

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

2-19-2008

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, February 19, 2008

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, February 19, 2008" (2008). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 376.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/376

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda 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.



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

19 February 2008, 3:00 p.m.
Champ Hall Conference Room

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order** Doug Ramsey
Approval of [Minutes of January 22, 2008](#)
- 3:01 Announcements** Doug Ramsey
1. Next Brown Bag Lunch with the President is March 17
 2. Faculty Evaluation Forms Update
- 3:05 University Business**.....President Albrecht
- 3:15 Information Items**
1. [Academic Integrity Policy](#).....Jeri Brunson
 2. [VPR Seed Funding Programs](#)Jeff Broadbent
 3. [Research Council Annual Report](#) Brent Miller
 4. [Committee on Committees Report](#)Will Popendorf
 5. [BFW Annual Report](#)..... Jeanette Norton
 6. [EPC Business](#).....Steven Hanks
- 4:10 Key Issues and Action Items**
1. PRPC Items Britt Fagerheim
 - a. [Representation of Extension and RCDE on Faculty Senate 402.10.1](#) (2nd reading)
 - b. [Reasons for Non-Renewal 407.7.2](#) (2nd reading)
- 4:20 New Business**
1. FDDE – [Code 405.7.2 Proposal](#) Ronda Callister
 2. Faculty Code Review Committee..... John Kras
- 4:30 Adjournment**

**USU FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
January 22, 2008 • 3:00 p.m.
Champ Hall Conference Room**

Present: Provost Raymond Coward, Doug Ramsey, Byron Burnham, Daren Cornforth, Jake Gunther, Ed Heath, John Kras, Pat Lambert, Mike Parent, Flora Shrode, and Andi McCabe

Excused: Brian Atwater, Steven Burr

Absent: Vince Wickwar

Invited Guest: Richard Cutler, Britt Fagerheim, Ronda Callister

Doug Ramsey called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of December 10, 2007

John Kras motioned to approve the December 10, 2007 minutes. Adrie Roberts seconded the motion. Motion passed with one minor change suggested by Daren Cornforth.

Announcements - Doug Ramsey

1. The next Brown Bag Lunch with the President is on February 11.

University Business

1. Provost Coward stated that the airport interviews for the HASS dean search is next weekend in Salt Lake City. There are seven candidates: five women and two men; five are sitting department heads, one is an institute director, and one is in a vice provost-like position.
2. During the week of February 4th through the 8th, the second candidate for the position of Dean and Executive Director of the Uintah Basin Regional Campus will visit for his campus interview. He will first go to Vernal and Roosevelt before coming to Logan.
3. The Utah legislative session has begun and President Albrecht will be in Salt Lake often over the next six weeks, which is why he was not able to attend today's meeting.

Information Items

1. **EPC Report** – Richard Cutler represented the EPC committee. The committee recommends a small change to general education requirements. Through an internal review, they discovered that USU is out of compliance with Regents policy regarding the number of general education credits. Our current minimum is 27, whereas the Regents policy states 30. Therefore, EPC recommends that students be required to take one additional 3-hour course outside their major from the list of designated General Education courses.

The next item was a proposal to establish a master degree of Music with an emphasis in Piano Performance and pedagogy.

The third recommendation was to suspend enrollment in the graduate certificate program in the Natural Resource and Environmental policy.

The last recommendation was to establish the School of Teacher Education and Leadership. If these last three recommendations were approved by the BFW, then this committee can move it forward to the Faculty Senate. If not, BFW would have to approve these with a written response before placing on the Senate agenda.

Mike Parent motioned to place the Education Polices Committee Report on the Consent Agenda item of the February 4, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting once BFW has approved the latter three recommendations. Doug Ramsey seconded the motion; motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

1. **LEED Resolution** – Doug Ramsey started by stating that Larry Hipps is opposed to the terminology 'or equivalent to' in reference to USU requiring that all new buildings be designed and constructed to meet the LEED silver certification. John Kras motioned to place this resolution with the deletion of the word 'better' in paragraph #1 of the suggested actions on the Action Items agenda of the February Faculty Senate meeting. Daren Cornforth further explained that the cost of the certification from LEED mostly gets you the recognition; it does not provide inspectors to make sure you are following LEED procedures. Ed Heath seconded the motion; motion carried unanimously.

New Business

1. **Faculty Parental Options** – Ronda Callister addressed the committee asking for consideration of increasing options for faculty parents. She stated that part-time tenure track faculty is not in code anywhere and recommended that the 405 code provide for part-time faculty to obtain tenure status by using equitable partial years of service in the equation. Provost Coward questioned if this was not addressed elsewhere in the code. Adrie Roberts motioned to defer this to PRPC to review the code with further clarification from the FDDE committee. Mike Parent seconded the motion, adding that FDDE could bring it back to the FSEC once more research has been completed. Motion failed with three in favor, four opposed, and one abstention.

The next item refers to faculty parental leaves of absence and modified duties with the birth/placement of a child, offering a release from teaching responsibilities during the semester that a child is born or adopted. There was no motion, but the committee suggested to Ronda that she take this back to FDDE to conduct more research of the code regarding post-tenure faculty.

2. **Proposed Code Change – Procedures Specific to the Tenure Process (405.7.2)** – Adrie Roberts brought forward a proposed change to addresses paragraph (5) of this code. The change proposes adding text that states “if a member of the committee convened by the Provost under this policy is also responsible for a separate evaluation and recommendation of a candidate under 405.7.2(4) as a dean, director or vice-president, then the evaluation and recommendation required under 405.7.2(4) will be made by the appropriate associate director, associate dean, or the associate vice-president”. Provost Coward stated that when he convenes the committee and the list of candidates is made available to them, he asks if there are any conflicts with those on the list. If there are, then that committee member will recuse him or herself from reviewing that candidate. He also feels that this does need to be looked at because the President made an administrative decision two years ago and the code has not caught up with that decision. Another option is to remove the Vice President of Extension from the committee member list and add to it a faculty member who has a significant understanding and appreciation of the University's Extension mission. Mike Parent recommended that no action be taken. Provost Coward also reminded the committee of the newly-created ad-hoc committee chaired by Flora Shrode, which is addressing promotion and tenure code. Doug asked Flora to take this to her committee for recommendations to PRPC.

Key Issues and Action Items


1. **PRPC Items**
 - a. **Reasons for Non-Renewal 407.7.2 (2nd reading)** - Britt Fagerheim brought back revised code according to the suggestions made at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Ed Heath motioned to place this item on the Issues and Action Items agenda of the February 4, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting. Mike Parent seconded the motion; motion carried unanimously.
 - b. **Membership; Alternates; Term; Vacancies 402.3 (1st reading)** – This was a charge to look at double representation. PRPC is proposing that code be added to clarify where multi-affiliation faculty are counted in the representation of the Faculty Senate, especially for those faculty members who serve Regional Campus and Distance Education. Ed Heath motioned to place this under Action Items on the February 4 Senate agenda. Mike Parent seconded the motion; motion carried with one abstention.

Adjournment

Doug Ramsey called for adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by: Andi McCabe, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, 797-1166

There are three vital relationships in every student's academic career. The Academic Integrity Policy directly reflects these relationships.



1. The online Academic Integrity Violation form (AIVF) allows the instructor to quickly and easily alert the student of the alleged violation and intended consequences.
2. The student responds and arranges a meeting with the instructor to resolve the issue.
3. A resolution report is filed by the instructor, enabling the Judicial Officer to maintain documentation of offenses and track repeat offenders.

- Grounds for appeal:
- Appeal of process (AIVF was not filed by instructor prior to sanctions being given)
 - A rational reason prevented student from responding/meeting with the instructor in the allowed time, approved by VP of Student Services.
 - There is factual disagreement among parties. Evidence is inclusive, new evidence/witness has been found.

If student has appealed to both Department Head and Dean of College but no resolution has been reached, the student may request a hearing with the Honor Board. The decision of the Honor Board is final.

After the first offense, the student will be placed on Academic Integrity Probation

Students with egregious or multiple offenses will be further sanctioned by the University.

PAGE 1: Academic Integrity Procedures

Notes:

1. AIVF = Academic Integrity Violation Form
2. Days are defined in Section C of the preface of the Student Code.
3. If the Instructor offers the student an alternative (i.e. revising a paper for partial credit) that is designed to be a learning opportunity rather than a sanction, no AIVF is filed.

Instructor determines an academic integrity violation has occurred and that sanctions are necessary.³ Egregious offenses will also be sent directly to Honor Board.

Instructor submits an online AIVF¹ within 7 days

Instructor does not submit AIVF within 7 days

AIVF is forwarded by email to: Student, Head of department in which class is housed, Executive Director (if RCDE student), and office of VP of Student Services

If instructor had a rational reason for not filing AIVF within 7 days, instructor must get approval of their dean⁴ to pursue disciplinary actions.

No sanctions or disciplinary penalties may be pursued.

Notes:

4. Dean will determine if the "rational reason" was appropriate

Instructor submits online AIVF

Student does not respond to email within 7 days

Student responds but refuses to meet with instructor

Student responds to instructor within 7 days and schedules a meeting with the instructor


Student admits violation

Student denies violation

GO TO PAGE 2

GO TO PAGE 3

PAGE 2: Academic Integrity Procedures



Notes:

- 5. Possible sanctions include:
 1. Retake test / assignment
 2. Grade change for test / assignment
 3. Failing grade for course
 4. **Other**
- 6. A standardized Resolution Report will be housed on the same website as the AIVF. The discussion, any negotiations, and final action will be detailed on that report.

PAGE 3: Academic Integrity Procedures

From Page 1: Student denies violation

From Page 2: Student had an acceptable reason for non-response

Grounds for Appeal:

- 1 – Appeal of process (instructor did not file AIVF prior to giving sanctions)
 - 2 – Extenuating circumstances for not responding to professor within 7 days
 - 3 – Evidentiary appeal. Evidence against student is inclusive or new evidence/witness has been found.
- There is factual disagreement between parties.**

Student must schedule a meeting between student, instructor and department head (of dept in which class is housed) within **7** days of instructor/student meeting (or of applied sanction).

No resolution is reached

Student has **7** days to schedule a meeting between student, instructor and dean (or designee)

No resolution is reached

Student contacts the VP of SS office to request a hearing with Honor Board within **7** days


Honor Board Hearing is held in accordance with code. Sanctions listed on AIVF may be instituted, upheld, or discarded. The decision of the Honor Board is final.

All parties agree to a resolution. Sanctions may be instituted, upheld, or discarded. Resolution report⁶ is signed by student and instructor. No further appeal may be filed by the student.

Resolution report⁶ is signed by student and instructor. No further appeal may be filed by the student.

End of Process.
For tracking of repeat offenders GO TO PAGE 4

PAGE 4: Academic Integrity Procedures (University level tracking process)



Academic Integrity Policy Revision Supplemental Document:

Why does the current code need to be changed?

Current code is inadequate both in concept and in practice:

- Few instructors are following the current code
 - It's not helpful, it's confusing, and it doesn't work.
- The current code offers no assistance to instructors
 - It does not offer recommendations for appropriate sanctions or provide information on how to proceed once a violation has been discovered.
 - It does not meet minimum due process requirements with respect to giving a student a failing course grade as a punishment for academic dishonesty.
 - Due process DOES NOT change what sanctions may be given, it governs the *process* of applying disciplinary action in a way that protects both the rights of the instructor and the rights of the student.
- Repeat offenders are not being tracked across colleges
 - Whether or not a student has a history of academic integrity violations must be verified by the instructor. This is an unreasonable burden on instructor time.
- There is no appeal process in the case of receiving a failing grade for a course.
 - Currently, the academic grievance process is being used as an appeal mechanism. Even if the student has admitted the violation but simply doesn't agree with the sanction, they can file an academic grievance against the instructor.

Why do I need to submit a form? I have enough paperwork.

The Academic Integrity Violation Form has several advantages over current practice:

- If used, the online AIVF will provide a quick and easy method of assuring that minimum due process has been allowed and documented. It will serve as official notification to the student of the alleged violation and intended sanctions, as well as provide all the information the student needs to resolve the issue.
 - The AIVF will instruct the student that they need to respond to the instructor within 7 days and schedule a face-to-face meeting or the intended sanctions will be applied.

