

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

3-2-2015

Faculty Senate Agenda, March 2, 2015

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Agenda, March 2, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 458.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/458

This Faculty Senate 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

March 2, 2015

Merrill-Cazier Library Room 154

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
Approval of Minutes February 2, 2015
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- Be sure to sign the roll
 - Faculty Senate Nominations & Elections
- 3:10 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Update on PTR code change process.....Stephen Bialkowski
- 3:30 Reports**
1. EPC Items for February.....Larry Smith
 2. AFT Annual Report.....John Stevens
 3. BFW Annual Report.....Alan Stephens
- 3:45 Unfinished Business**
1. AFT code change proposals from PRPC (Second Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
 2. Other 405 section code change proposals from PRPC (Second Reading).Stephen Bialkowski
- 3:55 New Business**
1. 405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T
(First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
 2. Request Senate ask PRPC move faculty forum dates.....Doug Jackson-Smith
 3. Request Senate ask PRPC to replace “in consultation with” with “by mutual agreement with”
for formation of promotion and tenure committees throughout Code.....Ronda Callister
- 4:30 Adjournment**



**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 2, 2015
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Call to Order

Doug Jackson-Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of January 12, 2015 were adopted.

Announcements – Doug Jackson-Smith

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

FS Presidential Elections. It will shortly be time to elect the next FS President Elect. Please consider nominations for a colleague or yourself.

PTR Code Change Process Update. PRPC has formed a subcommittee to develop code revisions for the PTR recommendations to be presented to the full senate hopefully in the March or early April meeting.

Faculty Gun Issues Survey. In cooperation with the faculty senate leaders at other Utah colleges and universities, Doug has helped design an online survey that we hope will go out to faculty at all of our campuses. The survey will be designed to assess faculty knowledge of campus policy and state law and to gather information relative to personal experiences with the guns on campus. This survey will be conducted before the end of the semester.

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett

President Albrecht began by presenting the Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee Report for Sydney Petersen. The 2015 Spring Commencement Speaker and also an Honorary Degree recipient is Stew Morrill. He will soon be retiring as USU basketball coach. Additional Honorary Degree recipients are Crystal Call Maggelet, co-founder of Crystal Inn, managing director of MacCall Management, CEO and president of Flying J, and board member of Pilot Flying J; and Richard L. Shipley, USU Foundation Board member, founder of Shipley Associates, Utah Foster Care Foundation and chair of the Great Salt Lake Interpretive Trust.

The legislative session began last week. As of now there are only three bills that are of interest to higher education.

Provost Cockett gave an update on the two ongoing Dean searches. Two candidates for the Dean of Libraries position came to campus last week; Ann Moore, Dean of Library Affairs at Southern Illinois University and Catherine Cardwell, Director of Libraries at Ohio Wesleyan University. The search committee is seeking input from anyone who had the opportunity to meet these candidates, please direct comments to Larry Smith.

Four candidates for the Dean of Science will be coming to campus in the next two weeks. They are Eric Triplett, Professor and Chair Department of Microbiology and Cell Science at the University of Florida; Maura Hagan past Director National Center for Atmospheric Research, University of Colorado Boulder; Richard Cutler, Professor and Department Head of Mathematics & Statistics at Utah State University; and Estella Atekwana Head Boone Pickens School of Geology, Oklahoma State University.

The Allen E. Hall Innovation Award is a new award given by the Utah System of Higher Education to support initiatives with clearly defined and well-conceived innovative strategies that are intended to improve undergraduate student success. The awardee or awardee team at each USHE institution will receive \$10,000: \$5,000 direct award to the faculty/staff member(s) (split equally between team members if a team is the awardee) and \$5,000 to be placed in an institutional account for the staff/faculty awardee or awardee team for the advancement of the highlighted innovation (Innovation Implementation and Augmentation Fund). The nominees for this award from USU are Clayton Brown, Department of History, and Michael Levin in Psychology. Dr. Brown developed an online game called Master of History. Students learn more about important world leaders by matching the leaders' accomplishments and photos. Dr. Levin developed a program to overcome barriers to mental health treatment for students. The award recipients will be announced March 27, 2015.

Spring enrollment is about the same headcount as last spring, but there is a 4 – 5 % increase in FTE enrollment. We believe this is primarily due to online classes.

Information Items

Electronic P&T Binders – Larry Smith. A new system for submitting P&T binders has been developed that allows all materials in a binder to be submitted and reviewed electronically. Larry Smith explained the process and John Louviere demonstrated the system to the senate. The guidelines followed in establishing the system were that it should be a simple process to use and would not change any policy currently in place. The platform chosen to operate the system is called Equella. Everything that currently goes into the blue P&T binder will be uploaded in .pdf format into the Equella system. Each college will designate a staff member to be responsible for helping faculty and departments create and upload electronic binders for each person who will be entering a decision year in 2015/16. The system will also provide access to the binder by the P&T committee members, department head and dean and any others who may need access. Faculty under consideration will be responsible for uploading the documents to the electronic binder and alert the college support person that it is ready for review. The focus is on the P&T decision-years, but if colleges choose, they may also use it for 3rd year reviews (and eventually for annual P&T evaluations). Provost Cockett commented that faculty should think of it as an electronic file cabinet that replaces the blue binder; no requirements are changed in the new process.

Allen E. Hall Innovation Award – Noelle Cockett. Presented as part of University Business.

Reports

January EPC Items – Larry Smith. The Curriculum Subcommittee reviewed two R401 proposals. Academic Standards Subcommittee modified catalog language regarding credits awarded for International Baccalaureate courses and the General Education committee passed a motion to change language regarding how the university evaluates general education courses taken more than 15 years ago. The Honors program presented a proposal to create a global engagement designation on transcripts.

Honorary Degrees and Awards Committee Report – Sydney Peterson. Presented as part of University Business.

A motion to accept the two reports was made by Stephan Bialkowski and seconded by Robert Schmidt. The motion passed unanimously

Unfinished Business

AFT Code Change Proposals (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. Doug presented the proposed changes that would require the reason for faculty non-renewals be included in the letter from the President. Two other changes in the proposal correct clerical errors.

Provost/AFT 405 Section Code Changes (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. This proposal includes four changes brought forward by the Provost and that have been previously reviewed by AFT and FSEC. Change number one clarifies that the newly drafted role statements should be approved by the provost, but the provost signature is not required on the role statement or revisions to the role statement. Change number two makes clear that annual work plans can be developed for faculty or units on regional campuses or at USU Eastern. Change three clarifies that the promotion and tenure letter may not be used as a substitute for the annual review letter. Change four allows academic deans and regional campus deans and/or chancellor to submit a joint letter during the promotion and tenure evaluation and recommendation process. A reference in the proposal to USU/CEU needs to be updated to USU Eastern.

Robert Schmidt moved to send the four changes to PRPC, with the understanding that this reading will count as the first reading. The motion was seconded by JP Spicer-Escalante. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski. The examples mentioned in this section of code referring to teaching does not include outside of class teaching opportunities. AFT has reviewed and approved the proposal. The change was initiated by Kris Miller and Scott Bates. It proposes that outside of classroom teaching activities should be allowed for the teaching part of the role statement in the P&T process.

A motion to send the proposed changes to PRPC was made by Michael Lions and seconded by Allen Stevens. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee

February 9, 2015

The Educational Policies Committee met on February 5, 2015. The agenda and 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.

During the February meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and actions taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of February 5, 2015 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 86 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the Department of Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences to rename the Master of Education to Master of Education in Educational Technology and Learning Sciences was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences to discontinue all specializations affiliated with the Education Specialist and the Master of Science degree programs was approved.
 - A request from the School of Teacher Education and Leadership for a specialization in Higher Education/Student Affairs within the existing Master of Education degree was approved.
 - A request from the School of Applied Sciences, Technology, and Education to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in Outdoor Product Design and Development was approved.
2. There was no report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of January 20, 2015. Actions include:
 - The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:
 - ART 1020 (BCA, Mark Koven)
 - HIST 4251 (DHA)
 - HIST 4815 (DHA)
 - NDFS 1010 (BPS)

4. Other Business

Addendum to January 8, 2015 EPC Report: A motion to make the time for final submission of course grades by faculty, 5:00p Thursday of the week after final exams, was approved.

