

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

3-8-2010

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 8, 2010

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, March 8, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 416.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/416

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

March 8, 2010

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ed Heath
Approval of Minutes February 16, 2010
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Raymond Coward, Provost
Michael Torrens, Director: Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation
- 3:20 Announcements**.....Ed Heath
Next Brown Bag Lunch w/President Thursday March 25th at noon Champ Hall
- 3:25 Information Items**
- Honorary Degrees and Awards Report.....Sydney Peterson
 - Committee on Committees, Election Results.....Betty Rozum
 - PRPC Annual Report.....John Engler
 - Ad Hoc Committee Report on Pre-Tenure Mentoring & Evaluation.....Mike Parent
- 3:50 New Business**
- EPC Items.....Larry Smith
- PRPC Code changes Section 402 – The Faculty Senate and Its Committees.....John Engler
- 4:30 Adjournment**



**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 2010
Champ Hall Conference Room**

Present: Ed Heath (President), Byron Burnham, Steve Burr, Renee Galliher, Jerry Goodspeed, Glen McEvoy, Ilka Nemere (for Kelly Kopp), Mike Parent, Flora Shrode, Darwin Sorensen, Nathan Straight, Dave Wallace, Vincent Wickwar, President Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Bloxham (Assistant) **Guests:** John Engler, BrandE Faupell, Vance Grange, Brent Miller, Tony Peacock, Larry Smith.

Ed Heath called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Darwin Sorensen moved to approve the minutes of January 11, 2010. Motion was seconded by Byron Burnham and passed unanimously.

University Business – President Albrecht. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee went into Executive Session for the first item of University Business, after which President Albrecht gave an update on the budget. The consensus numbers for fiscal year 2010 are flat and for fiscal year 2011 are down \$50 million. We will implement the one-time cut we have been given for 2010 with some minor adjustments. For 2011 we will see something above the 9% reduction we have already implemented but below the 17%. Senate Bill 3 will replace the 4% legislative cut making our final cut for 2010 \$4,200,500.

Concerning the new Ag building, we are positioned as well as we can be, but much depends on the economy and politics. The ARS meeting in Washington DC, where there will be more discussion on this, was rescheduled because of the snowstorm.

CEU bill passed unanimously out of the Senate Education Committee. Provisions that USU will not assume any debts of CEU were included in the bill.

Announcements

Next brown bag lunch w/President Friday February 26th at noon Champ Hall.
There are two nominees for the Committee on Committees.

New Business

EPC - Larry Smith. The Curriculum Subcommittee heard 46 requests for course actions. They also approved a proposal to change the name of the Department of Biological and Irrigation Engineering to Biological Engineering. There was no January meeting of the Academic Standards Subcommittee. In the General Education Subcommittee there were 5 new general education courses approved.

Steve Burr moved to place this item on the Consent Agenda, seconded by Mike Parent, motion passed.

Information Items

Human Resources Policy Changes - BrandE Faupell. Mike Parent clarified that when changes are made to the 300 Section of the Code, it has to go to those who will be affected by it including the Faculty Senate. The Senate cannot approve or disapprove the changes but they can make suggestions on the changes. BrandE highlighted several changes, some of them federally mandated and some are business decisions. Most of the discussion centered on the proposed changes to the leave policy and Long Term Disability.

HR is recommending a policy clarification stating academic faculty do not earn annual leave. There are two annual leave schedules for staff. For non-exempt employees (Classified) it takes 16 years to earn 22 days of annual leave, which exempt employees (Professional) earn immediately. HR is recommending we adopt the CEU schedule for leave benefits, which is: 1-5 years of employment earns 12 annual leave days, 6-8 years earns 18 days leave, and over 10 or more years earns 22 days annual leave.

Currently, when employees move from Short Term Disability (5 months) to Long Term Disability they are able to stay on medical insurance at no cost to them until they come off of Long Term Disability. HR recommends the following change as a cost saving measure; that they received insurance for their first year at no premium cost and the next two years will be at employee premium cost plus a 50% surcharge. After that, they would have to move to spouse insurance, state insurance or in many cases they qualify for Medicare disability. The estimated number of employees per year going on LTD is 10. Employees presently on LTD (currently 50) would be grandfathered and continue as is. When asked what our peer institutions were doing, BrandE stated that she would have to look into it further. Questions were asked about what the implied cost savings would be and she estimated at over half million per year relating to both premium payment and loss ratios on our medical insurance policy. The Committee asked for more data on the items dealing with Long Term Disability and FMLA Leave. The concern was that remaining a family friendly institution requires us to provide benefits that other institutions may not and as such will help us recruit and retain faculty. HR has not tracked the FMLA Leave data.

Mike Parent moved to place the Human Resources policy changes on the Faculty Senate Agenda as an Information Item. Motion seconded by Steve Burr, motion carried.