- The AIVF will provide information on what conditions must be met if the student wishes to appeal, what the levels of appeal are, and who to contact for more information about the process.
- The AIVF will serve as a tracking mechanism for repeat offenders at a university level.
 - The AIVF will be paired with a resolution report once the issue has been resolved. A paper copy of the online AIVF, a written letter from the instructor, or other official University document, may serve as a resolution report.
 - If no resolution report has been filed two months after the AIVF was submitted, the Judicial Officer will investigate.
 - The AIVF and the resolution report will become a student's permanent academic integrity file at USU.
 - If a sanction is applied, the student will automatically be put on academic integrity probation. They will be notified in writing of this probationary status. It will not appear on their transcript (unless a transcript designation is a University sanction).
 - Egregious and/or multiple offenses will warrant further University sanctions.
- The AIVF will provide guidance to new faculty and graduate student instructors as to available sanction options but **WILL NOT** restrict any instructor's or department's ability to choose the most appropriate sanction.
 - The AIVF is not intended to restrict an instructor's options in working with the student, rather to guide and to document. The instructor may request a meeting with the student directly, have several discussions with the student, and may utilize the AIVF form during those meetings. The online AIVF may be submitted along with a resolution report as part of those discussions.
- The AIVF can serve as documentation of resolution and of waiving the right to appeal. If the instructor and student meet and the student admits the violation, both the student and instructor sign the resolution report (or paper copy of the AIVF). Once a student signs the report, they waive their right to further appeal. The instructor then applies the intended sanction and the process ends, fully documented.
- If the instructor is unable to submit the AIVF within **7** days of determining that a violation has occurred **AND** that academic sanctions are appropriate, they must obtain permission from their college dean to pursue disciplinary action.

- A situation where the instructor chooses to give the student an alternative to a sanction as a learning/teaching opportunity would not require the AIVF. E.g. allowing a student to revise a paper for partial credit if the instructor believes the student does not fully understand what academic integrity entails.
- The time required for the instructor to reach a firm conclusion that a violation has occurred and that sanctions are appropriate is not part of the 7 days. It is understood that a period of discovery and investigation is often needed.
 - It is also understood that timeliness is important for both instructor and student. In good faith, it is left to the instructor to make their determination as quickly as possible.

What happens if I don't use the AIVF form?

If the instructor chooses not to use the AIVF form:

- The student will not be tracked at the university level and may continue to violate academic integrity across colleges without penalty.
- The question of whether or not minimum due process was met may be raised.
 - Lack of a submitted AIVF **prior** to the application of sanctions will be grounds for appeal by the student.
 - If the student's due process rights were violated, that will be grounds for an academic grievance against the instructor.
 - Further, if the student's due process rights were violated and they suffered significant financial loss (e.g. loss of scholarship or stipend), the instructor may be liable.

What about my right to grade as I see fit?

The revised policy utilizing the AIVF does not affect an instructor's right or ability to grade the quality of students' work in any way.

- Grading quality of work is not the same as disciplinary action for cheating. For example, a failing grade for quality of work could include a homework assignment with no correct answers or an essay with no punctuation. A failing grade given as a punishment for cheating is fundamentally based on the fact that it is not the student's own work. Judging the quality of that work is entirely different than determining that it is the work of another person.

- The revised policy and AIVF also **DOES NOT** affect the disciplinary actions that an instructor may take. It does not specify what sanctions can or cannot be given. By facilitating the allowance and documentation of due process, regardless of sanction, the revised policy and AIVF secures each instructor's and department's ability to choose the most appropriate sanction.

What is the appeal process?

If the instructor and student are unable to come to a resolution in either of the following ways:

- The student does not respond to AIVF notification or refuses to meet with the instructor.
 - The instructor will apply the intended sanctions and file a resolution report indicating the non-response or lack of cooperation of the student.
 - If the student had an acceptable reason – as defined in the Student Code – for non-response, they may file an appeal.
- If the student denies the violation AND the evidence against the student is inconclusive OR if new evidence/witness is found within 7 days after the student/instructor meeting.
 - In the case that the student denies the violation and informs the instructor of their decision to appeal, the instructor should submit an I/F grade or other appropriate Incomplete designation if they are required to submit a grade to meet University deadlines.
 - While it is simple to fill out a change of grade form, loss of a scholarship or stipend can be immediate and if the sanction is then reversed following an appeal, rectifying that financial loss is not as simple as a change of grade form.
- The first level of appeal is departmental. The student has 7 days from the student/instructor meeting to schedule a meeting with the department head of the department in which the course is housed and the instructor. If resolution is reached, a resolution report is filed and the process ends.
- The second level of appeal is at the college level. If no resolution was reached at the departmental level, the student has 7 days from the student/instructor/department head meeting to schedule a meeting with the dean of the college in which the course is housed and the instructor. If resolution is reached, a resolution report is filed and the process ends.
- The final level of appeal is to the Honor Board. If no resolution was reached at the college level, the student has 7 days from the

student/instructor/dean meeting to request a hearing with the Honor Board. The request should be made to the office of the VP of Student Services. The decision of the Honor Board is final.

- The Honor Board cannot modify sanctions. It may only uphold the sanctions, institute the sanctions, or discard the sanctions.

VPR SEED FUNDING PROGRAMS

PROGRAM	ELIGIBILITY	FUNDING	NOTES	REQ. OUTCOME
Existing:				
New Faculty Research Grant (NFRG)	Tenure- track asst. profs during 1 st 2 yrs	1-yr, \$15,000 max (annual)	Funds can be used for 1 mo faculty salary support, student RA, travel required to do research, supplies and equipment needed to complete the project.	Final report at project completion
Community-University Research Initiative (CURI)	Tenured, tenure-eligible, or research faculty	1-yr, No limit; ave. ~ \$20,000. (annual)	Same as above	Final report at project completion
New:				
Grant-Writing Experience Through Mentorship (GEM)	Tenure-eligible asst. profs, research asst. profs., or research professionals with ≤4 yrs in rank	1-yr, \$5,000 max (semiannual)	Requires active collaboration between the junior faculty member and a successful senior colleague Funds cannot be used for salary support of junior faculty member, but mentors can receive \$1,000.	Develop and submit an external grant proposal within 3 mo of project completion Serve on review panel for 2 yrs afterward
Research Catalyst (RC)	All tenured or tenure-eligible faculty, research faculty, or other USU research professionals	1-yr, \$20,000 max (semiannual)	Funds can be used for 1 mo faculty salary support, student RA, travel required to do research, supplies and equipment needed to complete the project.	Develop and submit an external grant proposal within 3 mo of project completion
Seed Program To Advance Research Collaboration (SPARC)	Same as RC, but must also engage faculty from more than 1 dept, research center, college or institution	1-yr, \$35,000 max (semiannual)	Funds use is same as above plus travel to meet with collaborators or representatives of funding agencies To obtain full award level, PIs must utilize a professional proposal development service	Develop and submit an interdisciplinary external grant proposal seeking ≥\$1M within 3 mo of project completion

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

ANNUAL REPORT

JULY 1, 2006 TO JUNE 30, 2007

BRENT C. MILLER, PH.D. VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

University research is fostered through improving campus research services and support, but more importantly through building multidisciplinary research programs and partnerships, both on and off campus, thereby enhancing the university's capacity for research excellence.

It is the mission of the Research Office to provide an environment that facilitates and stimulates research, scholarship, and creative activities by:

- Providing leadership to identify and pursue promising research opportunities.
- Providing resources to help recruit and retain outstanding faculty and students.
- Improving research support services that are highly responsive and efficient.
- Fostering a culture of academic research integrity that discloses and manages conflicts-of-interest and conflicts-of-commitment, and that is consistent with federal regulations.
- Identifying, protecting, and, where appropriate, commercializing intellectual properties for the benefit of authors/inventors, the university, and society.

Core campus constituencies of the Research Office are faculty, students, and unit administrators. The VPR chairs the University Research Council, which consists of deans, major center directors, and student and faculty representatives. Because deans, center directors, and department heads are appropriately most concerned with their respective units, the VPR must take a broader, campus-wide perspective.


The VPR needs to be actively engaged in professional networks and with societies that have the advancement of research as their mission. The VPR also must be engaged with external constituencies, including local and state elected officials, as well as federal and industry funding sponsors to advance university research.

ANNUAL REPORT

This annual report to the Faculty Senate covers the major activities of the Research Office and the Research Council from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. It is a summary of all units for which the VPR has responsibility. It also includes a summary of units for which the Office of the Vice President for Strategic Ventures and Economic Development has responsibility. This report is organized in five parts:

1. Overview of the VPR Office and Related Service Units
 - A. Sponsored Programs Office
 - B. Environmental Health and Safety Office
 - C. Institutional Review Board
 - D. Laboratory Animal Research Center
 - E. Center for High Performance Computing
 - F. International Program Development
2. Overview of the VP SVED and Related Strategic Units
 - A. Innovation Campus
 - B. Technology Commercialization Office
 - C. USTAR
3. Research Council Membership and Functions
4. Use of Facilities and Administration (F&A) Funds at USU, FY2006-2007
5. Selected Research Issues at USU

Utah State University Vice President for Research Organization



1. OVERVIEW OF VPR AND RELATED SERVICE UNITS

The VPR was responsible for the units shown in the previous diagram during fiscal year 2006-2007. The USU Research Foundation (USURF) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the university. It is a major organization with large-scale research programs, most notably the Space Dynamics Laboratory (SDL). A cooperative working relationship with the Research Foundation is essential for accomplishing the research mission of the university. The USU Research Council advises the VPR, providing a forum for considering major research issues.

A) Sponsored Programs Office (SPO)

The USU Sponsored Programs Office (SPO) is responsible for supporting and protecting the university and individual researchers as they propose, submit, and administer externally funded sponsored research projects. This role puts SPO in a unique situation to interact with virtually every college, department, research center, and administrative unit at USU. Further, the interdependent nature of contracting requires universal accountability if research endeavors are to be successful. Therefore, SPO makes every effort to provide the excellent service, effective resources, timely responsiveness, and accountability necessary to not only promote a successful research environment, but also to build the strong relationships necessary to promote continued research growth.

Some of the specific responsibilities of SPO include providing training and workshops, budgeting and proposal development assistance, assisting in the completion of mandatory internal and external forms, communicating and negotiating with sponsors to develop mutually advantageous agreements that protect the researchers as well as the university, and administering awards. Consequently, SPO has offered and will continue to offer workshops for grant writing, locating funding opportunities, industry contracting, and electronic research administration. SPO has also recently begun a Compliance Professional Educational Program to communicate university, federal and state regulations, policies and procedures to promote compliance and consistency throughout the university.

SPO fosters research at the university by helping researchers to develop and submit proposals that have the highest likelihood for success. To accomplish this, SPO provides the following services: budget development, interpreting contractual terms and conditions, completing required forms, grant editing, tracking pending proposals, notifying researchers upon award, and negotiating award terms and conditions with sponsors to protect the researcher and university. SPO also works closely with the Controller's Office to ensure that accounts are set up properly and that USU is compliant with federal and state regulations as well as sponsor-specific terms and conditions.

A single point of contact approach allows researchers to easily identify their assigned SPO administrator. Further, this approach allows each SPO administrator to become more familiar with sponsor-specific regulations as well as to familiarize themselves with individual researchers and their unique needs. SPO has also developed an excellent

working relationship with the Controller's Office creating a team approach for pre- and post-award functions that further supports research efforts.

SPO continues to update its website (<http://spo.usu.edu>) to enhance proposal development, provide more user-friendly interfaces, and making information more accessible and easier to locate. SPO policies and procedures are posted on the web and additional policies and procedures continue to be developed and published. Some new features and information available on the website include: guidelines for industry contracting; distinguishing between gifts, grants and contracts; export control; and resources for graduate/undergraduate students. SPO is also working on a step-by-step guide for PIs that provides information to simplify the entire grant lifecycle process (i.e. from locating funding opportunities to closeout procedures).

SPO provides monthly reports to the VPR regarding the status of research proposals and awards at Utah State University. Appendix A provides a summary of Sponsored Program Awards, FY2003 through FY2007. Appendix B compares awards by month and type of award for FY2006 and FY2007. Appendix C provides a summary of Sponsored Program Awards by Awarding Agency, FY2003 through FY2007; and Appendix D provides a summary of Sponsored Program Awards by Research Center, FY2003 through FY2007.

Note that awards in the Colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, and Science (Appendix A) were much lower in FY2005 than FY2004, mostly because USURF awards were removed from colleges and shown separately for the first time in FY2005. Note also that total awards were about \$40 M lower in FY2005 than FY2004 (\$122 M vs. \$162 M). This is largely due to the cancellation of RAMOS, the largest program at Space Dynamics Laboratory.

B) Environmental Health and Safety Office (EH&S)

The EH&S Office provides expertise and guidance for compliance with federal, state, and local safety and health regulations, as well as current professional practices and guidelines. Its goal is to prevent injuries, illnesses, and environmental damage through the recognition, evaluation, and control of potential hazards arising from university activities. This is accomplished through services that ensure a safe and healthy environment for all students, faculty, and staff at USU and the surrounding community. Services include assisting in compliance with regulations and training university personnel and students in appropriate safety measures. General areas of focus include biological, radiological, occupational, and chemical health and safety.