Academic Freedom and Tenure (AFT) Committee, Utah State University

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate, prepared February 2015

AFT Committee Members 2014-2015 (and year rotating off)

Agriculture / Applied Sciences	Grant Cardon (15)
Arts	Bruce Duerden (17)
Business	Richard Jenson (15)
Education & Human Services	Troy Beckert (17)
Engineering	Kurt Becker (15)
Humanities & Social Services	Cathy Bullock (16; vice chair)
Natural Resources	Peter Adler (16)
Science	Farrell Edwards (17)
Libraries	Becky Thoms (16)
Extension	Kathy Riggs (15)
Regional Campus & Distance Ed.	Susan Talley (17)
USU Eastern	Anthony Lott (17)
Senate	John Stevens (15; chair)
Senate	Foster Agblevor (16)
Senate	Michael Lyons (17)

Summary of Committee Meetings

The AFT Committee meets monthly during the academic year to discuss “matters related to academic freedom, tenure, promotion, dismissals, and other sanctions; and actions alleged not to be in accordance with the adopted standards, policies, and procedures of the University” [Policy 402.12.3(1)(a)].

Consideration of Code Revisions

AFT has responded to and initiated the following proposed code revisions:

- The Provost’s proposed changes to Policy 405, regarding signatures on the initial role statement, annual work plans, separating the department head’s “annual review” (role statement fulfillment) and “progress toward tenure” letters for tenure-eligible faculty, and joint letters from academic and regional campus deans in the promotion and tenure process. These proposed changes (with AFT amendments) appear in the Faculty Senate agenda for December 1, 2014.
- AFT’s proposed changes to Policy 407.6, regarding typographical errors and requiring a reason (but not elaboration) be included in notices of non-renewal for

tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty. These proposed changes appear in the Faculty Senate agenda for January 12, 2015.

- The Honors Program Director's proposed changes to Policy 405, regarding specific mention of student mentoring activities as criteria that may be considered in the evaluation of faculty members' teaching roles. These proposed changes (with AFT amendments) appear in the Faculty Senate agenda for February 2, 2015.

Disposition of Grievances

Faculty members may file grievances (of "actions taken against them") through the AFT Committee, following procedures outlined in Policy 407.5, which clarifies that "Grievances are allegations of arbitrary or capricious conduct; violations of legal, constitutional, or statutory rights; or violations of this code or adopted policies and procedures." The following table summarizes the number of grievances reaching various stages over the past few years.

<u>Stage of Process</u>	Years:	2010-2012	2012-2014	2014-2015
	AFT Chair:	Richard Jenson	Bryce Fifield	John Stevens
Formally filed grievance statement		5	4	0
Grievance panel hearing		3	1	n/a
Panel finding of valid grievance		1	0	n/a

In these formally filed grievances, the alleged grievable issues primarily involve procedures preceding non-renewal. Grievances not advancing from one stage to the subsequent stage in the table above have either been mutually resolved (sometimes using mediation) or withdrawn (by the faculty member, often by their obtaining new employment).

In addition to formally filed grievances, each AFT Chair has fielded numerous informal queries throughout the year from faculty members. At least four such informal queries have been made during the current academic year. The faculty member typically inquires whether alleged actions taken against them would constitute a grievable action. In responding to such inquiries, the AFT Chair does not assess the truth of any allegations in the grievance, but clarifies the grievance timeline and what necessary elements must be included in a formal grievance statement, consistent with Policy 407.5. Informal queries that do not lead to formally filed grievance statements often involve a faculty member's perceived (and perhaps real) incompatibility with the personality or management style of a supervisor or colleague, which in and of itself does not constitute a grievable action. After receiving this clarification from the AFT Chair, the faculty member remains responsible for the decision to formally file (or not file) a grievance statement.

Ongoing Work

In an effort to clarify the grievance process and timeline for potential grievants, panel chairs, and respondents (who are named in formal grievance statements), AFT is compiling a brief handbook. This handbook will be available on the Faculty Senate website, and will include a visualization of process timelines and clarifications on available resources, all consistent with Policy 407.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Stevens, as 2014-2015 AFT Chair
Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics

Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report 2015

Prepared by Alan Stephens

Charge:

The duties of the Budget and Faculty Welfare (BFW) Committee are to (1) participate in the university budget preparation process, (2) periodically evaluate and report to the Senate on matters relating to faculty salaries, insurance programs, 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.

Committee Members:

Vicki Allan – Engineering
Scott Bates (15) – Senate
Stephen Bialkowski (16) – Science
Diane Calloway-Graham - HSS
Rich Etchberger – Regional Campuses & Distance Education
Mike Kava (16) – USU Eastern
Carol Kochan (14) – Libraries
Chris Monz (16) – Natural Resources
Ilka Nemere (15) – Senate
Michael Pate (16) – Agriculture
Joanne Roueche (16) – Extension
Christopher Skousen (15) – Senate
Alan Stephens, Chair (16) – Business
Leslie Timmons (16) – Arts
Dale Wagner (15) – Education & Human Services

Meeting Dates:

March 24, 2014; September 26, 2014; October 24, 2014; December 2, 2014

Outline of meeting Facts and discussions:

The committee met with the Senate president, Provost Noelle Cockett, President Albrecht, VP Dave Cowley and BrandE Faupel. The discussions focused on the following issues:

- a. Salary increases.

- i. The president stated that BFW's discussion with him and the BFW survey was considered. However, BFW was not part of the ongoing salary and budget discussions, which apparently included only the dean's council.
 - ii. Salary compression was talked about but no significant movement has occurred with respect to this issue
- b. The debate about post tenure review.
- c. Role statements in the code and elsewhere particularly with respect to the RCDE to RC. This issue ties to Extra Service Compensation
- d. Extra Service Compensation. BFW worked with VP of Research on the new policy and will continue to work on the implementation of the policy.
- e. The consideration of moving 3rd year reviews for tenure eligible faculty to the 4th year. This decision was deferred to the FEC committee.

The committee worked with the provost to redefine the concept of service and increase its importance in the university setting in an effort to promote shared governance.

The committee is committed to building shared governance as defined in the code:

401.8.1(4) Collegial Governance of the University.

There is shared responsibility in the governance of the university with a meaningful role for the faculty. *This role includes participation in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the university, such as **budget matters and the appointment of administrators. The faculty should actively advise in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.*** (Emphasis added)

Two BFW members, Alan Stephens and Carol Kochan, represent the Faculty on the Benefits Advisory Committee, which works with Human Resources to review proposed changes to benefits. Other members of that committee consist of two members each from professional classified ranks. In addition, Alan and Carol represented the faculty on the Health Insurance RFP committee.

Subject: BFW Meeting Minutes

Date: 3/24/2014

Attending: Vicki Allan, Stephen Bialkowski, Carol Kochan, Ilka Nemere, Alan Stephens, Joanne Roueche, Chris Skousen, Dale Wagner

- Committee met with the president to talk about the results of the legislative session. For the most part the President was positive about the session with many of the universities need being met.
- The discussion then turned to the salary issue. Legislature allocated 1.25% on going and 1.75% for merit, compression, and retention. The discussion then went directly to the 1.75%.
- The president said that BFW's discussion with him and the BFW survey was considered. However, BFW was not part of the ongoing discussion which was apparently only held with the deans.
 - Chair notes again the selective use of the code: "The duties of the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee are to (a) participate in the university budget preparation process; (b) periodically evaluate and report to the Senate on matters relating to faculty salaries, insurance programs, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, consulting policies, and other faculty benefits;"
- The 1.75% is to be distributed by the deans.
 - Information about salary compression will be provided to the colleges by the provost.
 - The president indicated that it is not the time to deal with salary compression.
 - It was noted, based on the considerable institutional memory of the committee that it NEVER appears to be the time to address compression.
 - Salary decisions left to DH and Deans – no direction from central administration
 - It was noted by Stephen that by code the faculty of the departments should make the decision, however only one department does this.
 - President asked about vindictive DH. He indicated a faculty member should then take the issue to the dean. If you have a vindictive dean then he wants to hear about it.
 - The committee was underwhelmed by the response.