Research Council Report – Brent Miller. The Research Office provided a 30+ page report. The main focus for Faculty Senate will be the information regarding Research Council activities; they also provided a breakdown of the funding information in the office.

Vince Wickwar questioned what the dollar figures in the appendices represent. Awards and research expenditures are applied differently. The research expenditures get applied as they are incurred over time, so it will go across multiple years. Some awards are set up so that part of the award is recognized in the first year and others are set up to recognize the entire award in the first year. It varies by agency and the type of award that it is.

Mike moved to place the report on the Consent Agenda, Vince Wickwar seconded the motion, motion passed.

Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report – Vance Grange. The BFW is charged with participating in budget preparation process and periodically evaluates and reports on salary, insurance and other faculty benefits. They also review financial and budgetary implications of proposals for changes in academic degrees and programs and report to the Senate prior to action related to such proposals. BFW is also responsible for reporting significant fiscal and budgetary trends that may affect the academic programs of the university. BFW has two committee member vacancies that need to be filled from RCDE and HASS. There was lengthy discussion about the Employee Benefits Advisory Board (EBAB), which no longer exists, and the Employee Benefits Committee. Some felt that the BFW Committee should be involved in the policy change issues presented by HR, and questioned the role of the Employee Benefits Committee and whether they

were a decision making body or an advisory committee. There was also concern over the fact that the presentation made by Human Resources had not gone to the BFW Committee yet. Future work of the BFW committee includes information on AFLAC insurance and a proposal to save insurance premiums in a private savings account vs. contributing to a Roth 403B.

Mike Parent moved to place the report on the consent agenda, second by Vince Wickwar, motion passed.

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Report – Tony Peacock. AFT committee is very time intensive and laborious. All committee members have served on multiple hearings in the last year, which makes coordinating schedules difficult. The committee offered suggestions to FSEC to try to mitigate the time commitment of committee members, including the possible addition of an administrative assistant to help with the scheduling of meetings and document management. Improving the mentoring system of new faculty may reduce the number of tenure grievances, and possible reduction of class load for committee members was also discussed. Richard Jensen will chair the committee next year

A motion was made by Steve Burr to place this report as an information item on the agenda, second by Vince Wickwar, motion passed.

Old Business

PRPC Code Changes Section 401 (Second Reading) – John Engler. Section 401.1-5 was presented for a second reading with the suggestion by PRPC to change the phrase “professional colleagues” to “appropriate administrator”. Section 401.6-11 was presented for a first reading. PRPC noted that this section references a faculty list that is to be published each year. This has not been happening in recent years. The new online directory is incomplete and difficult to search. It is not stated in the code who is responsible for printing the directory. There are several concerns about faculty definitions in this section. Faculty is not defined as being core faculty, term faculty or another classification. This issue will need to be addressed further as the merger with CEU proceeds.

A motion was made by Steve Burr to place this report on the agenda as an action item, second by Vince Wickwar, motion passed.

Committee on Committees Vote. Mike Parent moved to place the Committee on Committees membership vote on the agenda as an action item, second was received and motion passed.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Election Results

red = newly elected
(2) = second term

| College/Unit | Senators | Term Ends | Alternates | Term Ends | Committees | Member | Term Ends |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|------------------|-----------|
| Agriculture | Bernard, Dale | 2011 | Deer, Howard | 2012 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | Ralph Whitesides | 2012 |
| Agriculture | Nemere, Ilka | 2012 | White, Ken (2) | 2013 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Rhonda Miller | 2011 |
| Agriculture | Worthen, Eric | 2013 | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Jeff Broadbent | 2012 |
| Agriculture | Whitesides, Ralph | 2012 | | | Educational Policies Committee | David Hole (2) | 2013 |
| Agriculture | Feuz, Dillon | 2011 | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Reza Oladi | 2011 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Paul Jakus | 2011 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | Paul Johnson | 2012 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|------|--|------|--|----------------|------|
| Business | H. Craig Peterson | 2013 | Olsen, David | 2013 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | Richard Jensen | 2012 |
| Business | McEvoy, Glenn | 2011 | Mills, robert (replaced Pete Ellis who is retireing) | 2013 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Alan Stephens | 2013 |
| Business | Paper, David | 2011 | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Randy Simmons | 2011 |
| Business | Parent, Michael (2) | 2012 | | | Educational Policies Committee | Stacey Hills | 2013 |
| | | | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Alison Cook | 2013 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Konrad Lee | 2012 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | Frank Caliendo | 2014 |