The EH&S Office interacts with many governmental regulators in the course of normal business, including: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State of Utah-Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Division of Radiation Control (DRC), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Many of these entities perform routine and unannounced inspections and require written programs, documented training, permits, and numerous reports of differing types that the EH&S Office completes for the university.

Responsibilities of the EH&S program cross many traditional aspects of the campus community. In FY2007 EH&S accomplished the following:

- Transported, managed and disposed of approximately 78,430 lbs. of hazardous waste, 600 lbs. of biological waste, approximately 1,980 lbs. of radiation waste, and recycled 63,390 lbs. of hazardous materials.
- Continued application of the radioactive waste volume reduction plan that results in cost savings by reducing the amount of waste shipped off-site for disposal by 125 lbs.
- Provided safety training to approximately 1,011 faculty, staff and students in 36 courses.
- Provided Logan City Fire Department 435 pre-incident plans for campus buildings. Provided Geographical Information System (GIS) emergency response data for all academic units (100% complete), non-academic units (35% complete), and for Innovation Campus (95% complete).

C) Institutional Review Board (IRB)

The IRB is charged with protecting the rights and welfare of human research participants. All research involving human participants, including unfunded research, must be reviewed in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations. USU has a Federal Wide Assurance with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) that commits USU to comply with federal regulations governing human participants in research and which is required for Department of Health and Human Services-funded research. This Assurance is renewed every five years.

The IRB consists of volunteer members with diverse expertise to provide adequate and comprehensive review of USU research activities. Regulations require that an IRB have at least one scientist, one nonscientist, and one member not affiliated with the institution; terms of service are three years and can be renewed.

USU board members are:

- Gretchen Gimpel Peacock (Chair) - Department of Psychology
- Thorana Nelson (Vice-Chair) - Department of Family, Consumer, and Human Development
- Richard Albiston - Prisoner Advocate
- John Allen - Department of Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology
- Kim Corbin-Lewis – COMDDE
- Melanie Domenech-Rodriguez - Department of Psychology
- Joanna Endter-Wada - Environment and Society
- Chris Fawson - Department of Economics
- True Fox - Administrator.

- Julie Gast - Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
- Stacey Hills - Department of Business Administration
- Stuart Howell - Community Representative
- Mike Monson (alternate) – Community Representative
- Bob Morgan - Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation
- Ron Munger - Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences
- Russ Price - Compliance Assistance
- Ed Redd - Deputy Director of the Bear River Health Services
- Noreen Schvaneveldt - Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences
- Tim Slocum (Alternate) - Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation
- David Wiley - Department of Instructional Technology

The IRB meets monthly to review protocol applications requiring regulatory approval. Certain research protocols do not require full board review and can be classified as “Exempt” or “Expedite.” All reviews follow criteria provided in federal regulations. All on-going research projects are reviewed yearly; however, if there is more than a minimal risk, the continuation research reviews are more frequent. Any proposed change or revision to a currently approved study that affects human participants must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to the implementation of that change. A special Amendment/Revision document is required from the PI.

The IRB Office documents compliance with federal regulations by maintaining a database of all research protocols submitted and of actions taken by the board. Written policies and procedures congruent with federal guidelines have been instituted by the board to address procedures such as yearly continuing review, reporting of adverse events, changes in research methods and objectives, and researchers’ conflict of interest. An IRB Handbook is available on the VPR website at <http://irb.usu.edu/>

The IRB Administrator is actively involved in implementing revised federal procedures and updating USU procedures; providing continuing education for faculty, students, and board; and helping to coordinate ethics-in-research training for researchers and IRB members. Appendix E illustrates the number of IRB research applications by types of review categories from 2003 through 2007.

D) Laboratory Animal Research Center (LARC)

The primary mission of the LARC is to support university animal research, testing, and teaching by providing resources for animal procurement, housing, husbandry and care, health care, and disposal. Space is also provided for researchers to conduct short- and long-term research. The LARC staff is also a resource for expert information on the use of live animals in research and teaching. The LARC is an Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) International accredited, Public Health Service (PHS) assured, and a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) registered animal research center.

The permanent LARC staff consists of the following: A director (A. Olsen), who is a

Utah-licensed and USDA-accredited veterinarian and is a member of the American Association of Laboratory Animal Practitioners and the American Association of Laboratory Animal Science; a full-time supervisor (K. Udy), who is a certified Registered Laboratory Animal Technologist by the American Association of Laboratory Animal Science; a full-time secretary (B. Demler); one full-time animal caretaker (T. Lauritzen); and a part-time animal caretaker (L. Potter). There are also part-time students employed who work in the washroom and provide basic animal care. In exceptional cases, researchers provide part or all of their own animal care. The Director (Olsen), full-time supervisor (Udy) and secretary (Demler) have shared assignments with the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

Major accomplishments for FY2007:

- The USDA inspector found the LARC to be in full compliance during the annual facility inspection.
- All available animal space is occupied.
- Capital equipment upgrade continued.
- Remodeling continues to upgrade facilities for additional work in the antiviral program.

E) The Center for High Performance Computing (HPC)

The HPC was established in FY2006 utilizing funds from an NSF major research instrumentation (MRI) grant and the research office. A 256-processor cluster with three different networks was purchased. Thomas Hauser (faculty member in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering) was hired as the center's part-time director, and John Hanks was hired from USU central IT as HPC system administrator to support the efforts of the center.

Major accomplishments for FY 2007:

- Organized and hosted a national symposium entitled "Challenges & Opportunities for High Performance Computing in Agriculture and Life Sciences." Dr. Colien Hefferan, USDA Administrator of CSREES, delivered the keynote speech with additional presentations from Cornell Theory Center, Cornell University, Arctic Region Supercomputing Center, University of Utah, Brigham Young University and Utah State University.
- Thomas Hauser organized and chairs the Utah Cyber Infrastructure Committee which includes partners from UoU, WSU, UVSC and SUU. The purpose of the committee is to promote, organize and seek funding to develop cyber infrastructure in support of research and collaboration in Utah and beyond.
- The HPC completed a visualization and access grid laboratory to provide faculty and students with resources for high-resolution visualization, remote collaboration through the Access Grid, and three-dimensional visualization. In addition, high

end workstations are available for faculty and students for data analysis, and pre/post-processing.

- The HPC increased its disk storage capacity to about 10 TB.
- The HPC is available to set up supercomputers for any USU faculty or department within about three working days, and to fully integrate it to all other USU HPC resources.

F) Office of International Program Development (OIPD)

The Office of International Program Development was transferred to the Research Office from the Provost's Office to strengthen USU research efforts in the international arena. OIPD was actively involved in a variety of faculty-led international projects and activities during the last fiscal year. Among them are:

Iraq Agricultural Extension Revitalization Project (IAER) (USDA; \$5.3 million) This project involves training Iraqi professionals in Jordan and Egypt and has been well received by the participants. USU is leading the Water Resources and Irrigation component of this project, in partnership with Texas A&M University (Lead), UC-Davis, Washington State University and New Mexico State University.

Presidential Scholars Program (Dominican Republic; Phase IV: \$9.7 million, Phase V: \$7.7 million) The Office of International Program Development (OIPD) prepared the agreement documents for Phase IV and carried out negotiations during January 2007 in Santo Domingo, in close coordination with the Provost's Office, which has responsibility for the Program. OIPD is also in discussions with the DR government about possible student programs in biotechnology and instructional technology.


Strengthening Water Users' Association (Armenia) USU submitted a bid on a project to be funded by the Government of Armenia and the Millennial Challenge Corporation of the U.S. USU submitted a formal Expression of Interest in November 2006 and was invited to submit a full proposal in FY2008.

2. OVERVIEW OF VPSVED AND RELATED STRATEGIC UNITS

In July 2006, President Albrecht hired Ned M. Weinschenker (Ph.D. in organic chemistry) as the Vice President for Strategic Ventures and Economic Development. Ned has broad experience in the start-up and development of multiple companies in the pharmaceutical industry, along with seven years as a venture capitalist.

The mission of Strategic Ventures and Economic Development is to enhance university-driven economic development by coordinating three important initiatives: The Technology Commercialization Office, the Innovation Campus, and the Utah Science Technology and Research Initiative (USTAR). Combining these three functions under a single management

umbrella allows for a streamlined process to support the evolution of research to patent to spinout companies or licenses to existing companies.



A) INNOVATION CAMPUS (IC)

The Innovation Campus is an effective working environment to conduct knowledge-based research for state-of-the-art technology enterprises, research institutes and laboratories. The Innovation Campus fosters partnerships between the University, business, government and the community, thus enhancing research opportunities and technological development. Tenants at the Innovation Campus have access to the expertise and services of USU’s research faculty and graduate students.

Although Space Dynamics Laboratory has constructed new buildings in the recent past, no new developer-owned buildings have been constructed for several years. The IC, however, continues to grow with granted rights to expand from 38 acres to 150 acres as the Agricultural Experiment Station moves to another Cache Valley location. Therefore, a plan has been initiated to begin attracting more interest in the IC. Significant additional development is expected during calendar year 2008.

The USTAR initiative also called for the construction of a research building of at least 100,000 SF that will be placed in the IC. As part of the plan, USU had to contribute \$10M to the \$60M from USTAR. A decision was made to make an existing building an in-kind donation for our match. This provided immediate space for USTAR teams and initiated the planning process for the new USTAR building. The total USTAR building space is expected

to be in excess of 125,000 SF and will be part of a 10-acre portion of the IC set aside for USU use.

As USU commercializes new research and technology, new companies will be created and grown, adjacent to and within the expanding Innovation Campus.

B) TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION OFFICE (TCO)

The TCO complements the instructional and research activities of USU and expands the University's impact on society by commercializing technologies developed at USU. Once technologies are commercialized for public use and benefit, they provide additional income to the University and its partners.

Translating university research into commercial products and services is a multi-step process that requires a major transition from a research environment to a commercial business environment. The key to managing this process is having tech-savvy business people who can bridge this "commercialization chasm." The technology commercialization process also requires three keys for success: a robust technology addressing clearly defined needs, knowledgeable business people, and financing of early stage ventures.

TCO strives to extract the fair market value of intellectual property by using the best business practices for the benefit of the inventor, USU, the Research Foundation, and the community. By effectively commercializing technology, the TCO provides additional revenue to USU, its departments, faculty, and staff. These activities also create potential for local job creation through formation of new businesses. Each TCO staff member combines business experience with a strong science and technology understanding. The TCO is committed to serving the interests of technologists, companies, and USU. Appendix F illustrates TCO accomplishments in FY2007, which are highlighted below:

- Increased license revenue to \$573,000 from \$500,000 in FY2006.
- Executed eight licenses.
- Increased invention disclosures to 62 from 54 in FY2006.
- Filed 29 patents – 11 of which were new technology
- Helped to create new "spin-out" companies:
 - S2 – creating three-dimensional images for e-commerce and other applications
 - Dynamic Screening Solutions – providing cost-effective and user-friendly interfaces for multi-agency computer input
 - RAD – developing techniques to identify and localize radioactive material

C) UTAH SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH INITIATIVE (USTAR)

USTAR is designed to increase the flow of university-driven economic development. This will benefit not only the University, but the entire state of Utah through the accelerated growth of new businesses and industries in Utah, which will create high-paying jobs and increase tax revenue.

Research focus areas are recommended by Utah State and approved by the USTAR Governing Authority as those areas most likely to create a large return on investment. At USU, three programs have been identified and funded: The Sustainable Energy Research Center (SERC), the Center for Active Sensing & Imaging (CASI), and the Center for Advanced Nutrition (CAN), with others currently in planning stages.

USTAR funding is to be used (a) to hire new faculty who are entrepreneurial and commercially-oriented to operate synergistically with existing expertise at USU; (b) to build state-of-the art facilities to house the research; (c) provide outreach to USTAR constituents. USTAR accomplishments for FY2007 include:

- 1) Current USTAR hires are:
 - David York – Center for Advanced Nutrition
 - David Ward - Center for Advanced Nutrition
 - Michael Lefevre - Center for Advanced Nutrition
 - Allen Howard – Center for Active Sensing & Imaging
 - Sridhar Viamajala – Sustainable Energy Research Center
 - Jeff Muhs - Sustainable Energy Research Center
- 2) Programming for the new USTAR building at USU was completed in December 2007, and interviews for contractor and design teams will take place in early 2008.
- 3) Creating outreach, not only from entrepreneurs to university researchers, but also from researchers to the entrepreneurs by fostering as much university-driven economic development as possible.