- President refused to direct compensation to compression since he has faith the DH and Deans will address the issue.
 - That faith is not shared by the faculty as indicated by the battle over 405 where distrust of administration is obvious.
- The chair suggested that the committee, over the summer and fall, track raises in each college for a report to central administration.

Subject: BFW Minutes

Date: 9-26-14

Attending: Michael Pate, Leslie Timmons, Alan Stephens, Dale Wagner, Vicki Allan, Diane Calloway-Graham, Chris Monz, Stephen Bialkowski, Carol Kochan, Joanne Roueche, Rich Etchberger, Mike Kava, Chris Skousen, Scott Bates

- Introductions of members
- Topics of discussion
 - Discussion of the RCDE to RC change (distance ed paying the same as campus students) and the implication for college and department budgets and faculty compensation.
 - It was noted by the committee that with respect to faculty compensation there appears to be no consistency across campus. Some faculty are paid overload, some have as part of load.
 - No consistence with respect to role statements.
 - This again opens up the whole discussion of extra service compensation and how that is inconsistently view by administrative units.
 - This topic was put on the agenda as a discussion to have with Provost Cockett and Robert Wagner.
 - A brief discussion was held on reported mistreatment of the lecturer ranks with respect to ACA. Some lecturers are teaching 4/4 and being held to 29 hours to avoid benefit payments.
 - Chair was charged with getting more information from Doug Jackson-Smith
 - Chair charged to contact BrandE Faupell
 - Committee members charged to investigate within their colleges, being sensitive to the non-tenured status of lectures and adjuncts
 - Committee has a lively discussion on Salary Compression.
 - Committee members were charged to talk to their college administrations about the amounts of money flowing to alleviate salary compression/inversion.
 - This topic was put on the agenda to discuss with President Albrecht.

- Another discussion of Post Tenure Review with respect to the Regents code.

- The faculty code is subject to the Regents code as per 202.1.1.
- The Regent Code is provided below with appropriate highlight
- **3.15. In-Depth Post-Tenure Review.**

3.15.1. **Intent of Post-Tenure Review:** The review shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance with the intent of:

3.15.1.1. recognizing performance in the discipline's endeavors which demonstrates growth and development;

3.15.1.2. communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and

3.15.1.3. enhancing each individual's future productivity.

3.15.2 **Procedures.** The institution shall establish procedures to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards. The criteria for such review shall include multiple indices, and be discipline- and role-specific, as appropriate, to evaluate:

3.15.2.1. teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment.

3.15.2.2. the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity.

3.15.2.3. service to the profession, school and community.

3.16. **Remedial Actions Based on Post-Tenure Review:** If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his or her discipline, he or she is responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and the institution is expected to assist through developmental opportunities. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action under institutional policies adopted pursuant to this policy.

- Chair and Stephen noted that our current code mirrored the regents code with two exceptions:
 1. That the timing of the reviews could be set to 7 years (accreditation cycle) as opposed to 5 year reviews in the current code
 2. Our professional development plan is inconsistent with the regent's code. Our current code says the PDP is initiated by the department head. The Regents' Code states that it is up to the faculty member to remedy the problem, which may be read as saying, the faculty

member and her/his review committee are responsible to develop the professional development plan.

▪ Chair asked 3 questions:

1. Should considering this; causing it to come on the regent's radar, which may result in something real nasty? Or, alternatively, we could make a simple change our current code to specify that the post-tenure review causes the development plan and then it would be consistent with Regents' Code.
2. Our sister universities, who all have similar codes, are NOT worrying about this, so why are we continuing to waste our time?
3. Finally, why would we want to cause our sister schools this much pain, because we refuse to leave well enough alone?

▪ Chair was tasked to propose to PRPC a revision of 405 to be in line with the Regents' Code. (Request to PRPC is attached)

○ At the request of Provost BFW considered two issues:

- Review procedure for those going up with teaching as area of excellence
- Move 3rd year review (the major go - no go decision year to the 4th year.
- Committee moved that this be taken to FEC

○ Other Topics from the Committee

- A discussion was held on class enrollment creep. That is, some classes have been expanded from 30 to 60+ students without adding new sections and without any consideration of faculty workload.
- The question was asked if there should be a code revision that stipulated a class size criteria
- Discussion was propose as a topic to bring up with the Provost

○ Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

To: Stephen Bialkowski, Chair PRPC, PRPC Committee, Douglas Jackson – Smith

Subject: Revision of Code 405 to be in compliance with Regents Code 3.15 and 3.16

Date: September 30, 2014

Whereas the Faculty code (section 400) is “subordinate to the Code and Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents’ of the Utah System of Higher Education” (202.1.1), the BFW committee requests PRPC bring section 405.12 into compliance with the Regents’ Code.

The Regents’ Code states:

3.15. In-Depth Post-Tenure Review.

3.15.1. Intent of Post-Tenure Review: The review shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance with the intent of:

- 3.15.1.1. recognizing performance in the discipline's endeavors which demonstrates growth and development;
- 3.15.1.2. communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and
- 3.15.1.3. enhancing each individual's future productivity.

3.15.2 Procedures. The institution shall establish procedures to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards. The criteria for such review shall include multiple indices, and be discipline- and role-specific, as appropriate, to evaluate:

- 3.15.2.1. teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment.
- 3.15.2.2. the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity.
- 3.15.2.3. service to the profession, school and community.

3.16. Remedial Actions Based on Post-Tenure Review: If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his or her discipline, he or she is responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and the institution is expected to assist through developmental opportunities. A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action under institutional policies adopted pursuant to this policy.

We suggest:

1. Since the Regent’s Code requires an “In-Depth Post-Tenure Review” in a “frequency consistent with accreditation standards,” and on belief that USU’s accreditation cycle is 7 years, we propose that the “In-Depth Post Tenure Review” be set to 7 Years.
2. Section 405.12.3 be changed to reflect Regent’s code 3.16, whereas the faculty member and/or his or her committee are charged to create a professional development plan as opposed to the department head or supervisor.

Subject: BFW Minutes

Date: 10-24-14

Attending: Michael Pate, Leslie Timmons, Alan Stephens, Dale Wagner, Vicki Allan, Diane Calloway-Graham, Chris Monz, Stephen Bialkowski, Carol Kochan, Joanne Roueche, Rich Etchberger, Mike Kava, Chris Skousen, Scott Bates

- Approved minutes
- Topics of discussion
 - The meeting was turned over to Provost Cockett who addressed several concerns of the BFW
 - Consideration the RCDE to RC change (distance ed paying the same as campus students) and the implication for college and department budgets and in particular faculty compensation.
 - 1. The discussion revolved around creating a consistent salary and role statement model.
 - The problem of salary compression and BFW's dissatisfaction with the president's trust in the DH and Deans to do the right thing.
 - 1. The provost discussed the salary compression data that she had, but was unwilling to direct departments to address salary compression.
 - Discussion of limits on class sizes. As the university has grown, class size has grown with little consideration of faculty time commitments. That is, class size appears to be more dependent on room size than on pedagogy; and the faculty observe that while they may still be on a 2/2 teaching load, it is quite different to teach 25 on a 2/2 load versus 60 on a 2/2 load.
 - 1. The provost indicated that overall, the evidence did not indicate a severe problem. However she was willing to investigate problems on behalf of individual faculty members.