| College/Unit | Senators | Term Ends | Alternates | Term Ends | Committees | Member | Term Ends |
|--------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---------------------------|-----------|
| Education | Bates, Scott | 2012 | Camicia, Steve | 2012 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | need to elect (3 yr term) | 2013 |
| Education | new | 2013 | Roggman, Lori | 2012 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Chuck Salzberg (2) | 2011 |
| Education | Dobson, Dorothy | 2011 | Walker, Andy (2) | 2012 | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Susan Turner (2) | 2011 |
| Education | new | 2013 | | | Educational Policies Committee | need to elect (3 yr term) | 2013 |
| Education | new | 2013 | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Sherry Marx | 2011 |
| Education | new | 2013 | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Yanghee Kim | 2011 |
| Education | Pyfer, Tami | 2011 | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | need to elect (4 yr term) | 2014 |
| Education | Shelton, Brett (2) | 2012 | | | | | |
| Education | new | 2013 | | | | | |



| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------|------------------|------|--|-------------------|------|
| Engineering | Bob Pack | 2013 | Fang, Ning | 2012 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | Scott Budge (2) | 2012 |
| Engineering | Folkman, Steve | 2012 | Stewardson, Gary | 2013 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Ed Reeve | 2012 |
| Engineering | Sorensen, Darwin | 2011 | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Paul Wheeler | 2013 |
| Engineering | Tullis, Blake | 2012 | | | Educational Policies Committee | Ed Reeve (2) | 2011 |
| Engineering | YangQuan Chen | 2013 | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Christopher Neale | 2011 |
| Engineering | Chris Winstead | 2013 | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Doran Baker (2) | 2011 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | Barton Smith | 2012 |



| College/Unit | Senators | Term Ends | Alternates | Term Ends | Committees | Member | Term Ends |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|---------------------------|-----------|
| HASS | new | 2013 | Bame, Jim | 2012 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | need to elect (3 yr term) | 2013 |
| ART | Fisher, Shawn | 2011 | Culver, Lawrence | 2011 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Tim Wolters | 2013 |
| SSH | Graham, Shane | 2012 | new | 2013 | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | need to elect (3 yr term) | 2013 |
| SSH | Grieve, Victoria | 2011 | Schroeder, Tom | 2012 | Educational Policies Committee | Ed Glatfelter | 2011 |
| SSH | Jackson-Smith, Doug | 2012 | Weil, Nolan | 2012 | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Maria Cordero | 2011 |
| SSH | McNamara, Peter | 2012 | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Michael Lyons (2) | 2011 |
| ART | Morrison, Nick | 2012 | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | Keith Grant-Davies | 2012 |
| SSH | Petrzelka, Peggy | 2012 | | | | | |
| HASS | new | 2013 | | | | | |
| SSH | Sanders, James (James Bame) | 2012 | | | | | |
| HASS | new | 2013 | | | | | |
| SSH | Smitten, Jeff | 2012 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|------|-------------|------|--|---------------------------|------|
| Natural Res. | Burr, Steve | 2011 | Dueser, Ray | 2011 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | Helga Van Miegroet | 2012 |
| Natural Res. | Mesner, Nancy | 2012 | new | 2013 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Robert Schmidt | 2011 |
| Natural Res. | Messmer, Terry | 2011 | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Nancy Mesner (interim) | 2012 |
| | | | | | Educational Policies Committee | Nancy Mesner (2) | 2011 |
| | | | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Karen Mock | 2011 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Nancy Mesner | 2011 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | need to elect (4 yr term) | 2014 |

| College/Unit | Senators | Term Ends | Alternates | Term Ends | Committees | Member | Term Ends |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--|---------------------|-----------|
| Science | Chang, Tom | 2011 | Cannon, Scott | 2011 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | David Peak (2) | 2011 |
| Science | Davidson, Brad | 2013 | Davidson, Brad | 2012 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Stephen Bialkowski | 2013 |
| Science | Flann, Nick (2) | 2011 | Wilczynski, Dariusz | 2012 | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Ian Anderson | 2013 |
| Science | Bialkowski, Stephen | 2013 | | | Educational Policies Committee | Richard Mueller (2) | 2011 |
| Science | Ted Evans (replaced Sue Morgan) | 2011 | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Susanne Janecke | 2013 |
| Science | Corcoran, Chris (2) | 2013 | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Greg Podgorski (2) | 2011 |
| Science | Wallace, Dave | 2011 | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | Richard Cutler | 2011 |
| Science | Wickwar, Vince | 2012 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|------|-----------------|------|--|-------------------|----------------|
| Library | Shrode, Flora (2) | 2012 | Holliday, Wendy | 2011 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | Britt Fagerheim | 2013 |
| | | | | | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Steve Sturgeon | 2011 |
| | | | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Bob Parson | 2011 |
| | | | | | Educational Policies Committee | Wendy Holliday | 2013 |
| | | | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Jennifer Duncan | 2011 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Pamela Martin (2) | 2011 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | John Elsweiler | inted, not ele |