3. RESEARCH COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP AND FUNCTIONS

The Research Council provides advice and recommendations to the Vice President for Research. Additionally, members of the Council provide direct and important channels of communication between researchers and those who make decisions affecting research at USU. Members of the Research Council are college deans or their representatives, and selected center/lab directors as specified by the University code of policies and procedures. Appendix G is a current membership list of the University Research Council. This group meets about once a month to discuss and make recommendations on research issues.

The following is a summary of major issues addressed by USU's Research Council in FY2007:

Grant Administration and Management System (GAMS) Update

GAMS software was purchased in 2005 with the expectation that it would improve the process of submitting proposals, managing awards, streamline processes between departments, and assist USU departments in the processing of grants. In the summer of 2007, however, the Sponsored Programs Office and the V.P. Research determined that GAMS would not enhance the proposal submission process as promised without significant work around by the university. The software

was NIH agency specific, and would not effectively or efficiently meet USU's broader requirements. The implementation process was suspended.

The Research Office contracted with the Research Foundation to revise Contract Administration and Management Software (CAMS) for proposal tracking.

International Program Development Update

USU's global emphasis increased in recent years, specifically with regards to biotech projects and a diversification in both research and education. This focus includes water resources (irrigation), arid land agriculture, and natural resource management in Iran, Bolivia, Africa, and the Dominican Republic. USU partnered with the government of the Dominican Republic to offer a master's program in public policy, government employee training, and instructional technology. Growth of these globalization opportunities will result in future partnerships worldwide.

Grant Development Workshops

David Paul, Director of Sponsored Programs, provided the Research Council with a summary of faculty workshops scheduled for 2007/2008. These workshops have focused on grant writing specific to NIH, USDA and other agencies and will include topics such as funding mechanisms, training on required forms, and agency-specific expertise. Other workshops focus on SPINS training, and grant workshops tailored to fit the needs of a given department and/or college unit.

TCO, Patents & USTAR Update

Ned Weinshenker was introduced to Research Council. He gave an overview of the TCO team, current projects and patents in process and activities in process with the USTAR initiative.

Banner Concerns

Many participants of Research Council expressed concern relative to the "decentralization" steps that have been implemented as a result of Banner. As an example, departments are required to print out their own monthly reports (a very time consuming process), which has resulted in extensive resource problems within units. In some cases, the challenges and barriers with Banner have increased, and the Council agreed that implementation of more changes in Banner should be slowed down until current issues are resolved.

High Performance Computing (HPC) Faculty Interface

Thomas Hauser, Director of the HPC, distributed an overview of HPC related proposals submitted to external funding agencies along with a summary of planned projects for the upcoming year. Dr. Hauser noted that HPC was a valuable research tool not only for research in engineering, but also research in the sciences.

ASUSU Academic Opportunity Fund (AOF)

Representatives from ASUSU (Michelle Lundberg and Brittany Webb) presented historical information to Research Council about AOF's funding support to students. They shared their concern regarding the depletion of ASU's FY2007 funds at a faster pace than previous years. They wanted each college to be aware of this limitation should additional student support be requested.

Graduate Student Health Insurance

Concern was raised at Research Council that USU is at a disadvantage when recruiting graduate students because many of our peer institutions offer their graduate students subsidized health insurance. Dean Byron Burnham was asked to research the pros and cons of implementing a similar program at USU. He was asked to gather data regarding costs associated with implementing this benefit and report back to the Research and Dean's Councils. He was asked to involve Controllers' Office in the process to ensure that the program would be correctly implemented at USU.

Data collection took place between October 2006 and March 2007. Throughout these months, Dean Burnham kept Research Council informed of his findings and presented a comparison of student insurance programs implemented at USU's peer institutions.

At the April 26th meeting, Dean Burnham distributed an information packet for the Research Council's review and consideration. The Council was also provided with the following summary:

- USU supports approximately 900 graduate assistants from various funding sources.
- Data included a chart showing how many assistants fall into the three main funding types: 1) State appropriations, 2) Research, and 3) Self-Funded, according to the "Fund Title" category, i.e. State E&G, State Line Item Appropriations, Overhead, Contracts & Grants, Federal Appropriations, Service Enterprises, Unrestricted, Restricted and General Accounts.
- Of the total, 52% of USU graduate assistants are supported by funds external to the university, with 48% supported by internal university funds.

The projected financial impact to each college was detailed along with a separate chart showing the number of assistantships, scholarships, and fellowships by fund code. Dean Burnham noted other issues needing further review include: 1) how to pay for fellowships, 2) implementation time frame, 3) eligibility requirement, 4) funding model considerations and sustainability of this benefit in subsequent years.

Status of FY2007 Congressional Requests

David Lee submitted USU's congressional requests on March 8th, 2007. In April, David traveled to USU to meet with every P.I. who had a congressional funding request in FY06. Research Council was updated on the status of USU's congressional requests for FY2007 as Congress

continued to sort out new directions, priorities, and relations within the administration. Uncertainties exist with the Continuing Resolution (CR) outlined by Congress, and Dr. Miller relayed that the CR will likely continue to the end of FY2007.

Based on the CR, the Research Office continues to monitor projects in order to maximize and capture funds that were designated for projects at the agency budget level from FY06-FY07. In some cases this has not been possible as Congress put funds into formula funding allocations that impact the overall budget amount and likewise dramatically impacted USU.

Vision for Growing Research at USU

Brent Miller introduced a goal to Research Council to increase the volume and competitiveness of USU research by 10-25%. Strategies included the following: 1) improving grant proposal development, 2) enhancing faculty seed grants and implementing new seed grants, 3) increasing support for student research, 4) increasing support for post doc and research faculty hires.

Jeff Broadbent introduced two new seed grant programs for review and consideration: 1) Seed Program to Advance Research Collaboration (SPARC), and Grant-Writing Experience through Mentorship. He noted that the intent of these programs is to increase sponsored research awards and to increase awards from funding agencies that allow USU to more fully recover its indirect costs. He noted that the purpose of SPARC will be to provide funding of up to \$35,000 to catalyze development of large interdisciplinary research teams and projects that involve scholarly activities in more than one department, college, or institution. GEM will provide funding of up to \$5,000 to enhance the professional development of junior faculty through one-on-one research and grant-writing interaction with successful senior faculty. The overall goal is to help junior faculty through the process of preparing a grant proposal as well as growing research at USU. Implementation is targeted before July 1, 2008.

Strategies for Growing Research

A committee, chaired by Associated V.P. for Research Jeff Broadbent, was formed in March 2007 to recommend initiatives that the Research Office could implement and grow sponsored research by 10-25%. The Committee's mission was: "Identify the best practices for USU to achieve 10-25% growth in research." Representation from all colleges, SDL/USURF, and Center for Person with Disabilities (CPD) was requested. The committee included:

Jeff Broadbent, VPR Office
Lisa Berreau, Science
Kelli Cargile-Cook, HASS
Steve Hansen, SDL/USURF
Yong Seog Kim, Business
Brandon Muramatso, Education
Jim MacMahon, Natural Resources/Ecology Center
Mac McKee, Utah Water Research Lab/Engineering
Russ Price, USU Research Integrity & Compliance
Cynthia Rowland, CPD

Lorraine Walker, Research Office Senior Business Officer
Bart Weimer, Ag/ICIB

Presentation by SDL/USURF on Proposal Development Process

Yvonne Polak and Audrey Tablon (members of SDL's proposal development team) presented an overview of SDL/USURF's proposal and grant writing process to Research Council. The goal is to integrate some of these same concepts on campus to grow research.

Accreditation Activities

A site visit from the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) took place on March 12th. A recap of this visit was relayed at Research Council by Aaron Olsen. The visit went extremely well with a few minor recommendations noted. USU was notified in June 2007 that its AAALAC accreditation was continued.

Application for accreditation by the association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP) is also underway. A self-assessment team was created to strengthen USU's institutional capabilities. A policy has been written to implement procedures and the application will be formally submitted to AAHRPP early in 2008. A site visit will then be scheduled sometime this fall.

Guest Research Council Presentations in FY2007

The following faculty presented a summary of their research to the Research Council:

- October: Assessing the Biological Integrity of the Nation's Streams and Rivers (Charles Hawkins, Watershed Sciences)
- November: Biofuels Research at USU (Lance Seefeldt, Chemistry & Biochemistry)
- January: Cache Valley 2030 ~ The Future Explored (Richard Toth, Environment & Society)
- February: The Lost Boys of Sudan (Michael Sweeney, Journalism & Communications)
- March: Underground Wireless Sensor Network Communication (Nathan Jack, Undergrad Student/USTAR)
- April: Institute for Dam Safety Risk Management (David Bowles, UWRL)

Time & Effort Reporting (Policy Review)

A draft of a proposed Time & Effort policy was presented to Research Council in April. The general consensus is the policy is necessary to comply with OMB Circular A21; however, further clarification and additional revisions could be made to improve the policy's effectiveness at USU. Research Council approved the draft, but noted the importance of refining the document further with additional revisions.

4. USE OF FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATION FUNDS AT USU, FY2006-2007

Facilities and Administrative (F&A) costs are the shared indirect or overhead costs of doing research. The federal government audits actual F&A costs and establishes a rate that the university seeks to recover from sponsors. Recovered F&A funds are used to pay actual indirect costs of research and to stimulate and expand research opportunities.

Appendix H is a report compiled by the Controller's Office that summarizes the amount of F&A generated in FY2006-07 by department; 30% returned to the cost center; and allocations of the 70% held centrally in the VPR.

5. SELECTED RESEARCH ISSUES AT USU

In addition to those items discussed in Research Council, listed below are selected initiatives that the VPR continues to refine in FY2006-2007:

- **National Center for Hearing Assessment and Management (NCHAM)**

The VPR continued a third and final year of funding to NCHAM that enabled recruitment of two senior scientists to come to USU. Hiring these faculty significantly expanded NCHAM's capability to secure extramurally-funded research related to identification of, and services for, children with permanent hearing loss.

- **Research Activities for Undergraduate Students**

Support was provided to 45 undergraduates through the Undergraduate Research and Creative Opportunities Grant Program in FY2007. The URCO Program is one of the oldest in the nation and has funded 500 undergraduates since its inception in 1975. In its 7th annual outing, the Research on Capitol Hill event, designed to illuminate the effect of a research university on undergraduate education, featured 42 Utah State students and a similar number from the University of Utah. In the first-ever Utah Conference on Undergraduate Research (UCUR) co-chaired by Utah State and the University of Utah and hosted on the latter's campus, almost 300 students from practically every institution of higher education in the state participated in presenting their research, scholarship, and creative activity. Twelve USU students were accepted to present at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) held in San Francisco in April, 2007.

The Undergraduate Research Program was honored in late April with the Robins Achievement of the Year Award. Associate Vice President Kinkead, who oversees the program, had a chapter published in the Council on Undergraduate Research's new volume, *Developing & Sustaining a Research-Supportive Curriculum*. She also presented with her UCUR colleagues at NCUR Faculty-Administrative session and the AAC&U special conference on Undergraduate Research. In January, 2007, she was an invited speaker to AAC&U's national conference and spoke on Undergraduate Research in the Arts and Humanities. The signature program of undergraduate research, the University Undergraduate Research Fellows, chose its fourth cohort in March at Scholars Day.

- **Federal Relations Process**

The VPR has developed a systematic process of coordinating congressional requests. Requests are presented by the deans and prioritized by the President and Provost in an effort to increase USU's chances of obtaining congressionally-directed funding and increasing the amount received. Additionally, the VPR has strengthened USU's presence in Washington, D.C. by meeting frequently with elected officials and federal agency representatives.

- **Communications About USU Research**

The importance and impact of USU research is being emphasized, showing that research solves problems, supports students, and fuels the economy. The Research Office distributes two main publications each year: "Research Matters" (Volume 5) features researchers from each college and "tells the story" of the benefits of research to the community, state, and world; and a research calendar (Volume 2) helps generate top-of mind awareness about USU research among key constituents. Other publications were created that support undergraduate research, USTAR, and other research-related programs. The Research Office also sponsored several events in 2007, including a pre-basketball game reception for community contacts, an orientation session for new faculty members, and USU Research Week. A VPR Dashboard, managed by the VPR marketing team, also presents research performance indicators (Appendix I).

- **Reporting of Research Activity at USU**

The VPR, in cooperation with the Controller's Office, has developed reports that reflect total research expenditures at USU utilizing NSF definitions. These data facilitate comparison of USU and peer institutions. Appendix J is a graph that illustrates research expenditures from federal and nonfederal sponsors for the past five years, and the associated table summarizes total research expenditures for scientific and engineering (S&E) research expenditures and nonscientific and engineering (non S&E) research expenditures for FY2007. FY2004 was the first year that non S&E research expenditures data were reported separately

- **Selected Other Research Issues of Concern**

The following have been noted as other research issues of concern: (1) Human Capital is a critical problem. (2) Some states are bonded to attract and retain faculty using better financial incentives. (3) Utah needs to develop better financial funding plans to build and fund facilities, including computing, imaging, and bioinformatics capacity. (4) Security plans need to be based on a systematic review of all buildings on campus, what is housed, and what security needs would be.