Subject: BFW Minutes

Date: 12-03-14

Attending: Scott Bates, Rich Etchberger, Mike Kava, Carol Kochan, Ilka Nemere, Joanne Roueche, Christopher Skousen, Alan Stephens, Dale Wagner, Douglas Jackson-Smith

- Topics of discussion
 - Extra Service Compensation – Mark McCellan presented the work he and his committee did on ESC to bring the policy into line with federal guidelines. The attachment to these minutes were part of the discussion
 - The major discussion concerned implementation.
 - In this regard, BFW's position was the procedures should come from a combination of the research office, senate and BFW with minimal input from HR. It seems that the HR has implemented past ESC policies with little input from the effected parties.
 - When Mark is ready to talk about procedures BFW will meet with him, possibly in January.
 - Dale's group was the only group to provide comments directly to BFW and these were passed along to Douglas Jackson-Smith
 - BFW was advisory to the Faculty Senate on this topic and the Senate president drafted a response to Mark McCellan.

POLICY MANUAL

COMPENSATION

Number 376

Subject: Extra-Service Compensation

Covered Employees: Benefit-Eligible, Exempt Employees

Date of Origin: January 24, 1997

Effective Date of Last Revision: April 9, 2004

DRAFT: December 1, 2014

FEDERAL GUIDANCE REFERENCES

The following policy is based on the following:

- **Utah Code 67-16-1 et.seq.**, “Utah Public Officers and Employees’ Ethics Act.
- **Federal Office of Management and Budget, Final Rule -- *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (A-81)*** – Federal Register, Vol 78, No. 248
 - (Superseding: OMB Circulars A-21, A-87, A-110, and A-122 (which have been placed in OMB guidance); Circulars A-89, A-102, and A-133; and the guidance in Circular A-50
 - Implementation Date: December 26, 2014
- **NSF, Office of Inspector General – 2004 Audit findings**
- **Department of Justice, settlement findings – 2008**
- **HHS Office of Inspector General – 2011 Audit findings**

Draft Editing Instructions:

If this policy is not implemented prior to December 26, 2014 — In order to be in compliance with current OMB rules, editors are to remove all references to OMB A-21, leaving in place the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements reference as currently noted in the text without change in meaning or intent.

376.1 INTRODUCTION

The University recognizes that employees may make unusual contributions to the University that are both related and unrelated to their Primary Work Assignments. This policy is designed to establish an institutional expression of support for appropriate, operations-based standards for Extra-Service Compensation.

376.2 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Primary Work Assignment

The Primary Work Assignment, defined is the basis upon which the University sets its expectations of an employee's duties and allocation of effort. USU utilizes the following methods to establish the Primary Work Assignment:

- (a) *For Faculty:* The primary work assignment is derived from the Role Statement, as defined in under section 6.1 and 11.1 of USU Policy #405, Tenured and Term Appointments: Evaluation, Promotion and Retention.
- (b) *For Non-Faculty Exempt Employees:* The primary work assignment is derived from the Office of Human Resources most recent position description available for that employee, which documents the responsibilities, functions, and requirements of each job. Expectations for the allocation of effort are also reflected in USU's annual Budget Process/Salary Planner process.

2.2 Full Workload

Full Workload for an employee shall be that workload for which an employee is compensated by the University, exclusive of compensation for incidental work. For exempt employees, it shall be that workload specified in the primary work assignment for a given period. The more closely an activity is associated with the University's compensation and reward systems, the more likely it will be included in the Full Workload.

2.3 Institutional Base Salary

Institutional Base Salary (IBS) shall be the salary paid by the institution for the performance of the full workload by a given employee. It may be based on appointments of differing lengths, such as the academic year, eleven months or twelve months. IBS shall be calculated in accordance with Budget Office Guidelines, "Salary Definitions." The IBS may change based on significant, non-temporary changes in the Primary Work Assignment or because of salary increases approved by the University.

2.4 Institutional Base Salary Earning Rate

The Institutional Base Salary Earning Rate shall be calculated based on the compensation level at which an employee is paid for his/her appointment term, divided by the number of months of that term. An employee shall not earn compensation from USU sources in

excess of the base salary rate in any given month, except as allowed under this policy, Extra Service Compensation or through a specially approved administration one-time payment.

2.5 Institutional Payout Rate

The Institutional Base Salary Earning Rate may differ from the amount of compensation actually paid to an employee during a given month, because salary for an appointment of less than 12 months is distributed across 12 months in the payroll system. For details concerning distribution of pay over a period different from the appointment term, contact the Controller's Office.

2.6 Incidental Work

Incidental Work is that work which is accomplished by an individual in excess of his/her Full Workload, as follows:

2.6.1 Incidental Work that is carried out within the institution and paid for as Extra-Service Compensation must be documented in the University's financial management systems, though it shall not be reported or certified in the University's time and effort reporting system.

2.6.2 Incidental Work that is provided without compensation shall be reported to the immediate supervisor in order to avoid conflicts of interest, including conflicts of commitment.

2.6.3 Incidental Work performed outside the university is neither reported in the time & effort or payroll systems, nor documented in the University's financial management systems; however, documentation of consulting leave time is required as set forth in USU Policy #377, Consulting Services.

2.7 Extra Service

Extra Service shall be any service rendered to the University that is not specifically identified as part of the employee's Full Workload. Extra service shall be clearly identified and approved in advance as such in accordance with this policy and Policy 404.1.2(7), Faculty Appointments, Professional Services.

376.3 POLICY

Opportunities for consulting or other activities that fall outside of an employee's Primary Work Assignment are granted in accordance with Utah Code 67-16-1 et. seq., "Utah Public Officers and Employees' Ethics Act," and as permitted under USU's consulting policy. Such activities shall be allowed at the University's discretion where clear benefit to the University can be demonstrated.

Employees may provide Extra Service to the University beyond their Primary Work Assignments either for or without compensation, provided that the preparation and performance of such services do not impede the discharge of their duties under their Primary Work Assignments.

Compensation received for Extra Service shall not exceed 20% of the individual's Institutional Base Salary without prior written approval of the Executive Vice President & Provost for academic units and without prior written approval of the Office of the President for all non-academic units.

3.1 Extra-Service Compensation Unrelated to the Primary Work Assignment

3.1.1 Extra Service Related to Sponsored Programs Sourced Funds.

Extra and supplemental compensation from federal funds is governed by OMB Circular A-21 (OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements), which also requires that like funding be treated consistently under like circumstances by the University. Thus, all external funding shall be subject to the regulatory guidance in OMB Circular A-21 (OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Section 200.430(h)(3)), as follows: "intra-university consulting is assumed to be undertaken as a university obligation requiring no compensation in addition to full-time base salary. However, in unusual cases...charges for such work representing additional compensation above IBS are allowable...". This principle applies to employees who function as consultants for sponsored agreements conducted under the direction of other University employees.

Extra-Service Compensation from external funds can be allowed for faculty and other exempt employees when **all** of the following conditions are met:

- (1) The request does not exceed the Base Salary Earnings Rate based on the employee's Institutional Base Salary, which is that compensation provided to an employee for fulfillment of his/her Full Workload;
- (2) The employee will perform a role outside of the individual employee's organizational unit or is otherwise different from his/her Primary Work Assignment; NOTE: Employees may not receive compensation for Extra Service work on projects for which they serve as PI or Co-PI.
- (3) Work is demonstrably in addition to the employee's Full Workload for the reporting period during which it will be performed;
- (4) The request is specifically proposed and included in the approved budget and/or agreement with the sponsoring agency or otherwise approved in writing by an authorized agency representative. If not specifically and explicitly provided for in the approved proposal, budget and/or award, an official sponsor approval must be obtained before any extra contractual work is done. NOTE: By itself, agency approval for Extra Service payment shall not be considered a waiver for requirements 1-3 above.

(5) The request is approved in advance by the Vice President for Research. Review and support will be required of the individual's department head, supervisor, dean and/or vice president as appropriate prior to submission to the Office of Research & Graduate Studies. Any request for above 20% will also require the follow-on approval of the Executive Vice President & Provost.

For additional forms and instructions concerning Extra-Service compensation involving external funds see RGS Procedure 376-PR.