| College/Unit | Senators | Term Ends | Alternates | Term Ends | Committees | Member | Term Ends |
|--------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--|-------------------------------|-----------|
| RCDE | Blackstock, Alan | 2012 | Tollefson, Derrik | 2013 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | need to elect (3 yr term) | 2013 |
| RCDE | Straight, Nathan | 2011 | | | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Dave Woolstenhulme | 2013 |
| | | | | | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Karen Woolstenhulme | 2013 |
| | | | | | Educational Policies Committee | Ronda Menlove | 2012 |
| | | | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Virginia Exton | 2013 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Robert Mueller | 2012 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | RCDE not represnted, per code | N/A |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|------|------------------------|------|--|-----------------|------|
| Extension | Goodspeed, Jerry | 2011 | Albertson, Marilyn (2) | 2013 | Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee | James Barnhill | 2012 |
| Extension | Holmgren, Lyle | 2011 | Barnhill, James | 2011 | Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee | Joanne Rouche | 2013 |
| Extension | Pace, Michael | 2013 | Olsen, Shawn | 2013 | Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee | Margie Memmott | 2011 |
| Extension | Nelson, Mark | 2011 | | | Educational Policies Committee | not represented | N/A |
| Extension | Beddes, Taun | 2013 | | | Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee | Donna Carter | 2011 |
| | | | | | Faculty Evaluation Committee | Ronda Olsen | 2011 |
| | | | | | Graduate Council (4-year terms) | not represented | N/A |

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC)
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
2009-2010 Academic Year

Submitted March 1, 2010

Members:

John Engler, Chair (10), College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences
Susan Turner (10), Jones College of Education and Human Services
Margie Memmott (11), Extension
Robert Parson (11), Library
Jeff Broadbent (12), College of Agriculture
Nancy Messner (12), College of Natural Resources
Randy Simmons (12), Huntsman School of Business
Scott Cannon (12), College of Science
Steven Folkman (12) College of Engineering
Shane Graham, Senate
Ronald Shook, Senate

This report covers the activities of the PRPC committee since the annual report submitted to the Faculty Senate on March 15, 2009.

PRPC committee meetings: Oct 13, Nov 10, Feb 4, Mar 4, Apr 1

Section 401

Addressed Level I and Level II comments from Code Review Committee, including:

- Many line edits such as capitalization, word choice, and grammatical correction in order to improve consistency and clarity
- Eliminated distinction in code between resident and non-resident faculty
- Eliminated the vague phrase “evidence of scholastic promise” in several locations as it referred to qualifications for faculty
- Added the phrase “as determined by appropriate administrator” in several locations to clarify who makes decisions about faculty qualifications and actions
- Eliminated the definition of the faculty position Extension Agents, as it is no longer in use nor recognized by HR
- Confirmed that faculty appointed to the Research Ranks are yet classified as term faculty, and that Federal Cooperator continue to be exempt from limitations of governance otherwise placed on term faculty.
- Recommended that language should be kept limiting adjunct faculty appointment to 50% in order to deter the replacement of benefits-eligible faculty with adjuncts.

- Recognizes that the faculty list, which code specifies be printed each year, is no longer being printed, but perhaps is being addressed, however insufficiently, by the online directory.

For the Mar 1 Senate meeting, changes to Section 401.1-401.5 are up for a second reading, and Section 401.6-401.11 for a first reading.

Recommendation

In its review of Section 401, PRPC noted concern about the definition of and use of term faculty at USU. PRPC has recommended that the senate form an ad hoc committee to review the code regarding term faculty roles in regards to:

- ways to limit the overuse of term faculty as replacements for research faculty
- ways to grant term faculty a greater role in governance and greater protection of academic freedom
- ways to protect lower-division and Gen Ed courses from a disproportionate hit during financial cutbacks
- ways to verify that appropriate use of term faculty is accommodated by code, and that academic units are abiding by code specifications
- ways to accommodate the inclusion of faculty from CEU into code

Section 402

Have received Section 402 with comments from Code Review committee, which PRPC will address in Mar and Apr meetings.



Report of the ad hoc Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring and Evaluation Committee

In Response to Evaluation Committee Report, October 2007
by the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Recommendation Number 8: The committee recommends that the University review for possible revision and for consistent implementation the **pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies** and procedures for post-tenure faculty evaluation policies and procedures, including institutional involvement in implementing plans for improvement (Standard 4.A.5 and Policy 4.1.a-d).