APPENDIX A
SPONSORED PROGRAM CONTRACT/GRANT AWARDS
BY COLLEGE¹


	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Agriculture	33,048,308	33,940,899	13,650,668	16,979,327	12,022,213
Business	460,787	1,773,316	1,985,155	2,373,466	1,334,038
Education	23,069,480	25,047,073	25,789,744	20,722,283	22,730,535
Engineering	58,024,532	70,912,859	9,911,299	10,223,439	13,258,408
HASS	303,769	703,482	925,631	1,456,615	1,088,437
Natural Res.	8,297,175	8,024,624	9,786,361	9,684,998	10,482,217
Science	9,083,475	14,855,670	10,038,023	8,123,447	7,890,437
USURF ²	-----	-----	43,566,429	49,353,930	54,000,033
Other	6,135,902	8,107,176	7,222,649	5,525,978	10,279,740
Jointly Admin. Programs ³	<u>-880,088</u>	<u>-882,436</u>	<u>-660,217</u>	<u>-1,391,647</u>	<u>-395,158</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$138,423,428</u>	<u>\$162,482,663</u>	<u>\$122,215,742</u>	<u>\$123,051,836</u>	<u>132,690,900</u>
Financial Aid-Pell Grants, etc.	19,013,394	21,527,791	22,402,674	24,374,592	19,474,007
Adjusted Total	<u>157,436,822</u>	<u>184,010,454</u>	<u>144,618,416</u>	<u>147,426,428</u>	<u>152,164,907</u>

¹ College awards include centers most closely aligned with that college (See Appendix D for Center totals).

² USURF/SDL awards were first removed from college totals and shown separately in FY2005.

³ Awards for jointly administered programs are reflected in the total of both colleges involved with these programs. The amount in the jointly administered programs category is an accounting function designed to eliminate double counting of awards.

APPENDIX B
**Utah State University Sponsored Program Awards
 FY 2006, FY 2007**



**APPENDIX C
RESEARCH AWARDS
BY FEDERAL SPONSORING AGENCY (IN DOLLARS)**

	FY02-03	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07
Department of Agriculture	8,921,597	11,501,852	14,844,728	12,933,403	11,291,025
Department of Defense	40,633,208	56,454,422	6,229,055	20,718,470	23,854,478
Department of Education	23,173,945	16,776,033	17,795,729	16,683,226	14,080,060
Department of Health and Human Services	11,086,906	13,327,011	9,568,985	10,997,713	10,488,329
Department of the Interior	3,248,809	2,949,134	3,754,104	5,096,481	3,596,782
Department of State	-	98,267	-	-	188,281
Environmental Protection Agency	1,060,190	294,821	643,766	911,386	116,509
National Aeronautics & Space Administration	22,249,464	24,749,979	24,977,824	23,596,496	21,987,757
National Science Foundation	4,513,242	4,510,344	8,761,253	9,331,392	6,099,684
State Agencies & Others ¹	42,549,461	53,348,591	58,042,973	47,157,861	60,461,975
TOTAL	<u>\$157,436,822</u>	<u>\$184,010,454</u>	<u>\$144,618,417</u>	<u>\$147,426,428</u>	<u>152,164,907</u>

¹This number is a composite of international banks, state agencies, other federal agencies, local agencies, private industry, and others.


APPENDIX D

**SPONSORED PROGRAMS CONTRACT/GRANT AWARDS
BY RESEARCH CENTER**


RESEARCH CENTER	FY 02-03	FY 03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07
Ag. Experiment Station	8,706,601	10,891,952	11,605,967	13,881,355	12,933,734
Center for Integrated BioSystems	12,879	0	0	0	0
CASS	1,810,200	1,709,473	1,647,479	537,175	1,226,610
CPD	8,391,484	11,791,164	11,873,218	6,071,622	7,275,949
Center for Space Eng. (Beginning FY2002, USURF reassigned reporting centers)	127,500	689,420	0	0	0
Cooperative Extension	5,364,247	5,771,652	4,339,414	3,242,340	1,761,756
Ecology	2,994,710	2,609,198	2,424,505	3,250,987	2,755,350
Eng. Experiment Station	430,762	3,263,631	274,991	558,532	776,561
Financial Aid-Pell Grants, etc.	19,013,394	21,527,791	22,402,675	24,374,592	19,474,007
High Performance Computing	0	0	0	0	523,700
International Programs	0	0	0	0	0
School of the Future	57,600	0	0	0	0
Provost	447,000	76,826	24,699	0	0
Univ. Research & Training	34,273,736	35,337,214	44,267,770	44,506,542	45,486,402
USTAR	0	0	0	0	177,292
USURF/SDL	70,322,046	86,951,616	43,566,429	49,353,930	54,000,033
Remote Sensing	1,276,434	1,007,343	0	0	0
UT Transportation Center	0	0	0	0	1,801,834
Utah Water Research Lab.	<u>4,208,229</u>	<u>2,353,174</u>	<u>2,191,270</u>	<u>1,649,352</u>	<u>3,971,679</u>
Total USU	<u>\$157,436,822</u>	<u>\$184,010,454</u>	<u>\$144,618,417</u>	<u>\$147,426,427</u>	<u>\$152,164,907</u>

APPENDIX E

**Institutional Review Board (IRB)
New Approved Research Projects by Category and Total
2003 - 2007
(Continuing Review FY 2006, 2007 and Addenda for FY 2007)**



APPENDIX F



APPENDIX G

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL Membership (2007-2008)

		Phone	UMC
Brent C. Miller	Vice President for Research, Chairman	1180	1450
Douglas Anderson	College of Business	1199	1450
Jeff Broadbent	Associate Vice President for Research	2376	3555
Byron Burnham	School of Graduate Studies	1189	0900
Noelle Cockett	College of Agriculture	1167	1435
Ray Coward	Executive Vice President and Provost	1167	1435
Jim Dorward	College of Education & Human Services	1469	2800
Mary Hubbard	College of Science	2478	4400
Nat Frazer	College of Natural Resources	2445	5200
Steve Hansen	Space Dynamics Laboratory	4501	9700
Scott Hinton	College of Engineering	2775	4100
M. K. Jeppesen	Information and Learning Resources	2645	3000
Gary Kiger	College of Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences	1200	0700
Joyce Kinkead	Associate Vice President for Advancement and Student Research	1706	1435
James MacMahon	Ecology Center	2555	5205
Mac McKee	Utah Water Research Laboratory	3188	8200
Doug Ramsey	Faculty Senate President	3783	5230
H. Paul Rasmussen	Agricultural Experiment Station	2207	4810
Sarah Rule	Center for Persons with Disabilities	6800	1987
Bart Weimer	Center for Integrated Biosystems	3356	8700
Vincent Wickwar	Research Council Faculty Senate Representative	3641	4405
 <u>Students</u>			
Kevin Abernethy	Academic Senate President	1726	0105
Jeri Brunson	Graduate Studies Vice President	1736	0105
Brittany Woytco	Science Senator	7441	0105

APPENDIX H

18-Dec-07

Utah State University
 Analysis of Facilities and Administrative Costs Generated and Allocated
 July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

College or Other Unit	Generated	Budget Allocations From 30% Return	Budget Allocations From 70% Centrally Held	Total Budget Allocations	Budget as a % of Generated
College of Agriculture					
Dean's Office - Agriculture			\$ 84,512.00	\$ 84,512.00	N/A
Agriculture - Economics	\$ 69,867.00	\$ 20,960.00	136,902.00	157,862.00	225.95%
Agricultural Experiment Station	13,852.00	4,156.00		4,156.00	30.00%
Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences	1,111,396.00	333,419.00	25,000.00	358,419.00	32.25%
Center of Epidemiologic Studies	385,811.00	115,743.00		115,743.00	30.00%
Nutrition and Food Science	34,555.00	10,367.00	168,087.00	178,454.00	516.43%
Plants, Soils and Biometeorology	72,149.00	21,645.00	213,237.00	234,882.00	325.55%
Total College of Agriculture	<u>1,687,630.00</u>	<u>506,290.00</u>	<u>627,738.00</u>	<u>1,134,028.00</u>	<u>67.20%</u>
College of Business					
Dean's Office - Business			74,519.00	74,519.00	N/A
Accounting			1,729.00	1,729.00	N/A
Business Administration	56,277.00	16,883.00	38,203.00	55,086.00	97.88%
Business Information Systems			9,040.00	9,040.00	N/A
Economics				-	N/A
Management and Human Resources			16,236.00	16,236.00	N/A
Total College of Business	<u>56,277.00</u>	<u>16,883.00</u>	<u>139,727.00</u>	<u>156,610.00</u>	<u>278.28%</u>
College of Education and Human Services					
Dean's Office - Education and Human Services			100,751.00	100,751.00	N/A
Center for Persons with Disabilities	896,530.00	268,959.00	135,035.00	403,994.00	45.06%
Communicative Disorders	115,789.00	34,737.00	77,029.00	111,766.00	96.53%
Elementary Education	73,869.00	22,161.00	40,646.00	62,807.00	85.02%
Family Consumer and Human Development	172,576.00	51,773.00	42,400.00	94,173.00	54.57%
Health, Physical Education and Recreation Department	1,131.00	339.00	5,850.00	6,189.00	547.21%
Instructional Technology	313,998.00	94,199.00	41,565.00	135,764.00	43.24%
Psychology	704,853.00	211,456.00	89,070.00	300,526.00	42.64%
School of the Future	1,382.00	415.00		415.00	30.03%
Secondary Education			36,931.00	36,931.00	N/A
Special Education and Rehabilitation	48,802.00	14,641.00	5,000.00	19,641.00	40.25%
Total College of Education	<u>2,328,930.00</u>	<u>698,680.00</u>	<u>574,277.00</u>	<u>1,272,957.00</u>	<u>54.66%</u>
College of Engineering					
Dean's Office - Engineering	171,061.00	51,318.00	63,148.00	114,466.00	66.92%
Biological and Irrigation Engineering	115,155.00	34,547.00	165,020.00	199,567.00	173.30%
Civil and Environmental Engineering	267,522.00	80,257.00	22,375.00	102,632.00	38.36%
Electrical and Computer Engineering	211,186.00	63,356.00	85,052.00	148,408.00	70.27%
Engineering and Technology Education	31,898.00	9,569.00	3,500.00	13,069.00	40.97%
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering	386,109.00	115,833.00	118,166.00	233,999.00	60.60%
Utah Water Research Laboratory	606,311.00	181,893.00		181,893.00	30.00%
Total College of Engineering	<u>1,789,242.00</u>	<u>536,773.00</u>	<u>457,261.00</u>	<u>994,034.00</u>	<u>55.56%</u>
College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences					
Dean's Office - Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences	137,461.00	41,238.00	96,218.00	137,456.00	100.00%
Art			13,197.00	13,197.00	N/A
English			25,298.00	25,298.00	N/A
History			7,827.00	7,827.00	N/A
Intensive English			11,492.00	11,492.00	N/A
Interior Design			5,169.00	5,169.00	N/A
Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning	1,618.00	485.00	7,406.00	7,891.00	487.70%
Languages and Philosophy			26,463.00	26,463.00	N/A
Music			15,751.00	15,751.00	N/A
Political Science	6,974.00	2,092.00	30,765.00	32,857.00	471.14%
Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology	43,172.00	12,952.00	42,100.00	55,052.00	127.52%
Total College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences	<u>189,225.00</u>	<u>56,767.00</u>	<u>281,686.00</u>	<u>338,453.00</u>	<u>178.86%</u>

Utah State University
Analysis of Facilities and Administrative Costs Generated and Allocated
July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