3.1.2 Extra-Service Compensation from Non-Sponsored Programs Sourced Funds

USU's Disclosure Statement to the Federal Government (DS-2) requires the institution to use the same salary and wage distribution system for all like employees, regardless of the source of their compensation. Thus, the University uses consistent practices for identifying, charging and reporting all personnel costs, including its method of identifying which activities will be included in the Full Workload (and therefore the Institutional Base Salary) and which will not.

As a result, Extra Service Compensation from all non-sponsored programs sourced funds must meet all of the following restrictions:

- (1) The Extra Service is compensated at a rate not to exceed the Institutional Base Salary Earnings Rate which, is based on the employee's Institutional Base Salary (the compensation provided to an employee for the fulfillment of the employee's Full Workload);
- (2) The work is outside of the scope of the employee's required job expectations, as set forth in the Primary Work Assignment;
- (3) Work is demonstrably in addition to the employee's Full Workload for the reporting period during which it will be performed;
- (4) The Extra Service is based on temporary and unusual circumstances, and funds have been allocated to pay for the services.
- (5) The request is approved in advance by the Executive Vice President & Provost. Review and support will be required of the individual's department head, supervisor, dean and/or vice president as appropriate prior to submission to the Office of the Executive Vice President & Provost.

For additional guidelines concerning Extra-Service compensation involving non-sponsored programs sourced funds see Provost Procedure 376-PR.

3.1.3 Extra Service Related to Primary Work Assignment

Only in the most unusual circumstances, outcomes and activities focused on furthering the institutional missions of discovery, learning and engagement, which are exclusively funded from unrestricted and non-sponsored programs sourced funds, which are also related to the Primary Work Assignment can qualify for Extra-Service compensation.

Extra Service compensation related to the Primary Work Assignment should not be used as a regular supplement to an individual's salary.

Requests for Extra-service Compensation related to the Primary Work Assignment may not exceed the Institutional Base Salary Earning Rate, and must be approved in advance by the Executive Vice President & Provost.

3.2 Relationship of Extra Service Compensation to Non-appointment Payments

USU allows faculty and other exempt employees with appointments of less than 12 months to receive compensation at their Institutional Base Salary Earning Rate for periods up to a total of 12 months per fiscal year based upon the conduct of research, teaching, or other activities that are consistent with federal and USU policy and that do not conflict with the faculty member's Primary Work Assignment. This compensation is not Extra Service.

Non-appointment compensation is subject to effort reporting and certification. Effort and compensation for such work should therefore occur in parallel with, or in replacement of the employee's Primary Work Assignment, and may be expended at any time during the fiscal year. Thus, employees working during periods not included in their academic appointments shall, when appropriate, utilize any non-appointment period available to them to reach this 12-month capacity for salary compensation before any Extra-Service Compensation will be approved.

USU does not limit an employee's opportunity to receive compensation paid directly by a non-University funding source as per USU's consulting policy.

376.4 RESPONSIBILITY

4.1 Department Heads and Supervisors

In keeping with Federal expectations that USU will meet agency requirements for department heads, supervisors, vice presidents and deans are responsible for reviewing extra service opportunities with employees before they occur to ensure that interference or conflict with the employee's Primary Work Assignment is

avoided or appropriately managed. The department head/supervisor and dean has primary responsibility for working with employees to ensure compliance with this Extra Service Compensation policy. Refer to RGS Procedure 376-PR and Provost Procedure 376-PR for guidance on implementing this policy. Departments and colleges will bear primary responsibility for repayment of disallowed Extra Service Compensation costs.

4.2 Employees

Employees are responsible for accurately completing the Request for Extra Service Compensation Form and for obtaining supervisory approvals prior to submission. Conflicts of interest must be disclosed as they arise.

PROCEDURAL REFERENCES

Procedures corresponding to this policy include:

- RGS Procedure 376-PR for guidance on Extra-Service Compensation related to sponsored program activities
 - Provost Procedure 376-PR for guidance on Extra-Service Compensation for non-sponsored program activities
-

USU Board of Trustees – Audit Committee – Timeline

- a. **2013** – USU Audit Committee Meeting –
 - i. McLellan Requested to discuss
 - ii. Two policies re: Sponsored Programs identified to address internal audits:
 - 1. **April 20, 2007** -- *Time & Effort Policy (582)* –
 - 2. **April 9, 2004** -- *Extra Service Compensation Policy* –
- b. **November 2013** – VPR establishes T&E administrative working group to address policies
 - i. HR, B&F, VPR, Comptroller, Audits, SPO, SPA – to study OMB instructions and draft new policies
 - ii. 1st target: Time & Effort – broader impact with critical definitions
 - iii. 2nd target: Extra Service Compensation – depends upon T&E and has broader impact
- c. **April 2014** — Research Council approves new Time & Effort Policy (582)
- d. **April 30, 2014** – President’s Council installs new *Time & Effort Policy (582)*

Risk mitigation action-TIME & EFFORT COMPLIANCE -:

- 1. New Time & Effort Policy is in place as of APRIL 30th, 2014 meeting full OMB instructions.
- 2. Cost share accounting practices (SPO & SPA) retro action back to 2010
- 3. Cost share accounting practices (SPO & SPA) in place September 1, 2014 for new sponsored projects
- 4. Voluntary New Financial Training (RFAST) all Key Personnel -- in place as of SEPTEMBER 1, 2014
- 5. Mandatory Training of all Faculty (RFAST) all Key Personnel -- in place JANUARY 1, 2015

May, 2014 — Research Council – Failed to vote on Draft *Extra Service Compensation Policy*
Needed to produce more background on OMB guidance for ESC

Sept., 2014 — Research Council -- Failed to vote on Draft *Extra Service Compensation Policy*
Needed to allow more time to consider OMB guidance for ESC

Oct. 24, 2014 –BOT Audit Committee –
Review of progress to revise audit risk issues on Sponsored programs.

Time Line ...

- July 2011 - McLellan
- 2011 & 2012 - Failed Internal Audits - T&E, ESC
- 2013 -- BOT Audit Committee

**Failed Audits: USU 2007 Time & Effort Policy,
USU 2004 Extra Service Compensation Policy**

First Target: Time & Effort Policy

Fall 2013 -- Working Group

VPR, SPO, SPA, Audits, Comptroller, Finance, HR:
Review of OMB Rules under the new
Uniform Administrative Requirements (A81) - Fed Register V.78, N248

April 2014 — New Time & Effort Policy implemented by BOT

May 2014 — Draft ESC Policy discussed by Research Council

Sept 2014 — Draft ESC Policy discussed by Research Council

Oct 2014 — BOT Audit Committee Discussions

Nov 2014 — New ESC Policy -- passed by Research Council

OMB Actions:

Dec. 26, 2013 — New Rules posted - Federal Register - Final Notice
Combining many circulars including A21, A133, A110

Dec. 26, 2014 — New Rules are to become law and audited against

OIG Actions:

2004 — Audit Findings against San Diego State University

2011 — Audit Findings against State University of New York

DOJ Actions:

2008 — \$1 million settlement against St. Louis University

The New USU ESC Policy ...

- Picks up Time & Effort Definitions
- Allows for Extra Service
- 20% Cap - Removable by the Provost
- Separates into 3 processes

[1] ESC from Sponsored Program funds - for Not Primary Role

[2] ESC from non-Sponsored Program Funds - for Not Primary Role

[3] ESC on Primary Work Assignment

[1] ESC (Sponsored Program Funds) - Not Primary Role

Adhere to **ALL** of the following:

- [1] Base Salary Earning Rate
- [2] Consulting Only - outside of unit -- Not PI or Co-PI (Unusual & Temporary)
- [3] Above Full Workload
- [4] Approved apriori by Sponsor
- [5] Approved apriori by VPR
- [6] if over 20% - will also require Provost approval

POLICY calls for **RGS PROCEDURES** for use when applying policy

[2] ESC (Non-sponsored program funds) - Not Primary Role

Adhere to **ALL** of the following:

- [1] Base Salary Earning Rate
- [2] Outside of Job Expectations in primary work assignment
- [3] Above Full Workload
- [4] Temporary & Unusual
- [5] Approved apriori by Provost

POLICY calls for **PROVOST PROCEDURES** for use when applying policy

[3] ESC for Primary Role Assignment - Highly Unusual

Adhere to **ALL** of the following:

- [1] Base Salary Earning Rate
- [2] Super unusual & temporary
- [3] Approved apriori by Provost

Approach -- Metrics vs Process



To: Mark McLellan, Vice President for Research and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies
Noelle Cockette, Provost and Executive Vice President
From: Douglas Jackson-Smith, USU Faculty Senate President
Date: December 8, 2014
RE: Feedback on Extra Service Compensation Policy from Faculty Senate

As the designated representative of USU's faculty for the review of changes in 300-level code at Utah State, I wanted to share my feedback on the proposed Extra Service Compensation Policy (No.376). My comments are based on ongoing discussions with my faculty senate leadership colleagues, the presentation and discussion on the floor of the senate on December 1st, and the meeting with members of the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee on December 3rd.