Introduction and Background

During a campus accreditation visit in 2007, members of a site visitation team from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) met with faculty representing each academic college at Utah State University (USU) as well as selected other academic units (such as the library). One area of concern expressed by faculty in several of these sessions was about the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation process at USU. Specifically, faculty identified a possible conflict of interest between the mentoring and evaluation roles expected of faculty who serve on Tenure Advisory Committees (TAC). While the Commission, in their report, noted positive comments from faculty with respect to the mentoring role of the senior faculty on Tenure Advisory Committees, they also shared negative comments concerning their objectivity as evaluators given their mentoring role. Specifically, the visitation team said the following in their report:

“The conflicting responsibilities frequently, if not universally, result in recommendations favoring the award of tenure with too little regard to actual performance. Faculty members have strong feelings regarding the dual roles of the committee – first as advisory and later as evaluative – because of the potential for conflict as the relationships become adversarial. Positive comments reference the committee as a source of mentorship and direct guidance. Negative comments reference the fact that faculty serving as mentors have difficulty in becoming objective when the candidates apply for tenure. Clearly this procedure merits review for clarification or possible revision, given the disparity of opinions and the extent of confusion regarding the authority and role of the promotion advisory committees.” (Page 48).

Based upon these observations, the NWCCU Commission recommended “that the University review for possible revision and consistent implementation the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies...”

During the 2008-2009 academic year, several discussions occurred about this issue among members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Provost Coward, and President Albrecht. These discussions culminated in a consensus that a “blue ribbon” committee should be formed to explore the Commission’s recommendation (the committee was referred to as the “Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee”).

It was further agreed that the committee should be co-chaired and members selected by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Vice-President and Provost. The committee was formed in April 2009 and first met in May 2009. At that time, the committee reviewed the accreditation report from NWCCU and relevant parts of Section 400 of the University Policy Manual (commonly referred to as the “Faculty Code”). The committee also discussed issues raised in recent grievances suggesting that there might be confusion over the dual roles of faculty on Tenure Advisory Committees. Finally, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Committee discussed their own experiences, observations, and concerns associated with the USU codified process and considered various data and appropriate comparisons that would provide context and scope for understanding the issues.

The committee held twice monthly meetings through the fall 2009 semester with the co-chairs meeting separately several times to set meeting agendas. Initially, the committee focused on what could be found in the literature and by way of data that would shed light on issues associated with the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation. Relatively few studies have been published which address the perceived conflict of interest between mentoring and evaluation. Most are descriptive of a narrow set of work place practices in a single work environment. If there is any consensus in these studies, findings are that mentors and mentees should understand the importance of this process and their respective roles, which should be clearly communicated in some form of education or training.

The committee examined data from the past eight years of promotion and tenure decisions at USU (2002 to 2009) and discovered that virtually all candidates during that time received a positive recommendation from their Tenure Advisory Committee or their Promotion Advisory Committee (328 of 333 or 98.5%). One possible explanation for this high rate of support at the final stage of the probationary period is that USU weeds out weak candidates before they get to the final stage. Specifically, tenure achievement rates at USU were compared to ten peer universities, and those comparisons indicated that USU was within the range of tenure achievement rates of peer institutions, albeit towards the high end. Considerable discussion over several meetings about possible reasons for differences between USU and the ten-university study concluded with an agreement on two points: (1) the tenure achievement rates at USU are similar to those of national peers, and (2) there may be evidence of a possible misunderstanding between the Tenure Advisory Committee’s perceived mentoring responsibility and their codified evaluation responsibility. Such differences of interpretation may be especially apparent when the TAC votes favorably and subsequent votes are negative (at the department head, dean, Central Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Presidential levels – or some combination thereof).

The committee then turned its attention to identifying the strengths and weaknesses of our current system where the TAC is expected both to mentor and evaluate a candidate for promotion and tenure. As the strengths and weaknesses of our current system were discussed, it

became apparent that one possible weakness was related to a common problem – i.e., variability in the interpretation of the words (and their nuances) that appear in the code. The committee concluded that a possible mitigation of the perceived conflict between the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation could be achieved through the education and training of all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.

The Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee also concluded that small changes to the code might be adopted to preserve those positive aspects of our current system while clearly reinforcing the evaluative responsibilities of the TAC. We discovered, for example, that the word “mentoring” does not appear in the code where the responsibilities of the TAC are described. Other words that do appear include “assist,” “counsel and advise”, and phrases like “assist the faculty member in the achievement of tenure.” While each of these words might be construed as some dimension or form of mentoring, the interpretation of these words and their nuances might also lead some colleagues to move beyond mentoring and embrace a role of advocacy.

Thus, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee adopted two recommendations in response to the NWCCU report:

1. To create a rigorous, systematic and structured training program for all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.
2. To recommend minor changes to the text of the “Faculty Code” that would improve the understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and actions to be taken by the Tenure Advisory Committee.

These two recommendations are described in more detail in the rest of this report.

Improved Training and Communication

The Office of the Provost routinely reviews the responsibilities, procedures, and deadlines for the promotion and tenure (P&T) review process with deans and department heads. However, there is currently no training for faculty members who sit as evaluators on Tenure Advisory Committees (TAC). One of the actions of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee was to propose a plan for training the senior scholars who chair the TACs. This section of the report outlines the proposed plan of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee that includes a description of the target audience for the training, the development of the curriculum, and the instructors and presentation format for the training.

