

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

4-7-2014

USU Faculty Senate Minutes, April 7, 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, April 7, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 195.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/195

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 7, 2014
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Call to Order

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

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett

President Albrecht reported that they are now about 2/3 of the way to completing the visits with each college reporting on the post legislative outcomes. The presentations have been going well.

Provost Cockett discussed the references to Regional Campus and Distance Education (RCDE). She feels that the name of Distance Education is not an appropriate designation as it seems to denote a difference in the way things are done in classes on campus in Logan versus campuses in other locations. She would like, from here on out, to no longer refer to RCDE, but instead RCs to represent Regional Campuses. All four delivery methods, face to face, online, broadcast, and blended, are offered in Logan, and at all RCs, and at Eastern. Starting in Fall, the delivery method designation will be added to every class description for registration as well as the campus designation. There will be a single portal for registration for all classes. These name changes will be sent to PRPC. Online classes are now on the tuition table and the tuition plateau has been lowered to 12 – 18 credits.

Reports

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee Report – Stephen Bialkowski.

Some vacancies on committees have existed for more than a year. Committee on Committees is responsible for filling the positions. Senators are encouraged to volunteer for committees and chair positions.

March EPC Items – Larry Smith. Larry briefly highlighted one major item from the report, the creation of a new department. It will be called the Department of Nursing and Health Professions and will be housed in the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education. This department will include the nursing programs from the Regional Campus system, it will not affect the courses offered in partnership with Weber State.

A motion to approve the report agenda was made by Vince Wickwar and seconded by Robert Schmidt. The motion passed unanimously.

Unfinished Business

PRPC Section 405.7.2(5) and 407.6.3(2) Notification date unification (second reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

A motion to approve this second reading was made by Jeanette Norton and seconded by Doug Jackson-Smith. The motion passed.

PRPC Code Change 402.3.2 Add Assigned Teaching to List of Unavoidable Absences (Second Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

A motion to approve this second reading was made by Steve Mansfield and seconded by Vince Wickwar. The motion passed.

Discussion of Post Tenure Review Decision Points – Yanghee Kim.

Doug Jackson-Smith moved to limit discussion to 10 minutes for each item, a second was received and the motion passed unanimously.

Yanghee reviewed the process and decisions previously made:

- *A post-tenure peer review committee will be held as a consequence of negative annual reviews that evaluate the multi-year performance of the faculty member.*
- *A peer review committee will be formed in a manner described in the current code.*

Discussion on further decisions to be made:

1. Peer Review Committee Appointment:

The peer review committee shall be appointed by

A. Mutual agreement of the dept. head and the faculty member. If agreement cannot be reached, the individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements, **OR**

B. Current code (405, page 30: “the committee appointed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member...”).

This proposed change is a result of the discussion last month. The language of mutual agreement is used in several other places in code. A senator questioned what the procedures would be for the appeal or hearing procedure, section 407 would need to be reviewed and the process clarified. Senators were reminded that we are not writing or changing code today, only agreeing on ideas and directions to send to PRPC who will draft the code language and begin the formal code change process.

Jake Gunther made a motion to add an option C that the faculty member decides the composition of the peer committee membership. A second was received. The motion failed with 10 votes in favor of the motion and 33 votes opposing the motion.

Votes for option A: 45

Votes for option B: 2

2. The Meaning of a Negative Annual Review:

A *negative* review means that the faculty member under review fails to ‘discharge conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position (405.12.1)’. **Yes No**

This proposal is to clarify and specify the meaning of what a negative review is. This also uses existing code language. Doug Jackson-Smith explained the intent of the FSEC was to clarify that if there is a trigger to a peer review committee being formed, that the trigger references this standard. An affirmative vote on this point would be to ask PRPC to articulate clearly what a negative annual review means. A senator suggested the wording be changed to something like “the faculty member has been deemed to not be discharging ...etc.:. Rhonda Callister explained that someone may have a negative review and just not get a raise. Item #3 below allows a faculty member who disagrees with a negative review the ability to request a peer review committee. Item #4 below says that if a department head initiates a Professional Development Plan, a peer review committee would be required. This item simply defines what a negative review constitutes. The senate leadership is hesitant to specify a number of negative reviews that would trigger peer reviews. They feel there should be more room for individual departments to work with faculty and determine when this becomes appropriate. A department head would have to include in a review letter the language of “fails to discharge conscientiously...”

A senator motioned for more time for discussion, a second was received. A senator questioned what the metric is for evaluation. Other senators answered that the language is already in the code that departments must determine their own criteria for annual reviews and that should be left alone. The department is the appropriate place to look for this information and it should not be a centralized standard.

Votes Yes 45

Votes No 0

3) Faculty Appeal:

When a faculty member disagrees with a negative annual review, the faculty member may choose to request a peer committee review. This request shall be submitted to the Dean or the authority above the department head. **Yes No**

This proposal is to establish a way for a faculty member to appeal if they do not agree with a negative review. Renee reminded the senate that a negative review is a formal declaration that you failed to discharge conscientiously and with professional competence your duties, NOT negative or critical comments. A senator questioned if the request of the faculty could be denied. The language should be changed to “choose to initiate a peer committee review”. It was also suggested the last sentence be completely removed (“This request shall be submitted to the Dean or authority above the department head”).

Doug Jackson-Smith commented that PRPC would need to specify that these are items that occur when it is triggered in a multi-year rolling window of negative reviews or when a department head initiates a professional development plan. A senator stated that when the code language is drafted it needs to be very specific that the window is a 3 year or a 5 year review. Yanghee asked if the discussion about the multi-year window could be covered later, separately from this item.

Yanghee called for a vote on this item, with the understanding the wording would be changed from request to initiate and specific language would be drafted by PRPC at a later time.

Votes Yes 48

Votes No 0

4) Initiation of Professional Development Plan:

If the department head initiates a professional development plan, as a consequence of annual reviews, the post-tenure peer review shall be held to conduct an evaluation of the multi-year performance of the faculty member. **Yes No**

A brief discussion on this item was begun, but due to time limitations a motion to table the issue until the next Faculty Senate meeting was made. Rhonda Callister seconded and the motion passed.

New Business

Nomination/Election of Faculty Senate President-Elect – Robert Schmidt. Robert opened nominations for Faculty Senate President-Elect. Terry Peak nominated Rhonda Callister and Scott Bates seconded. No other nominations were made. Robert closed nominations. Rhonda was elected by acclamation.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.