Overall, we support the new policy as a necessary change in response to new federal guidelines and regulations. To be clear, there are a number of faculty who would prefer more liberal ESC policies that would allow them to be paid for extra work on an ongoing basis (as has been the practice for some units in the past). However, we appreciate that this is not permissible under federal law. We also recognize that the old policy was not in compliance with these new standards, and appreciate the hard work and effort that your office has made to develop a new policy that is both compliant and allows some appropriate flexibility for implementation.

Substantively, we agree with the suggestion made by the Provost at our December 1st meeting to drop the word 'internal' for the second category of ESC situations. With that edit, we would approve of this new policy as drafted.

Faculty support for the policy is also based on the assumption that we will be involved in the important decisions still to come that relate to the implementation and procedures that will be developed. We would encourage your offices to set up a meeting in the spring semester with the Budget and Faculty Welfare committee to discuss the process, request form templates, and documents outlining implementation procedures.

Specifically, I would urge us all to consider the following specific points during implementation:

- Protect faculty who might be caught in the transition between the old and new policies.
 - If faculty have been taking on additional responsibilities for many years for their department of the university (above their prior workload) in return for ESC, but will not qualify under the new policy, we believe there are two options that these faculty should be offered:
 - Relieve them of the additional responsibilities if they cannot be compensated, or
 - Roll the additional compensation into their base salary rate.
 - We are firmly opposed to requiring faculty to continue these additional responsibilities without compensation.

- Provide clear guidance to financial officers at the college and department level that there are appropriate ways to use summer salary funding for many situations in which extra-service compensation was used in the past. Specifically, it would be useful to clarify that faculty could accept extra work obligations (say teaching a special course) during the academic year, but be compensated through summer salary (to cover the other work tasks that would be displaced due to the new teaching responsibilities). To the extent that we can avoid invoking the ESC policy, I think the transition to the new policy will be much more straightforward.
- Ensure that implementation of the new policy is consistent across and within units. This may require developing an approval tracking system (or regular audits) that permit the Provost and VPR to see requests that were both approved and denied by Department Heads and Deans. Perhaps specify an appeals process for faculty that do not think their requests were handled fairly or consistently.
- Review the unique situation related to county extension faculty. As we understand it, these faculty will no longer be able to serve as PIs or CoPIs on external grants in exchange for extra service compensation (as had been done frequently in the past). These faculty need to be given advice about how to find other ways to reward them for pursuing and engaging in external grant funded work. For example, in special cases where a faculty member has a track record of consistently obtaining external funding, serious consideration should be given to either increasing their base salary and/or allowing them to distribute their base salary over 11 months to enable them to pursue summer salary funding.
- Consider clarifying for implementation what might be ‘temporary and unusual’ work assignments – particularly relative to the number of years a faculty member might be engaged in doing additional new tasks for their department or unit.
- Consider clarifying in code (or developing procedures) to help define the relationships between official USU role statements and workload or work assignment documents. Because ESC is mainly available for faculty who are asked to do things that are outside of their primary work assignment, and because this term is linked to role statements in the new policy, it is important to protect faculty from arbitrary or inconsistent implementation of workload expectations for faculty with similar role statements (at least at the unit or department level). Two principles that we would like to see codified in code or policy would be:
 - Faculty in any single unit (department, college or regional campus) with similar role statement teaching percentages will be expected to carry a similar teaching load.
 - Faculty asked to teach additional courses above the typical load associated with a similar role statement in their unit will be eligible for extra service compensation since this would be outside of their primary work assignment.
 - Alternatively – faculty may not be asked to teach courses above the typical load associated with a similar role statement in their unit unless they agree to a change in their role statement or are offered and made eligible for extra service compensation.

Proposed change #1 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

State that a non-renewal notice must disclose the reason for non-renewal, but elaboration is at the president's discretion.

Reason for change:

There are only three allowable reasons for the non-renewal of tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty (Policy 407.6.2): unsatisfactory performance of assigned role, failure to meet tenure requirements (only applicable in final tenure decision year), and cessation of extramural funding required for salary support. The same Policy section also states that these faculty members may not be non-renewed for reasons that violate their academic freedom. A recent grievant to the AFT committee pointed out that no reason was included in their notice of non-renewal (although previous reviews of the faculty member had indicated concerns). Policy 407.6.4 says that the notice of non-renewal may state the reasons for non-renewal, at the president's discretion. It seems only fair to disclose to a non-renewed faculty member the reason(s) for non-renewal (of the three allowed by code) in the formal written notice. Such disclosure would also strengthen the protection of academic freedom, and non-renewed faculty members would not be left to wonder whether their academic freedom was an issue. This can be achieved without any additional burden on the president (who writes or approves the formal notice of non-renewal), as the proposed change would only require the written notice to identify one (or more) of the three allowable reasons, with the president retaining the option to elaborate. The AFT committee opposes requiring such elaboration, however, as that could be an unnecessary duplication of previous reports or reviews of the faculty member. Stating the reason (of the three allowed) for non-renewal in the written notice is not redundant since that is where the final *decision* (as opposed to *recommendations* from the tenure advisory committee, department head, or dean) is communicated to the faculty member (Policy 407.6.3).

Current USU Policy 407.6.4(1):

"Reasons for non-renewal may be stated in the notice of non-renewal, at the president's discretion."

Proposed USU Policy 407.6.4(1):

"**The reason(s) for non-renewal (of the three specified in 407.6.2) ~~may~~ shall be stated in the notice of non-renewal. At the president's discretion, the notice may elaborate on the reason(s) by referencing previous reports or reviews of the faculty member (405.7, 405.12.1).**"

Proposed changes to 405 policy (initiated by Provost Cockett; reviewed & amended by AFT committee)

CHANGE 1

- Clarify that the role statement should be approved by the Provost but the Provost's signature is not needed.

Reason for change:

Currently, the draft role statement is approved by the Provost before an offer is extended to a new faculty member and the Provost's signature is obtained after the faculty member, department head and dean(s), Vice President for Extension and/or chancellor have signed. However, the routing of the role statement back to the Provost can delay processing the hiring EPAF and seems unnecessary because the Provost has already approved the document.

Current USU Policy (405.6.1):

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 academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains.

Proposed USU Policy:

A role statement will be prepared by the department head or supervisor, and agreed upon between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member at the time he or she accepts an appointment, as indicated by their signatures. The role statement should also be, ~~and~~ approved by the academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean, prior to the faculty member's signature, and then signed by the academic dean, and the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean where applicable. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains.

CHANGE 2

- Allow for an annual work plan for faculty located on the RC and Eastern campuses.

Reason for change:

Faculty at the regional campuses and USU-Eastern teach classes in a variety of delivery methods including face-to-face, broadcast, online and blended. Significant planning is required to appropriately schedule and deliver classes across the regional and Eastern campuses. A signed annual work plan would facilitate class scheduling and also keep the department head at the Logan campus “in the loop” on course assignments and planned research activities for each RC and Eastern faculty member. The annual work plan would be initiated by the department head in consultation with the RC dean, and approved by the department head and RC dean.