Target Audience

The Provost annually reviews the P&T process with deans and department heads. Building upon that tradition, the purpose of the proposed training is to extend these instructions to a larger audience. Specifically the training is intended for faculty who chair or are members of Tenure Advisory Committees. During a candidate's probationary period, these committees meet formally once each year for the purpose of evaluating a candidate's progress toward tenure. At the end of the probationary period, the TAC evaluates the candidate's record of accomplishments

and makes a recommendation to the department head. The TAC is the first level of evaluation. Tenure Advisory Committee chairpersons would be required to attend the training, and members of the TAC would also be invited to attend but their attendance would not be required.

Curriculum Development

The curriculum to be developed is focused on informing TAC chairs and members about their roles and responsibilities. The foundation for the curriculum will be Section 400 of the USU Policy Manual (commonly referred to as the “Faculty Code”). The training is intended to clarify the roles of TAC members as evaluators. By the means of this training, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee aims to address the conflict expressed by some TAC members over the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation. The curriculum will be developed by a committee, appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, whose members have experience serving on and/or chairing TACs. This committee will work in cooperation with the Office of the Provost, who will be responsible for creating and assembling the training materials.

Instructors and Presentation Format

The instructors for the proposed training would be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Executive Vice President and Provost. The instruction will be given in person and will be reinforced with on-line supplementary materials. A successful precedent for on-line delivery of such training is the ombudsperson course that is provided entirely on-line, under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, using the Blackboard course management system. The Office of the Provost will provide logistical and staff support for the production of the materials needed for the training and the coordination of meeting times and locations.

Code Revision

The second recommendation of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee is to examine carefully the section of the “Faculty Code” (Section 405.6.2(1)) that describes the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) and propose changes to the Faculty Senate. All of the paragraphs in this section seemed clear with the exception of the third paragraph, which reads,

“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) nonrenewal of 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, nonrenewal of the appointment (407.2.1(5)) at the end of the probationary period.”

Several potential problems and uncertainties were identified in the preceding paragraph extracted from the Faculty Code. For example, in the first sentence, what does it mean to “assist the faculty member”? What does “appropriate counsel and advisement” mean? In the same manner, it is not clear that the statement - “to render judgment that the faculty member has or has not attained the criteria for tenure” only applies to the final year of the probationary period. Indeed, members of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee agree that judgments about progress towards tenure need to be rendered each year. This responsibility is reinforced in the final two sentences of the paragraph (see above). In the third sentence, the meanings of the following phrases are unclear: “to these ends” and, again, “counsel and advise.” In the fourth sentence, it appeared that an attempt was made to include two distinct actions that might be stated more clearly with two distinct sentences. Further, based on the text and on the experience of several committee members, it appeared that this sentence was trying to include references to the consideration of early tenure. The possibility of early tenure, more properly described as the consideration of administrative nomination for tenure, is discussed later in the Code (In Section 405.7.3 (1) under the phrase “Exceptional Procedures”). Indeed, this later section refers back to the paragraph above. The Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee concluded that this paragraph might be easier to interpret if a reference to early tenure was specifically included in the text.

Taken as a whole, the committee concluded that the intention of the above paragraph could be clarified by focusing on three items: (1) the role of the TAC; (2) the responsibilities of the TAC; and (3) the actions it needed to take. In that context, however, some of the current text became almost duplicative. To avoid that situation, the statements on role and responsibility were combined. Moreover, to clarify further the role of the TAC, a sentence was added for the exceptional consideration of administrative nomination for tenure (commonly referred to as “early tenure” – a phrase, however, that never appears in the “Faculty Code”). Combining these considerations, the committee believes that the following revised version better captures what the TAC should do:

“The role and responsibility of the Tenure Advisory Committee is to provide an annual evaluation of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. The TAC is responsible for providing feedback to the faculty member with regard to progress toward tenure and promotion, and shall recommend (a) to renew the appointment or (b) not to renew the appointment (407.2.1 (5)). In the final year of the probationary period, the committee shall recommend (a) awarding promotion and tenure or (b) denying promotion and tenure (407.2.1 (5)). At any time during the probationary period, the committee can be asked to render judgment on an administrative proposal to grant promotion and tenure in accordance with Section 405.7.3 (1) of the Faculty Code. Under those circumstances, the TAC shall recommend (a) to award promotion and tenure or (b) to continue the probationary period.”

The intent of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee is for this recommended code revision to be shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee where it will be discussed in the presence of the chair of the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC). The intent, then, is to encourage the Executive Committee to charge the

PRPC with reviewing the proposed code change, to make revisions consistent with those recommended above and to present the code change to the Faculty Senate as an action item.