<u>College or Other Unit</u>	<u>Generated</u>	<u>Budget Allocations From 30% Return</u>	<u>Budget Allocations From 70% Centrally Held</u>	<u>Total Budget Allocations</u>	<u>Budget as a % of Generated</u>
College of Natural Resources					
Dean's Office - Natural Resources	\$ 79.00	\$ 24.00	\$ 104,873.00	\$ 104,897.00	N/A
Aquatic, Watershed and Earth Resources	364,738.00	109,421.00	50,539.00	159,960.00	43.86%
Ecology Center	84,680.00	25,404.00	9,200.00	34,604.00	40.86%
Environment and Society	90,777.00	27,233.00	7,045.00	34,278.00	37.76%
Forest, Range and Wildlife Sciences	448,103.00	134,431.00	48,137.00	182,568.00	40.74%
Total College of Natural Resources	<u>988,377.00</u>	<u>296,513.00</u>	<u>219,794.00</u>	<u>516,307.00</u>	<u>52.24%</u>
College of Science					
Dean's Office - Science			83,672.00	83,672.00	N/A
Biology	413,164.00	123,949.00	32,969.00	156,918.00	37.98%
Center for Atmospheric and Space Sciences	499,396.00	149,819.00	50,000.00	199,819.00	40.01%
Chemistry and Biochemistry	279,240.00	83,772.00	341,407.00	425,179.00	152.26%
Computer Science	147,254.00	44,176.00	166,635.00	210,811.00	143.16%
Geology	88,605.00	26,581.00	103,858.00	130,439.00	147.21%
Mathematics and Statistics	56,032.00	16,810.00	65,189.00	81,999.00	146.34%
Physics	281,299.00	84,390.00	112,513.00	196,903.00	70.00%
Total College of Science	<u>1,764,990.00</u>	<u>529,497.00</u>	<u>956,243.00</u>	<u>1,485,740.00</u>	<u>84.18%</u>
Vice President - University Extension					
Brigham City Campus	15,911.00	4,773.00		4,773.00	30.00%
Cooperative Extension	50.00	15.00		15.00	30.00%
Extension Agriculture and Natural Resources	70,688.00	21,206.00		21,206.00	30.00%
Extension Field Staff	23,431.00	7,029.00		7,029.00	30.00%
Extension Youth Programs	16,404.00	4,921.00		4,921.00	30.00%
Extension Community Development	1,078.00	323.00	50,910.00	51,233.00	4752.60%
Uintah Basin Center	2,826.00	848.00		848.00	30.01%
Total Vice President - University Extension	<u>130,388.00</u>	<u>39,115.00</u>	<u>50,910.00</u>	<u>90,025.00</u>	<u>69.04%</u>
International Programs					
International Programs	-	-	40,000.00	40,000.00	N/A
Total Internatinal Programs	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>40,000.00</u>	<u>40,000.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Vice President - Student Administration and Services					
Campus Recation	27,476.00	8,243.00		8,243.00	30.00%
Student Support Services	28,666.00	8,600.00		8,600.00	30.00%
Vice President for Student Serivces	9,000.00	2,700.00		2,700.00	30.00%
Undergraduate Scholarships and Recruitment			100,000.00	100,000.00	N/A
Total Vice President - Student Administration and Services	<u>65,142.00</u>	<u>19,543.00</u>	<u>100,000.00</u>	<u>119,543.00</u>	<u>183.51%</u>
Vice President - Information Technology					
Information Technology	9,937.00	2,981.00		2,981.00	30.00%
Total Vice President - University Extension	<u>9,937.00</u>	<u>2,981.00</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2,981.00</u>	<u>30.00%</u>
Utah State University Research Foundation					
Space Dynamics Laboratory	11,002,424.00	11,002,424.00	135,074.00	11,137,498.00	101.23%
Total Utah State University Research Foundation	<u>11,002,424.00</u>	<u>11,002,424.00</u>	<u>135,074.00</u>	<u>11,137,498.00</u>	<u>101.23%</u>
School of Graduate Studies					
School of Graduate Studies	3,011.00	903.00	272,000.00	272,903.00	9063.53%
Total School of Graduate Studies	<u>3,011.00</u>	<u>903.00</u>	<u>272,000.00</u>	<u>272,903.00</u>	<u>9063.53%</u>
Total Colleges and Non-Academic Units	<u>20,015,573.00</u>	<u>13,706,369.00</u>	<u>3,854,710.00</u>	<u>17,561,079.00</u>	<u>87.74%</u>

Support of Infrastructure


Utah State University
Analysis of Facilities and Administrative Costs Generated and Allocated
July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

<u>College or Other Unit</u>	<u>Generated</u>	<u>Budget Allocations From 30% Return</u>	<u>Budget Allocations From 70% Centrally Held</u>	<u>Total Budget Allocations</u>	<u>Budget as a % of Generated</u>
Vice President - Research					
Center for High Performance Computing	\$8,336.00	\$2,501.00	\$ 396,260.00	\$ 398,761.00	4783.60%
Audit Disallowance			\$ 94,536.00	\$ 94,536.00	N/A
Disallowance Account			\$ 50,000.00	50,000.00	N/A
Building 620 Rent			\$ 189,348.00	\$ 189,348.00	N/A
FBA Prof SVCS			15,000.00	15,000.00	N/A
Internet II			97,138.00	97,138.00	N/A
LARC Renovation			53,550.00	53,550.00	N/A
Office of Technology Management and Commercialization			909,661.00	909,661.00	N/A
Budget Cut			200,000.00	200,000.00	N/A
Special Projects			24,000.00	24,000.00	N/A
Women and Gender Research Institute			13,500.00	13,500.00	N/A
Strategic Ventures and Economic Development	25,236.00	7,571.00	-	7,571.00	30.00%
URCO			10,000.00	10,000.00	N/A
Undergraduate Research			15,000.00	15,000.00	N/A
Washington Based Support			191,400.00	191,400.00	N/A
Total Vice President - Research	<u>33,572.00</u>	<u>10,072.00</u>	<u>2,259,393.00</u>	<u>2,269,465.00</u>	<u>6759.99%</u>
Vice President - Business and Finance					
Accounting and Financial Reporting			160,134.00	160,134.00	N/A
Controller's Office			60,716.00	60,716.00	N/A
Facilities and Administrative Cost Study			254,805.00	254,805.00	N/A
Federal Single Audit			27,920.00	27,920.00	N/A
MAXIMUS Consulting			24,000.00	24,000.00	N/A
Purchasing			24,069.00	24,069.00	N/A
Total Vice President - Business and Finance		<u>-</u>	<u>551,644.00</u>	<u>551,644.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Total Support of Infrastructure (% is computed on total Facilities and Administrative costs generated from all units)					
	<u>33,572.00</u>	<u>10,072.00</u>	<u>2,811,037.00</u>	<u>2,821,109.00</u>	<u>8403.16%</u>
Provost's Office					
Total Provost's Office	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>43,200.00</u>	<u>43,200.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Vice President - Research					
Biotechnology Bond			791,168.00	791,168.00	N/A
Total Vice President - Research			<u>791,168.00</u>	<u>791,168.00</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Total	<u>\$ 20,049,145.00</u>	<u>\$ 13,716,441.00</u>	<u>\$ 7,500,115.00</u>	<u>\$ 21,216,556.00</u>	<u>105.82%</u>


APPENDIX I USU RESEARCH PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD – FY 2007

Research Funding


Total Research Expenditures¹ ▲




F&A (Indirect Costs) Recovered ●




Effective F&A Rate² ●



USU Non-Student Research-Related Jobs ▼




Funded Utah Centers of Excellence ▲




Sponsored Programs


Number of Proposals Submitted³ ▲




Number of Grants Awarded³ ●




Total Amount of Contracts/Grants Awarded⁴ ▼



Federal Funding as a Percent of Total Funding ●




Industry Funding as a Percent of Total Funding ●




Tech. Commercialization


Number of Invention Disclosures ▲




New Patents Filed ●




Gross License Income ▲



Startup Business Income ▲




Number of New Start-Up Companies ▲




Innovation Campus


Tenants ●




Total Square Feet ●




Percent Net Occupancy ●



Employees ▲




Student Employees ▲




Student Research


Funding for Undergraduate Research ▲




Funding for Graduate Research⁵ ▲




Undergraduate Research Employees Headcount ▲



Graduate Research Employees Headcount ▲



Undergraduate Research Transcript Scholars⁶ ●



TREND KEY:

- ▲ higher
- ▼ lower
- no change


- green = better
- red = worse
- black = neutral

FOOTNOTES:

- ¹ According to NSF Report
- ² Some funding agencies by policy limit the recovery of F&A costs to less than the negotiated rate. Effective F&A is the ratio between modified total direct costs and actual F&A collected.
- ³ One proposal can be awarded in multiple years.

- ⁴ The largest SDL project, RAMOS, was canceled in 2005.
- ⁵ Graduate research funding includes: fellowships, travel, and graduate student recruitment.
- ⁶ 2008 number includes only students who graduated in December 2007.

APPENDIX J



Millions of Dollars

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Non-Federal	43.3	47.3	38.9	42.4	47.3
Federal	95.5	108.4	92.7	96.2	108.4
Total S&E	138.8	155.7	131.6	138.6	155.7
Non S&E	1.8	0.6	2.6	4.3	0.6
Total Research Exp.	277.6	312	265.8	281.5	312

Committee on Committees
Information Report to the Senate (no action required)
Faculty Senate Reapportionment Summary

12 February 2008

The Committee on Committees with the help of Andi McCabe and the Office of Assessment, generated the following tables that lists the number of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty in each administrative unit and their apportionment among next year's Senators, per code section 402.10.1. Overall, there are 13.6 eligible faculty per Senator. The method to generate these data were changed from the past practice in two small ways.

One: part time faculty (previously excluded) were included in these data; there is nothing in code that indicates they should be excluded. The total number of part-time faculty is 27 who equate to 20 FTE. It turns out that when these 20 FTE were distributed across six departments, the distribution of Senators for next year did not change; however, this practice will be integrated into the Banner program in the future. For the record, Banner also lists 4 faculty on leave-without-pay who are not included in these data.

Two: for the first time the reapportionment tables list Remote Campuses and Distance Education faculty. As predicted last spring, generating these data took considerable hand tracking of faculty and adjustments to the numbers generated by Banner; coordination is on-going to smooth this process for the future. Technically, Senators representing RCDE will not become official until a code change to 402.10.2 or 402.3.1 is approved; however, we are suggesting that Extension and RCDE coordinate their nominations and possibly their elections this spring with these numbers in mind.

See attached re-apportionment data.

Utah State University
2008-09 Faculty Senate Reapportionment Summary by Administrative Unit

Table 1. 2007-08 Reapportionment

Administrative Unit	Faculty		Senators	
			Number	
	Number	% of Total	Un-rounded	Rounded
Agriculture	78.0	10%	5.74	6
Business	54.0	7%	3.98	4
Education	104.0	14%	7.66	8
Engineering	73.0	10%	5.37	5
Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences	169.0	23%	12.44	12
Natural Resources	44.0	6%	3.24	3
Science	112.0	15%	8.25	8
Total Colleges	634.0	85%	46.68	46
Extension*	91.0	12%	6.70	7
Libraries	22.0	3%	1.62	2
Remote Campuses & Distance Education				
TOTAL	747.0	100%	55.00	55

Table 2. 2008-09 Reapportionment

Administrative Unit	Faculty		Senators	
			Number	
	Number	% of Total	Un-rounded	Rounded
Agriculture	78.0	10%	5.71	6
Business	56.0	7%	4.10	4
Education	110.5	15%	8.09	8
Engineering	69.0	9%	5.05	5
Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences	168.6	22%	12.35	12
Natural Resources	46.6	6%	3.41	3
Science	116.3	15%	8.52	9
Total Colleges	645.0	86%	47.24	47
Cooperative Extension	64.0	9%	4.69	5
Library & Instructional Support	23.5	3%	1.72	2
Remote Campuses & Distance Education	18.4	2%	1.35	1
TOTAL	750.9	100%	55.00	55

Table 3. Comparison of Number of Faculty and Senators, 2006-07 and 2007-08

Administrative Unit	2006-07		2007-08		1-Year Change	
	Faculty	Senators	Faculty	Senators	Faculty	Senators
Agriculture	78.0	6	78.0	6	0.0	0
Business	54.0	4	56.0	4	2.0	0
Education	104.0	8	110.5	8	6.5	0
Engineering	73.0	5	69.0	5	(4.0)	0
Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences	169.0	12	168.6	12	(0.4)	0
Natural Resources	44.0	3	46.6	3	2.6	0
Science	112.0	8	116.3	9	4.3	1
Total Colleges	634.0	46	645.0	47	11.0	1
Extension*	91.0	7	64.0	5	(27.0)	(2)
Library & Instructional Support	22.0	2	23.5	2	1.5	0
Remote Campuses & Distance Education			18.4	1	18.4	1
TOTAL	747.0	55	750.9	55	(14.5)	(1)

* Non-Resident Extension Faculty were accepted as members of the Faculty Senate in 2001-02. In prior years, only Resident Extension Faculty were members.

Note 1: Faculty include tenured and tenure-eligible faculty in the Human Resource System (HRS) file between 7/1/07 and 11/01/07.

Note 2: "Full-time" for 9-month faculty is defined as 1.00 FTE and for 12-month faculty as 0.75 to 1.00 FTE.

Note 3: The faculty in the jointly administered department of Economics was assigned equally to the administering colleges.