Current USU Policy (405.6.1):

Some academic units may find it useful to employ an annual work plan or “role assignment”. The faculty member's role assignment provides for the detailed implementation of the professional domains 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.

Proposed USU Policy:

Some academic units, [such as Extension and the Regional and Eastern campuses](#), may find it useful to employ an annual work plan or “role assignment”. The faculty member's role assignment provides for the detailed implementation of the professional domains 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.

CHANGE 3: The annual P&T letter generated by the department head should not be used as the annual review letter for tenure-eligible faculty.

Reason for the change: The standards for promotion and tenure are different than the standards for the annual review.

Current USU Policy (405.12.1):

Each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean.

The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor for tenure-eligible faculty (405.7.1 (3)) may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

Original Proposed USU Policy:

The annual evaluation and recommendation letter by the department head or supervisor developed for tenure-eligible faculty as part of the promotion and tenure process (405.7.1 (3)) may not serve as a substitute for this annual review letter for salary adjustment.

CHANGE 4

- Joint letter from the academic and regional campus (RC) deans or chancellor should be allowed during the evaluation and recommendation in the promotion and tenure process.

Reason for the change: The USU Policy currently requires separate letters from the regional campus dean or chancellor. However, a single letter from the academic dean and the RC dean or chancellor can effectively convey the recommendation and needed information during the tenure and/or promotion process.

Current USU Policy [405.7.2(4); 405.8.3(4); 405.11.4(4)]:

405.7.2(4): Tenure

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's recommendation, and the tenure advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11, except that for third-year appointees the date is November 20. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the tenure advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.8.3(4): Promotion

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.11.4(4): Term appointments

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a separate recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a separate recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

Proposed USU Policy:

405.7.2(4): Tenure

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's recommendation, and the tenure advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11, except that for third-year appointees the date is November 20. The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. or These recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the tenure advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.8.3(4): Promotion

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. T or these recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

405.11.4(4): Term appointments

The academic dean or vice president for extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11. The regional campus dean will also submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each regional campus candidate, and likewise, the chancellor of USU-~~CEUEastern~~ will submit a ~~separate~~ recommendation for each USU-~~CEUEastern~~ candidate. T or these recommendations may be submitted jointly with the academic dean's recommendation. Copies of letters from the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate, department head or supervisor, and placed in his or her file at the time that these recommendations are transmitted to the next level of review.

Proposed change #2 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

Fix a typographical error.

Reason for change:

Unnecessary word should be removed.

Current USU Policy 407.6.2:

“... Tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments non-renewed for reasons which that violate their academic freedom or legal rights.”

Proposed USU Policy 407.6.2:

“... Tenure-eligible and term appointment faculty members may not have their appointments non-renewed for reasons ~~which~~ that violate their academic freedom or legal rights.”

Proposed change #3 to the USU Policy (stemming from AFT committee jurisdiction):

Fix a typographical error.

Reason for change:

Policy 407.6.6(8) does not exist, but Policy 407.5.6(8) refers to the scope of the recommendation of the AFT hearing panel.

Current USU Policy 402.12.3(1)(b):

“Hearing panels of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee shall, when hearing grievances, determine whether procedural due process was granted the petitioner as provided in this policy and determine whether the grievance is valid or not valid (see policy 407.6.6(8)) The recommendation of the hearing panel shall be binding on the general membership of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.”

Proposed USU Policy 402.12.3(1)(b):

“Hearing panels of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee shall, when hearing grievances, determine whether procedural due process was granted the petitioner as provided in this policy and determine whether the grievance is valid or not valid (see policy 407.~~65~~.6(8)). The recommendation of the hearing panel shall be binding on the general membership of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.”

405.2 TENURE AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA FOR CORE FACULTY RANKS

2.2 Criteria for the Award of Tenure and for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor are awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her responsibilities as defined by the role statement. Although tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to carry out the major university functions of teaching, research or creative endeavors, extension, and service, individual emphasis will vary within and among academic departments as described in each faculty member's role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs, and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement. The criteria for the award of tenure and the criteria for the award of promotion from assistant to associate professor are the same. These criteria include, but are not limited to: an established reputation based upon a balance of teaching, research or creative endeavors, extension, and service; broad recognition of professional success in the field of appointment; evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which the faculty member performs; and evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement (policies 401.3.2(3) and 405.2.1). Excellence is measured by standards for associate professors within the national professional peer group.

The foregoing criteria are to be applied to the following areas:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes but is not limited to all forms of instructional activities: classroom performance, broadcast and online instruction, mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, student advising and supervision, thesis and dissertation direction, and curriculum development. Documentation supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of instructional materials such as syllabi, instructional manuals, edited readings, case studies, media packages and computer programs; authorship of textbooks; teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; success of students in post-graduate endeavors; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows, applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; recognition by peers of substantive contributions on graduate committees; service on professional committees, panels, and task forces; and invited lectures or panel participation.

405.5 TENURE AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FACULTY RANKS

5.2 Criteria for the Award of Tenure and for Promotion from Professional Career and Technical Education Assistant Professor to Professional Career and Technical Education Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion from professional career and technical education assistant professor to professional career and technical education associate professor are awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her assignment. Although professional career and technical education faculty are expected to carry out the major university functions of teaching, research or creative endeavors, and service responsibilities assigned to them, individual emphasis will vary as described in the faculty member's role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement.

The criteria for the award of tenure and for promotion from professional career and technical education assistant professor to professional career and technical education associate professor are the same. These criteria include, but are not limited to: all of the qualifications prescribed for an professional career and technical education assistant professor; a bachelor's degree from an accredited university; a minimum of seven years of full-time teaching at an accredited college; an established reputation based upon a balance of teaching, research or creative endeavors, and service; broad recognition for professional success in the field of appointment; evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which the faculty member performs; and evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement. Excellence is measured by national standards within the professional peer group.

The foregoing criteria are to be applied to the following areas:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, all forms of career and technical education instructional activities: classroom performance, student advising and supervision, oversight of independent learning mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, and curriculum development. Documentation supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in identifying the needs of the identified audience; curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of up-to-date instructional methods materials such as workshops, conferences, classes, lectures, newsletters, syllabi, instructional manuals, assigned readings, case studies, media presentations, packages and computer-assisted instruction, programs; authorship of extension bulletins, self-instruction textbooks or other instructional materials; program development teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows.

applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; success of students in post-instructional licensing procedures or employment placements; service on professional committees; panels and task forces; and invited presentations or panel participation and professional lectures or consultations.

405.10 TERM APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA

10.1 Criteria for Promotion to the Penultimate Ranks:

Clinical or Research Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor (Federal Cooperator), Assistant Professor (Federal Research), Lecturer, Professional Practice Instructor to Clinical or Research Associate Professor, Associate Professor (Federal Cooperator), Associate Professor (Federal Research), Senior Lecturer, and Professional Practice Associate Professor

Promotion to the penultimate ranks is awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional domains in which he or she performs and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement.

For promotion to the penultimate ranks, faculty members must demonstrate their ability to fulfill the following criteria, appropriate to their appointment:

(1) Teaching.

Teaching includes all forms of instructional activities: classroom performance, mentoring students inside and outside the classroom, student advising, clinical supervision, thesis and dissertation direction, and curriculum development. Evidence supporting teaching performance must include student and peer evaluations where appropriate, and may include, but is not restricted to: proficiency in curriculum development as demonstrated through imaginative or creative use of up-to-date instructional materials such as syllabi, instructional manuals, edited readings, case studies, media packages, and computer programs; authorship of textbooks; teaching and/or advising awards; authorship of refereed articles on teaching; success of students in post-graduate endeavors; evidence of mentoring inside and outside the classroom, including work with graduate or undergraduate researchers, graduate instructors or undergraduate teaching fellows, applicants for major scholarships or grants, and Honors or other independent study work; recognition by peers of substantive contributions on graduate committees; service on professional committees, panels, and task forces; invited lectures or panel participation.