Summary

Feedback from USU faculty led our accreditation agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, to recommend that we review for possible revision the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies employed on our campus. The USU Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, created a committee of faculty to explore this issue. After exhaustive review and discussion, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee concluded that two actions would improve our current policies and procedures. Specifically, the committee proposed two recommendations in response to the NWCCU report:

1. To create a rigorous, systematic and structured training program for all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.
2. To recommend minor changes to the text of the “Faculty Code” that would improve the understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and actions to be taken by the Tenure Advisory Committee.

The members of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee request the USU Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, to implement the two recommendations adopted by our committee.

Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Pre-Tenure Mentoring Process

Chairs: **Michael Parent**, Professor, Department of Management, Faculty Senate President
Raymond T. Coward, Executive Vice President and Provost

Members: **Susan L. Crowley**, Professor, Department of Psychology
Jacob H. Gunther, Associate Professor, Department of Electrical and
Computer Engineering
Kelly L. Kopp, Associate Professor, Department of Plants, Soils and Climate
R. Douglas Ramsey, Professor, Department of Wildland Resources, Faculty
Senate Past-President
Flora G. Shrode, Associate Librarian, Merrill-Cazier Library
Michael B. Toney, Professor, Department of Sociology, Social Work and
Anthropology
Vincent B. Wickwar, Professor, Department of Physics, Faculty Senate
President-Elect

PRPC Report for Faculty Senate, 16 Feb 2010

FIRST READING (Sections 402.1 through 402.3)

Recommendations:

1. Several clarifications in phrasing.
2. The title “Director” be changed to reflect practice of “VP” as head of RCDE and Extension.
3. The number of meetings a senator can miss before the seat being vacated, even when an alternate is arranged, be changed from 5 to 4 to reflect an expectation that a senator attend at least half of the meetings in a year.
4. A condition be added so that if a senator is going to be unavailable for more than half of an academic year, the seat would be automatically vacated.

POLICY MANUAL

FACULTY

Number 402

Subject: The Faculty Senate and Its Committees

Effective Date: July 1, 1997

Revision Date: November 16, 2001

Revision Date: April 29, 2002

Revision Date: January 12, 2007

Revision Date April 30, 2007

Date of Last Revision: May 6, 2009

402.1 AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY TO REVIEW FACULTY SENATE ACTIONS

Actions of the Faculty Senate (Senate) shall be subject to the appellate power of the faculty, as provided in policy 401.9.3. The agenda and actions of the Senate shall be reported to the faculty as provided in policy 402.4.2(3).

402.2 AUTHORITY OF THE SENATE

The authority of the faculty is delegated to the Senate. The Senate legislates and sets policy for matters within the collective authority of the faculty. See policy 401.9. The Senate shall have the power to act for and represent the faculty in all matters of

educational policy, including requirements for admission, degrees, diplomas, and certificates; and in curricular matters involving relations between colleges, schools, divisions, or departments.

The Senate shall also have the following powers: (1) To receive and consider reports from any faculty committee, and from any council, department, division, administrative officer, library, or college; and to take appropriate action. (2) To consider matters of professional interest and faculty welfare and to make recommendations to the President of the University and other administrative officers. (3) To propose to the President amendments or additions to these policies.

2.1 Senate Power of Internal Governance; Referral of Matters to the President

The Senate shall have the power to make rules governing its own procedures and to establish its own order of business. All other matters considered and approved by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Executive Secretary to the President of the University and, in appropriate cases, to the Board of Trustees.

2.2 The President, University Administrators, and Board of Trustees

The Senate is an advisory body to the President of the University. While the Senate votes on policy and procedural issues, including but not limited to policy and procedural issues in these policies, these actions and recommendations cannot be implemented without the approval of the President of the University. The Board of Trustees advises the President of the University and approves or disapproves any [substantive policy or procedural change](#), ~~addition or deletion in the policies~~. Approval or disapproval of Senate actions, whether by the President of the University or by the Board of Trustees, shall be reported back to the President of the Senate by the President of the University, or a designee, in a timely manner following the Senate action. When Senate actions receive final approval, it is the responsibility of University administrators and administrative bodies to implement the action.

2.3 Senator's Handbook

Each senator shall receive a current Senator's Handbook which explains briefly the role and operation of the Senate. The Handbook will include: (1) provisions of this policy pertinent to Senate proceedings, rules, and membership; (2) a simplified statement of the Rules of Order; and (3) rules for calling meetings. The Senate Executive Secretary must ensure that each newly elected Senator receives a Handbook no later than the September meeting of the Senate.

402.3 MEMBERSHIP; ALTERNATES; TERM; VACANCIES

3.1 Membership

The Senate shall be composed of the following members: (1) Fifty-five faculty members elected by and from faculty members eligible to vote in Senate elections (see policy 401.6.3(2)(d)); (2) the President and the Provost of the University or their designees; (3) eight appointees of the President of the University who shall be vice presidents and/or deans, six of whom must hold faculty appointments and must be designated annually preceding elections to the Senate; (4) the four chairs of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee, the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee, and the Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee, if they are not one of the faculty members elected to the Senate; and (5) three students, who shall include the Associated Students of Utah State University (ASUSU) President or a designee, the ASUSU Academic Senate President or a designee, and the Graduate Student Senate (GSS) President or a designee.