Note 4: The green figures in the rounded senators' number columns indicate adjusted numbers.

Note 5: In 2006-07, Extension split into Cooperative Extension and Regional Campus & Distance Education

Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee 2007-2008 Summary Report

Jeanette Norton, Chair (08) Agriculture
Steve Harris (09) Vice Chair, Libraries
Ted Evans (10) Science
Jim Bame (08) Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
JoLene Bunnell (10) Extension
Charles Salzberg (09) Education and Human Services
Gary Stewardson (10) Engineering
Eugene Schupp (09) Natural Resources, on sabbatical
Fred Baker (08) Alternate for Gene Schupp
Vance Grange (10) Business
Jake Gunther (09) Senate
Daren Cornforth (09) Senate
James Sanders (10) Senate

This report covers the activities of the BFW committee since the last summary report in March 2007 through January 2008.

Meetings: 2007: March 27, April 24, August 28, September 25, October 30, November 27
2008: January 29

Facts and Discussions:

The Budget and Faculty Welfare committee is concerned with budget matters, faculty salaries, insurance programs, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, consulting policies, and other faculty benefits.

The duties of the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee are to: (1) participate in the budget preparation process; (2) periodically evaluate and report to the Senate on matters relating to faculty salaries, insurance program, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, consulting policies, and other faculty benefits; (3) review the financial and budgetary implications of proposals for changes in academic degrees and programs, and report to the Senate prior to Senate action relating to such proposals; and (4) report to the Senate significant fiscal and budgetary trends which may affect the academic programs of the University.

Main items discussed at recent meetings include:

The results of BFW Committee actions may be found in the committee minutes published within the USU Faculty Senate web pages. A short summary of our actions and findings are given below.

BFW operation

The review of academic program changes for budgetary impact by the BFW committee has been ongoing but the work flow between different review committees needs improvement. J. Norton met with Graduate Dean Burnham and agreed to continue with parallel review but to keep committees informed through email communication.

Summary of academic program review

BFW continued a discussion and review of the integration of regional campuses, distance education, on-line education, and continuing education programs into existing USU departmental programs. The goal of integration is considered a considerable improvement over previous administrative structures. Faculty roles assignments will be formulated through co-operation between (Logan) department heads and regional campus executive directors. Faculty on regional campuses will have letters at the time of review from department head, dean, and regional campus executive director. Some concerns remain about budgetary impacts and funding sources for tenure eligible faculty although funding through legislative action (HB 185) has improved this situation. Efforts to improve participation and acculturation of all faculty including those from regional campuses are ongoing.

The BFW remains concerned about pre-tenure tenure-track faculty teaching overload courses because of financial incentives or departmental pressure. We also are concerned about tenured faculty with research roles teaching overload courses that reduce their time available to complete and publish research. We discourage departments from assigning faculty to teach off-campus courses on an overload basis. Department heads need to appreciate the significant input of time required for faculty to develop courses for electronic delivery and support this effort by reducing other workload demands if possible.

The BFW Committee examined the financial implications and impacts to faculty of several new programs or degrees. The results of the BFW Committee discussions were communicated to EPC or its representative and are on record in the minutes. The BFW Committee assumes that financial problems found by BFW will be addressed before programs are approved by EPC.

Programs reviewed this year:

1) International Program-China: Bachelor of Science with a Major in Economics

BFW concerns were communicated to DEED committee through Rhonda Menlove. Rhonda Menlove and Chris Fawson worked on clarifying these issues and program was approved by EPC on 4/3/07, FS on 4/30/07, and Trustees on 7/13/07.

2) Bachelor in Interior Design (BID Degree)

BFW concerns communicated, program has not passed Graduate Council

3) Masters degree in Anthropology with a specialization in Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management

Concerns communicated, review ongoing at Graduate Council

4) Master of Music degree (M.M.) with an emphasis in Piano Performance and Pedagogy

Concerns communicated, review ongoing at Graduate Council

Issues of Faculty Welfare Discussed

1) Faculty salary compression

Administration acknowledges this problem but it is difficult to correct without additional legislative support. There was some improvement in 2007 budget year. Equity and merit pay increases will continue to be used to retain high performers. Efforts are ongoing to document

status of salaries compared to salaries at peer institutions. There have been concerted efforts at several public universities to address this problem and BFW is assessing these proactive approaches for consideration by the faculty senate.

2) Conflict of Interest Policy on Textbooks

The faculty is required to be self-policing of potential conflicts of interest. BFW Chair will communicate with compliance office (Mr. Russ Price) about changes in Conflict of Interest Form 1. This would add the \$500 level as a screening device but not an absolute limit.

Suggested wording for COI form 1 question #4

4. In university courses you teach or for which you have direct responsibility, do you require the use of a textbook or course materials which you have authored or compiled, and from which you receive significant royalty or other sales proceeds? (For this purpose “significant” means royalties and/or proceeds that annually exceed \$500).

Yes _____ No _____

3) Suggest change in scheduling on grievance review (continuance during academic breaks)

BFW does not recommend changes to current policy due to creating situations in which faculty on 9-month appointments would be required to serve on committees during academic breaks. While continuance of committee function may be encouraged, changing the code to require work through break periods was not judged to be in the best interest of faculty serving on these committees.

4) Request for availability of group supplemental medical insurance for retirees

BFW has expressed this concern through Employee Benefits Advisory Board, the HR staff has taken this matter under consideration and progress is being made in assessing options and offerings from various providers.

Recommendations or actions needed:

1) Conflicts of Interest Textbook and course materials policy

BFW suggested changes to wording on COI forms, any further overall policy change should be brought before FS for their review.

2) BFW supports the requests of faculty to have available for purchase group supplemental coverage for retirees. BFW encourages HR to continue to move forward on this issue as it is of considerable interest to USU faculty to have a program in place as soon as possible. BFW will be monitoring the progress on this issue closely.

3) Budgetary priorities

BFW requests an annual meeting with the administration to review USU budgetary priorities before the legislative session begins. This issue was not adequately discussed this year.

4) Faculty Salary Compression

BFW will research proactive approaches taken by peer institutions and report on findings to the faculty senate early fall 2008.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee
February 7, 2008

The Educational Policies Committee met on February 7, 2008. Minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties at <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/index.html>.

The Educational Policies Committee, after careful review, recommends approval of the following by the Faculty Senate:

- 1) Request from the Department of Sociology, Social Work and Anthropology to offer a Master of Science in Anthropology with a specialization in Archeology and Cultural Resource Management.
- 2) Request from the Department of History to offer a Latin Teaching Minor.
- 3) Several new courses were approved. These may be reviewed in the minutes of the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Educational Policies Committee, which are posted on the Curriculum Subcommittee website.

402.10 SENATE ELECTIONS

10.1 Apportionment of Elected Faculty Positions

Annually, the Senate Committee on Committees shall apportion the number of elective Senate positions to the colleges, Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, and the Libraries. Apportionment shall be in proportion to the number of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty in each college, in Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, and in the Libraries. The minimum representation from each of these academic units shall be one.

For purposes of Faculty Senate elections and apportionment, USU faculty members with joint or multiple academic affiliations will only be counted in one unit. For example, faculty members on the Logan campus with appointments or affiliations with more than one academic unit will be counted in the academic department that administers their tenure. In a similar manner, faculty members on the regional campuses will be aggregated and counted into a single category (referred to as the Regional Campus and Distance Education unit) and will not be counted in the Logan campus academic departments to which they are affiliated. Any questions or disputes about where a faculty member is counted will be adjudicated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

10.2 Election of Faculty Members to the Senate

(1) Scheduled date; notice to deans and directors.

Elections of faculty representatives to the Senate and sufficient alternate senators to serve when regular senators cannot attend, are held by colleges, Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, and the Libraries. Elections shall be supervised by the Senate Committee on Committees. Elections shall be conducted during the spring semester of each school year, in time to be announced at the March meeting of the Senate. Additional elections shall be held as necessary to ensure the availability of alternates to fill vacancies in unexpired terms for the duration of those terms. The Senate Committee on Committees shall notify the appropriate deans and directors of the number of senators to be elected annually by their faculty and the date by which the elections must be held.

(2) Nominations.

After receipt of notice that annual elections shall be held, the appropriate deans and directors shall communicate by memorandum with their resident faculty members eligible to vote in Senate elections (see policy 401.6.2 for limitations) for the purpose of nominating Senate candidates. There shall be at least two candidates for each vacancy.

(3) Voting.

Faculty members with tenured or tenure-eligible appointments and faculty members with term appointments may nominate and vote for candidates in Senate elections in the academic unit in

which they are apportioned. Balloting shall be by mail within each college, Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, and the Libraries (~~see~~ policy 402.10.1).

(4) Verification and notice of election results.

The colleges, Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses and Distance Education and the Libraries must submit the names of nominees elected to the Senate Committee on Committees on or before the final date set for the conclusion of elections. The Committee on Committees shall verify all election results and then inform the Senate of the names of new members at its regularly scheduled April meeting. All election results shall be made public.

10.3 Elections within the Senate

Nominations for the offices of Senate President and President Elect shall occur from the floor during the April Senate meeting. Elections shall be by secret ballot completed prior to the May meeting.

Number 407

Subject: Academic Due Process: Sanctions and Hearing Procedures

.....

407.7 NONRENEWAL

7.1 Definition of NonRenewal

Nonrenewal is the ending of employment of tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty, other than by dismissal (policy 407.2.1(5)) or by termination (policy 406.2.3(2)). When nonrenewal occurs at the end of the pretenure probationary period for tenure-eligible faculty (policy 405.1.4), it is a denial of tenure.

...

7.2 Reasons for NonRenewal

There are only three reasons for nonrenewal: ~~cessation of extramural funding that is required for a substantial portion of the salary support of the faculty member,~~ unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member's assigned role (policies 405.6.1 and 11.1), ~~or~~ failure to satisfy the criteria for the award of tenure; or cessation of extramural funding that is required for a substantial portion of the salary support of the faculty member. A denial of tenure shall be based upon tenure advisory committee review (policy 405.7.2). Nonrenewal prior to the end of the pre-tenure probationary period for tenure eligible faculty is an administrative decision of the department head, director, dean, or vice president and must be approved by the Provost and President. In making this decision regarding non-renewal, the department head, director, dean, or vice presidents is to take into consideration the most current and all previous reports from the tenure advisory committee. ~~Nonrenewal prior to the end of the pre-tenure probationary period may be based on tenure advisory committee review (policy 405.6.2(1)).~~ Tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments non-renewed for reasons which violate their academic freedom or legal rights.

407.7 NONRENEWAL

7.1 Definition of NonRenewal

Nonrenewal is the ending of employment of tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty, other than by dismissal (policy 407.2.1(5)) or by termination (policy 406.2.3(2)). When nonrenewal occurs at the end of the pretenure probationary period for tenure-eligible faculty (policy 405.1.4), it is a denial of tenure.

7.2 Reasons for NonRenewal

There are only three reasons for nonrenewal: cessation of extramural funding that is required for a substantial portion of the salary support of the faculty member, unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member's assigned role (policies 405.6.1 and 11.1), or failure to satisfy the criteria for the award of tenure. A denial of tenure shall be based upon tenure advisory committee review (policy 405.7.2). Nonrenewal prior to the end of the pre-tenure probationary period for tenure eligible faculty is an administrative decision of the department head, director, dean, or vice president and must be approved by the Provost and President. Nonrenewal prior to the end of the pre-tenure probationary period may be based on tenure advisory committee review (policy 405.6.2(1)). Tenureeligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments nonrenewed for reasons which violate their academic freedom or legal rights.

7.3 Notice of NonRenewal

(1) Delivery of notice.

The President or the President's designee shall prepare written notice of non-renewal and shall deliver the notice personally to the faculty member, or shall have the notice delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested. If the notice is thus mailed, it is deemed effective for all purposes.

(2) Notification schedule.

For tenure-eligible faculty appointments non-renewal must first be preceded by the following minimum notice (Table 407.7.3): (a) not later than March 1 for first-year and second-year appointees; (b) not later than December 15 for third-year appointees; (c) no later than January 29 prior to the issuance of a terminal year appointment for fourth-year and fifth-year appointees, except in the case of denial of tenure (see Section 407.7.1), where minimum notice shall be not later than April 15.

Table 407.7.3 Notification schedule for nonrenewal of tenure-eligible faculty appointments on a normal pre-tenure probationary period.

.....

**There is an early schedule for annual review and recommendation for renewal for third-year appointees.

For term appointment commencing at times other than the beginning of the academic year, notice of non-renewal must be no later than: (a) 60 days prior to the end of the first year of service; (b) 130 days prior to the end of the second year of service; or (c) 30 days prior to the issuance of a terminal year appointment after two or more years of service.

