignored. Another faculty suggested that grievances go to binding arbitration rather than to the president for resolution. The senate president suggested that perhaps specific areas of the code need to focus on giving faculty a stronger voice with the administration rather than re-vamping large segments of the code. The floor was open for one or two more questions or comments before the time to close the meeting. There were no more comments, questions or concerns.

  The Faculty Senate President thanked the faculty for their participation and the forum was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.