With the exception of faculty holding special or emeritus appointments, any member of the faculty who is not designated as a presidential appointee is eligible for election to the Senate.

3.2 Alternates for Elected Members

Senate members are expected to attend its meetings regularly. In cases of unavoidable absence, including sabbatical leave, professional development leave, and unpaid leaves of absence, Senators will arrange for an elected alternate senator to attend in their place. (see policy 402.10.2) The alternate shall have full voting rights.

Senators must notify the Executive Secretary of the Senate in writing (email is acceptable) whenever alternates will replace them. If an absent senator fails to arrange for a substitute more than once during an academic year, then that senators' position will be considered vacant (see policy 402.3.4). Senators are considered absent whenever they are replaced by designated alternates (see policy 402.3.4).

3.3 Term

Faculty members elected to the Senate shall serve three-year terms or, as provided in policy 402.3.4, complete the three-year term vacated by a faculty member. Terms shall begin July 1 following elections and ~~may be re-elected~~are renewable once, after which a faculty member is ineligible to stand for election for one year. The term of office for student members of the Senate shall be one year and shall coincide with the term of ASUSU and GSS officers. The term of office for presidential appointees shall be one year and shall begin July 1. A presidential appointee can be reappointed to consecutive terms, up to a maximum of six years, after which the appointee is ineligible for appointment for one year.

3.4 Vacancies

A senate seat shall be declared vacant if a senator (1) resigns, (2) is terminated, (3) goes

Comment [JE1]: The question was asked: Why 55 senators? PRPC has no knowledge of where the number originated, nor do we propose a change.

on extended medical leave, ~~(4) will otherwise be unavailable for more than half of the academic year, (5) misses more than one regularly scheduled meeting during an academic year without arranging for an alternate, or (6) misses five-four~~ regularly scheduled senate meetings ~~even when an alternate is arranged during any one academic year, or misses more than one regularly scheduled meeting without arranging for an alternate.~~ The Executive Secretary of the Senate reports all vacancies to the Committee on Committees. For vacancies ~~owing to resignation, termination, incapacitating illness or four absences from regularly scheduled Senate meetings,~~ an alternate elected senator will be appointed by the affected ~~college d~~Dean or ~~Director-VP~~ to fill the seat in accordance with policies 402.3.2 and 402.10.1. For vacancies among Presidential appointees, the President shall appoint a new Senator within 30 days.

402.4 RECORDS; AGENDA; MINUTES; ORDER OF BUSINESS

4.1 Records

The records of the Senate shall be kept by an executive secretary for the use of the members of the faculty, the President of the University, and the Board of Trustees. Records are public unless otherwise specified by action of the Senate in accord with state law (see policy 402.8).

Under the supervision of the President of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Secretary shall ensure that Senate actions approved by the President of the University, or where necessary by the President and the Board of Trustees (see policy 402.2.2), are published in campus media within an appropriate time frame and included in the Senate records.

Comment [JE2]: A question was asked about defining "campus media." PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

4.2 Agenda and Minutes

(1) Senate agenda.

The Executive Committee shall meet at least 14 days in advance of regularly scheduled Senate meetings to prepare the agenda and make assignments to those who are to report to the Senate. A copy of the agenda must be sent to each senator at least five days before regularly scheduled meetings.

Comment [JE3]: A question was asked if a copy being sent is appropriate. PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

(2) Faculty petition to place matter on the agenda.

Any 25 faculty members may petition the Senate to obtain consideration of any matter within the Senate's authority. The petition shall be presented in writing to any Senate member, who shall then give notice of the petition to the Senate or to its Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall place the matter raised in the petition on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting or, at the discretion of the Senate President, on the agenda of a special meeting called in accordance with the provisions of policy 402.6.2.

Comment [JE4]: PRPC was asked if 25 is an appropriate number to require use of senate time. PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

(3) Distribution of agenda and minutes.

One week prior to each Senate meeting, the Executive Secretary shall provide each academic unit, for public posting, a copy of the agenda of the next meeting, without attachments, and minutes of the prior Senate meeting.

(4) Publicizing and publication of recommended changes in policies or procedures.

Under the supervision of the President of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Secretary shall ensure that Senate actions recommending a change in this policy or in other University policies or procedures are publicized in a timely manner to the campus and reported to campus news media.

4.3 Order of Business

Except as otherwise provided by the Senate, its order of business shall be: call to order (quorum), approval of minutes, announcements, university business, information items, consent agenda, key issues and action items, new business, and old business.