7.4 Procedures

(1) Statement of reasons for nonrenewal.

Reasons for nonrenewal may be stated in the notice of nonrenewal, at the President's discretion.

(2) Conference.

At the faculty member's request, a conference to discuss the nonrenewal shall occur between department head or supervisor and faculty member who received notice of nonrenewal within 5 days of receipt of the notice of nonrenewal.

(3) Review by higher administrative level.

At the faculty member's request, the nonrenewal and relevant documentation shall be reviewed in conference with the faculty member at the next higher level outside the academic unit within 15 days of the notice of nonrenewal. Unless specifically requested by the faculty member, this conference shall not include the department head or supervisor.

405.6 TENURE, PROMOTION AND REVIEW: GENERAL PROCEDURES

6.1 Role Statement and Role Assignment

A role statement will be prepared by the department head or supervisor, agreed upon between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member at the time he or she accepts an appointment, and approved by the director (where applicable) or dean. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional service (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional service. Role statements serve two primary functions. First, the faculty member can gauge his or her expenditure of time and energy relative to the various roles the faculty member is asked to perform in the University. Second, role statements provide the medium by which the assigned duties of the faculty member are described and by which administrators and evaluation committees can judge and counsel a faculty member with regard to his or her allocation of effort. During the search process, the department head or supervisor will discuss with each candidate his or her prospective role in the academic unit as defined by the role statement.

The role statement shall be reviewed, signed and dated annually by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and dean, director, or vice provost, and revised as needed. Any subsequent revision may be initiated by either the faculty member or the department head or supervisor. Any revision of the role statement should be mutually agreed to by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and approved by the director (where applicable) or dean. If agreement cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements before transmitting revised role statements to P/T committees. A copy of the role statement, and any later revisions, will be provided to the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, director (where applicable), the dean, vice president, the Provost, and the members of the tenure and/or promotion advisory committee.

The faculty member's role assignment provides for the detailed implementation of the professional services of the faculty member described in the role statement. During the annual review, the role assignment may be adjusted within the parameters of the role statement. Major changes in the role assignment may prompt review and revision of the role statement.

6.2 Advisory Committees

(1) Tenure advisory committee.

For each new tenure-eligible faculty member who is appointed, the faculty member's department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president appoint a tenure advisory committee. All tenure advisory committees will be appointed during the faculty member's first semester of service. The committee shall consist of at least five members, at least one of whom is from outside the academic unit. The department head or supervisor will designate the chair of the committee. The dean of the college will appoint

a tenure advisory committee for department heads appointed without tenure in academic departments. The Provost will appoint a tenure advisory committee for directors, deans, or vice presidents (where applicable) appointed without tenure.

The tenure advisory committee members shall be tenured and hold rank higher than that held by the faculty member under consideration unless that faculty member is an untenured full professor, Extension professor, librarian, or Extension agent. If there are fewer than five faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. The department head or supervisor of the candidate shall not serve on tenure advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the tenure advisory committee. The candidate may request replacement of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor, the director (where applicable), and the dean, or vice president.

The role of the tenure advisory committee is to assist the faculty member in the achievement of tenure through appropriate counsel and advisement and to render judgment that the faculty member has or has not attained the criteria for tenure.

Concurrently, the tenure advisory committee has a responsibility to recommend the nonrenewal of the appointment of a faculty member who is not, in the judgment of the committee, progressing satisfactorily toward tenure. To these ends, the tenure advisory committee shall counsel and advise and thereafter make an annual recommendation with respect to the continuation of the appointment of the faculty member. Such a recommendation will be: 1) to renew the appointment; 2) to nonrenew the appointment (407.2.1(5)) prior to the end of the probationary period; 3) to award tenure; or 4) to deny tenure, that is, to nonrenew the appointment (407.2.1(5)) at the end of the probationary period.

(2) Promotion advisory committee.

When a faculty member without tenure is to be considered for promotion, the tenure advisory committee shall also serve as a promotion advisory committee. The term of this committee shall expire when the faculty member is awarded tenure.

Following tenure, if a faculty member so desires, he or she may request in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed and meet with the faculty member. This shall be done by the department head in consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, vice provost or vice president within 30 days of receipt of the written request. The promotion advisory committee must be formed by February 15th of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) above be held at this time.

If the promotion advisory committee meets for the first time in the fifth year post tenure, this committee would also perform the functions of the post-tenure review committee. If this committee has met prior to the fifth year then this committee or a three member subcommittee may form the post-tenure review committee and carry out the Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty 405.12.2.

The promotion advisory committee shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and higher rank than does the faculty member. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a chair other than him or herself. Normally, two academic unit members of higher rank who have served on the candidate's tenure advisory committee shall be appointed to the promotion advisory committee, and at least one member shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than four faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee. The candidate may request removal of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president. When a department head or supervisor is being considered for promotion, the director (where applicable), the appropriate dean, or vice president shall appoint the promotion advisory committee; when a director (where applicable), dean, or vice president is being considered, the Provost shall appoint the promotion advisory committee. When a faculty member with tenure wishes to be considered for promotion, at the request of the candidate for promotion the department head or supervisor shall, by February 15 of the Spring Semester six months prior to that consideration, convene the promotion advisory committee to meet with the candidate.

(3) Review committee for tenured faculty.

The review committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member being reviewed. The committee shall be appointed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president and shall include at least one member from outside the academic unit. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall not serve on this committee, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee (see 405.12(2)).

6.3 Candidate's File

The candidate is responsible for keeping his or her professional file current and complete.

This file is the primary source of information for the tenure and/or promotion advisory committee. The file should include thorough documentation of teaching, research/creative endeavor, librarianship, service, and/or extension effort, in accord with the role assignment.

Other materials that provide information or data of consequence to the formal review of the candidate should be added to the candidate's file as supplementary material before the tenure advisory committee's annual meeting. The candidate is entitled to review this supplementary material upon request, with the exception of peer review letters. If a candidate wishes to comment on any item in this supplementary material, the candidate's written comment must be added prior to the annual meeting of the tenure advisory committee.

6.4 University Records: Access

A faculty member has the right to examine, upon request, University records maintained or retrievable under his or her name or identifying number.

University records maintained or retrievable under a faculty member's name or identifying number shall be open to inspection only by the President and administrative officers or persons to whom the President delegates in writing the power to inspect such records. Other persons shall not be permitted to examine such records except as required by law.

6.5 Ombudspersons

All Colleges, Extension, and the Libraries will appoint ombudspersons to serve in the Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review processes. Ombudspersons will be tenured faculty members (as defined in section 401.2.1) and elected or appointed in their respective colleges. The Provost's office will develop and implement a plan for the ombudsperson program that defines the election or appointment process, the terms of office, the training, and the implementation of the ombudsperson program.

An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of a promotion committee or a tenure committee. Ombudspersons must receive adequate advance notice of a committee meeting from the chairperson.

For post-tenure quinquennial review meetings and for meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the tenure, promotion, or review candidate to review the committee's evaluation and recommendation, the candidate or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson.

The ombudsperson is responsible for ensuring that the rights of the candidate and the University are protected and that due process is followed according to the Faculty Code. Ombudspersons shall not judge or assess the candidate, and therefore is not a member of the promotion, tenure, or review committee, or a supervisor of the candidate.

Ombudspersons who observe a violation of due process during a committee meeting

should immediately intervene to identify the violation. Committee reports shall be submitted to the department head or supervisor only if they include the ombudsperson's signed statement that due process has been followed.

If the ombudsperson cannot sign such a statement, then the ombudspersons shall report irregularities to the department head or supervisor and the dean or other administrator. After conferring with the ombudsperson, the department head, supervisor, dean or other administrator will determine what, if any, actions should be taken.

405.7 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE TENURE PROCESS

7.1 Annual Event

(1) Meetings of the tenure advisory committee.

An initial meeting of the committee shall be held to acquaint the candidate with the members, to discuss the professional plans of the candidate, to review the role statement, and to initiate an annual review of the candidate's progress. An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of the tenure advisory committee in accordance with policy 405.6.5. All tenure advisory committee members shall participate interactively in all committee meetings, either physically or by voice conferencing, at the appointed date and time. Ombudspersons must be present in person, with the exception of meetings for fieldbased Extension faculty, when they may participate by voice conferencing.

(2) Evaluation and recommendation by the tenure advisory committee.

After the initial meeting, the tenure advisory committee shall meet with the candidate at least annually and review the candidate's file and supplementary material to evaluate progress toward tenure. An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of the tenure advisory committee in accordance with policy 405.6.5. The committee will submit, each year, a written report to the department head or supervisor. This report shall be submitted by December 1 for first-year and second-year appointees, by October 26 for third-year appointees, and by December 1 during subsequent years (see Table 405.1.4). Except in the year in which the tenure decision must be made, the report shall include an evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure and identify areas for improvement in the candidate's performance as necessary. **The report shall also contain a recommendation regarding the renewal or nonrenewal of the appointment (405.6.2(1); 407.7).** Copies of all reports signed by the committee members shall be provided to the candidate, the department head, or supervisor and the director (where applicable), the dean, or vice president. A copy shall be placed in the candidate's file.

(3) Evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor.

The department head or supervisor shall, after receiving the tenure advisory committee report, meet annually with the candidate to review fulfillment of the role statement and the role assignment and evaluate progress toward tenure. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the candidate to review the committee's evaluation and recommendation, the candidate or department head or supervisor may

request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. Subsequently, the department head or supervisor shall submit in writing to the director (where applicable), dean, or associate or assistant vice president of extension an evaluation of the candidate indicating where satisfactory progress is being made and where improvement is needed. The department head or supervisor may recommend the nonrenewal of the appointment of the faculty member. This report shall be submitted by December 18 for first-year and second-year appointees, by November 10 for third-year appointees, and by December 18 during subsequent years. Copies will be provided to the candidate and the tenure advisory committee. A copy shall be placed in the candidate's file.

Code Change Suggestions to 405.7.2(1) and 405.8.3(1)

7.2 Additional Events During the Year in which a Tenure Decision is to be Made

(1) External peer reviews.

Prior to September 15, the department head or supervisor will make a single solicitation of letters from at least four peers of rank equivalent to or higher than that sought by the candidate. If fewer than four letters arrive, additional letters will be solicited only to attain the minimum of four letters. The reviewers must be external to the University and must be held with respect in academe. The candidate will be asked to submit the names of potential reviewers and to state the nature of his or her acquaintance with each of them. The number of names should be at least equal to the number of letters to be solicited. At least one-half of the reviewers must be selected from the candidate's list. The department head or supervisor and the tenure advisory committee shall mutually agree to the peer reviewers from whom letters will be solicited. *The candidate may also submit up to two names of potential reviewers that they do not want contacted. The department head and the tenure advisory committee must abide by this request.* A summary of the pertinent information in his or her file initially prepared by the candidate and a cover letter initially drafted by the department head or supervisor with final drafts mutually agreed upon by the candidate, the tenure advisory committee, and the department head or supervisor shall be sent to each reviewer by the department head or supervisor. Each reviewer should be asked to state, at the very least, the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate, and to evaluate the candidate's published work and/or creative endeavors, and recognition and standing among his or her peers. Copies of these letters will become supplementary material to the candidate's file.

8.3 Procedures for Promotion

(1) External peer reviews.

Prior to September 15, the department head or supervisor will solicit letters from at least four peers of rank equivalent to or higher than that sought by the candidate. If less than four letters arrive, additional letters will be solicited only to attain the minimum of four letters. The reviewers must be external to the university and must be held with respect in academe. The candidate will be asked to submit the names of potential reviewers, and to state the nature of his or her acquaintance with each of them. The number of names should be at least equal to the number of letters to be solicited. At least one-half of the reviewers must be selected from the candidate's list. The department head or supervisor and the tenure advisory committee shall mutually agree to the peer reviewers from whom letters will be solicited. *The candidate may also submit up to two names of potential reviewers that they do not want contacted. The department head and the tenure advisory committee must abide by this request.* A summary of the pertinent information in his or her file initially prepared by the candidate and final draft mutually agreed upon by the candidate, the promotion advisory committee, and the department head or supervisor

shall be sent to each reviewer by the department head or supervisor. Each reviewer should be asked to state, at the very least, the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate, and to evaluate the candidate's published work and/or creative endeavors, and recognition and standing among his or her peers. Copies of these letters will become supplementary material to the candidate's file.

Rationale: Many disciplines are populated by small numbers of notable scholars, but they may have also very strong paradigm differences in research approaches. Asking for reviewers from different paradigmatic perspectives can yield very different conclusions about the quality of the work. The candidate is in the best position to suggest those individuals who might not provide a fair review. This is a policy that is often used at journals and publishers where authors are allowed to suggest reviewers that should and should not review their work.