

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

3-3-2014

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, March 3, 2014

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, March 3, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 193.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/193

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
MARCH 3, 2014
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Call to Order

Yanghee Kim called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of February 3, 2014 were adopted.

Announcements – Yanghee Kim

Roll Call. Members are reminded to sign the role sheet at each meeting.

At the next meeting we will hold open nominations for President-Elect.

Shared Governance Award – Renee Galliher

The nominees are Rhonda Miller, Scott Bates, Ed Reeve, and Jason Olsen.

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett

A highlight of the Founders Day Celebration this year will be a Presidential Series of Lecture by Joyce Kinkead our Carnegie Professor, USU Alum, Briana Bowen our Truman Scholar, and Nobel Laureate Lars Peter Hansen. The celebration this year is focusing more on student and faculty accomplishments.

The legislative session closes at midnight next Thursday. President Albrecht gave an overview of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 tuition and the process for increases to each. Administration has asked the Board of Trustees to approve an increase of Tier 2 tuition in the range of 0 – 3%. Tier 1 will be determined after the legislative session so that we have some flexibility. Tier 1 will likely be around a 3% increase. The Higher Education Base Budget was passed without additional cuts. Any money that comes our way for promotion and tenure increases will not have an effect on any compensation increases that the legislature may approve. When asked by the legislature how USU has met their needed cuts, they were shown that programs offered were reduced by 51, 24 new programs were added, resulting in a net decrease of 27 programs. There are a number of bills that will affect higher education still pending in the legislature; a bill that would require grievance procedures to take place under oath and a bill affecting the licensing of landscape architecture professionals are being discussed.

Consent Agenda Items – Yanghee Kim

**Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report – Alan Stephens
Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Report – Bryce Fifield
March EPC Items – Larry Smith**

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Information Items

Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee Report – Sydney Peterson, Vince Wickwar. The CEO of Global Poverty Project, Hugh Evans, has been named as the Commencement Speaker for this year. Evans is an Australian humanitarian and an internationally renowned development advocate. He will receive an honorary doctorate along with Tayseer Al-Smadi, senator in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and chairman of the Jordan Press and Publishing Corporation; Pamela J. Atkinson, an advocate for impoverished, underprivileged and homeless populations in Utah; and R. Gilbert Moore, a specialist in rocketry and propulsion science who founded USU's Get Away Special Program.

PRPC Code Change 405.7.2(5) and 407.6.3(2) Notification date unification (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. No action taken on first readings.

PRPC Code Change 402.3.2, add assigned teaching to list of unavoidable absences (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. No action taken on first readings.

Old Business

PTR Decision Points – Yanghee Kim. At the previous meeting the senate asked the FSEC to create decision points for discussion and voting. These decision points are included in the agenda packet. There are three major issues that cover the differences between the current code and the proposed code. The first issue is on the PTR process, the second issue concerns post tenure committee structure, and the third is the professional development plan. The FSEC determined that changes to the professional development plan are dependent on what is decided on the first two issues and will be discussed and finalized in the next FSEC meeting. Doug Jackson-Smith reminded senators that this is only an advisory vote and not changing code; any decisions made will be forwarded as a guide to PRPC and go through the appropriate channels.

Becky Lawver moved that in the interest of time, discussion should be limited to three minutes for each item. The motion was seconded and passed with one dissenting vote. Discussion continued and a friendly amendment was made and accepted to extend the time to 7 minutes per item. The vote was unanimous.

Question 1 - Should the post-tenure peer review process be

- a. Triggered: required only of tenured faculty that are judged to be 'not meeting expectations' in annual reviews, or
- b. The current code: (required of all tenured faculty, every 5 years).

Senators spoke in favor of each proposal. Renee clarified that the annual review criteria is developed by the departments, and it is not in code that the department head conduct the reviews. Jake Gunther commented that there has been a criticism of the current code that it is not uniform, but what can be more uniform than requiring every person to undergo a review every 5 years. The statement was made that option B fosters more trust. Clarification of option A was that a peer review will occur only when the faculty member is reviewed as "not meeting expectations" during an annual review. Under the current code a negative review would not trigger a peer review and it could likely be that a person might receive 4 or 5 negative reviews before a peer review would be enacted. It was brought up that the Code states that the purpose of the annual department review is to be used for salary adjustment and for renewing contracts. Discussion continued for over 10 minutes.

The faculty senate president called for a vote. Votes in favor of option A: 25. Votes in favor of option B: 17.

Question 1-1 – If triggered, should annual reviews for post-tenure faculty consider

- a. A multi-year rolling window, or
- b. The current code: "each department shall establish procedures..." (405, page 30).

Renee explained that the rationale of the task force in having a rolling window was that the current code unfairly penalizes faculty members who have a bad year. Recognizing there are variations in careers overtime and one of the benefits of tenure is the freedom to take risks and try new things, it was felt there needed to be a broader window in terms of the annual review. Senators engaged in a discussion on the meaning of the phrases “meets/does not meet expectations” and “effective and excellence” as used in the review process. Yanghee clarified that “excellence and effectiveness” are used only for promotion and tenure, not for the annual reviews. Discussion continued until the Senate President announced the time limit had expired at 12 minutes.

A motion was made and seconded to vote to accept the multi-year rolling window for annual reviews for post tenure faculty (option A). Clarification was made that this applies only to the post tenure review process, and that this is not drafting code language at this time. Votes in favor of the motion: 39, Votes against the motion: 3

Clarification was made that “Each department shall establish procedures based on a multi-year rolling window” is the language that PRPC should work into the code language for this issue.

Question 2 - Should the post-tenure peer review committee be

- a. College-level, or
- b. The current code: “the committee appointed by the dept. head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member...” (405, page 30).

In support of the current code, a statement was made that the person being evaluated is consulted in the selection of the committee. The first initial review comes from people in your department because they know best if you are successful or not. There was discussion about small departments who do not have enough tenured faculty to comprise a committee and whether or not committees should be formed at the college level. One member’s problem was with the language “appointed by the department head”. The pros and cons were discussed. Clarification was made that the Code states that the committees “must include at least one member from outside the academic unit”, etc. The concern from RCDE colleagues is that if there is a change in the Code and there are not enough people that efforts need to be made to find people who have relevant experience to speak to their situation. Discussion continued past the time limit and largely focused on the phrase “in consultation with” from the current code.

Yanghee Kim called for a vote of all those in favor of option A: 18. Those in favor of option B: 25.

A motion to table the rest of the agenda until the next meeting was received and seconded.

New Business

Reviews of Administrators – Yanghee Kim. Discussion on this item was postponed until the next meeting due to time limitations.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.