New Proposals for Code Changes (From Faculty Senate Executive Committee)

1. Move Faculty Forum date away from November regular faculty senate meeting
 - a. Motivation: The lack of a regular faculty senate meeting in November has caused significant delays in our ability to address important faculty business in the fall, and in the pace at which new course or academic program proposal from the Educational Policies Committee can move through the approval process. If we have the freedom to find another window to hold the Faculty Forum (away from a regularly scheduled senate meeting), we might also have the flexibility to pick a time and place that is more likely to facilitate widespread faculty participation.
 - b. Proposal
 - i. Revise code (Section 402.9) (see page 2 below) to identify an alternative date for Faculty Forum that does not conflict with a regular meeting of the Faculty Senate or Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
 - ii. Tentative suggestion – some time during the month of October.
2. Replace the phrase ‘in consultation with’ with ‘by mutual agreement with’ in sections of code where the appointment of
 - a. Motivation: To provide faculty with the right to help decide the composition of the committees that engage in reviews for tenure and promotion decisions, and post-tenure review purposes.
 - b. Proposal
 - i. Revise several sections of code:
 1. 405.6.2 (1) Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)
 2. 405.6.2 (2) Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC)
 3. 405.8.2 (1) Meetings of the PAC
 4. 405.11.2 Term Faculty Promotion Advisory Committee
 5. 405.12.2 Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty
 - ii. Replace “in consultation with” with “by mutual agreement with” the faculty member and other appropriate decision-makers.
 - iii. To review places in the code where “by mutual agreement with” is currently used –see pages 7-10 below.

EXISTING CODE ON FACULTY FORUM

402.9 FACULTY FORUM

9.1 Membership of the Faculty Forum; Description

Faculty Forum consists of all elected Senate members, and the chairs of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee, the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee, the Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Forum meetings are a means of open discussion for elected Senate members and the committee chairs without participation by or from the president of the university, the executive vice president and provost, the presidential appointees, academic deans and department heads, chancellors, regional campus deans, or the student members of the Senate, unless specifically requested by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum (see Policy 402.9.3(2)). During meetings of the Faculty Forum, participants may discuss subjects of current interest, question and debate any policies and procedures, and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Forum does not exercise the legislative authority of the Faculty Senate.

9.2 Meetings; Agenda; Notice

The Faculty Forum shall convene at and in lieu of the regularly scheduled November meeting of the Senate. This annual scheduled meeting of the Faculty Forum will be open to all faculty members to attend and speak, with the exception of those excluded by policy 402.9.1.

Additional special meetings may be held by the call of the Faculty Forum President, or upon the written request of a majority of the Faculty Forum Executive Committee, or upon the written petition of 10 members of the Faculty Forum, or upon the written petition of 25 faculty members. Special meetings of the Faculty Forum will be scheduled, whenever possible, within two weeks after receipt of the petition(s) by the Faculty Forum President. Business at special meetings of the Faculty Forum will be conducted by Faculty Forum members. The Faculty Forum Executive Committee will set the agenda for the November meeting and other Faculty Forum meetings. The agenda will include all items raised by the petition(s), together with items deemed pertinent by the Executive Committee. The minutes and agenda for all Faculty Forum meetings shall be distributed in accordance with policy 402.4.2(3). Notice of the November Faculty Forum meeting will be given in the October Senate meeting and distributed to faculty on all campuses.

9.3 Officers and Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum

(1) Officers.

The Senate President shall preside over and conduct meetings of the Faculty Forum and its Executive Committee. The Senate President-Elect shall serve as the President-Elect of both, and shall perform the duties of the Senate President when the latter is unable to exercise them or when the Senate President-Elect is designated by the Senate President to perform in the Senate President's stead.

(2) Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum.

The Faculty Forum Executive Committee shall consist of the elected faculty members on the Senate Executive Committee (policy 402.12).

AREAS WITHIN SECTION 405 OF CURRENT FACULTY CODE WHERE “IN CONSULTATION WITH” IS MENTIONED

405. 6 TENURE, PROMOTION AND REVIEW: GENERAL PROCEDURES

405.6.2 Advisory Committees

(1) Tenure advisory committee (TAC).

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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, appoint a tenure advisory committee. A tenure advisory committee must be appointed during the faculty member's first semester of service. The committee shall consist of at least five members, one of whom must be 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 deans, vice presidents, or chancellors (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, librarian, extension professor, or professional career and technical education professor. 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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. The department head or supervisor of the candidate shall not serve on the tenure advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. A department head or supervisor may only be appointed to the TAC with the approval of the faculty member under consideration. The department head or supervisor for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee. **In consultation with** the faculty member, academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, 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, and the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.

The role and responsibility of the TAC 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 pre-tenure 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 pre-tenure 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 USU Policy Manual. Under those circumstances, the TAC shall recommend (a) to award promotion and tenure or (b) to continue the pre-tenure probationary period.

(2) Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC)

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 academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, 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) below be held at this time.

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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, 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. A department head or supervisor may only be appointed to the promotion advisory committee in unusual circumstances and with the approval of the faculty member under consideration. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. **In consultation with** the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, 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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean...

405.8 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE PROMOTION PROCESS

405.8.2 Faculty with Tenure

The promotion advisory committee shall meet upon request of the faculty member, or in no case later than February 15 of the third year following tenure, to consider a recommendation for promotion.

The department head or supervisor, academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, provost, or president may propose promotion. Such a proposal shall be referred to the promotion advisory committee for consideration and all procedures of 405.8.3 shall be followed.

(1) Meetings of the promotion advisory committee

When the promotion advisory committee, formed by the department head or supervisor **in consultation with** the faculty member and with the approval of the chancellor or regional campus dean (where applicable) and the academic dean, meets for the first time, the purpose of this meeting, similar to the first tenure meeting, will be to ensure that an appropriate role statement is in place and to provide information to the faculty member about promotion to the rank of professor...

405.11 TERM APPOINTMENT: GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

405.11.2 Promotion Advisory Committee

When a faculty member with term appointment is being considered for promotion, the department head or supervisor shall, **in consultation with** the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean appoint a promotion advisory committee of at least five faculty members who have higher rank than does the candidate for promotion, a majority of whom are tenured. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a chair other than him or herself. The promotion advisory committee shall be appointed during the fall semester of the year upon the request of the faculty member who seeks promotion. At least one member shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than five qualified faculty members in the academic unit, the department head or supervisor shall, **in consultation with** the academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, fill the vacancies with qualified faculty of related academic units. The department head or supervisor for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee. The department head or supervisor may, with the approval of the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, 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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean...

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

405.12.2 Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years by a post-tenure quinquennial review committee consisting 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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and must include at least one member from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, **in consultation with** the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. 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. An administrator may only be appointed to the quinquennial review committee with the approval of the faculty member under consideration.

AREAS WITHIN 405 SECTION OF CURRENT FACULTY CODE WHERE “MUTUAL AGREEMENT” IS CURRENTLY USED

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 academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains. 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, including the campus or center location, 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 academic dean, or, where appropriate, the vice president for extension, chancellor, or regional campus dean 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, including the campus or center location, **should be mutually agreed to by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus 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 promotion advisory committee and tenure committees.

405.7 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE TENURE PROCESS

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 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 candidate may also submit names of potential reviewers that he or she does not want contacted, although this list is not binding on the department head or supervisor.

The department head or supervisor and the tenure advisory committee shall mutually agree to the peer reviewers from whom letters will be solicited. 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 external reviewer should be asked to state, the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate and to evaluate the performance, record, accomplishments, recognition and standing of the candidate in the major area of emphasis of his or her role statement. If the candidate, department head, and tenure advisory committee all agree, external reviewers may be asked to evaluate the secondary area of emphasis in the role statement as well. Copies of these letters will become supplementary material to the candidate's file (see Code 405.6.3).

405.8 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE PROMOTION PROCESS

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 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 candidate may also submit names of potential reviewers that he or she does not want contacted, although this list is not binding on the department head or supervisor.

The department head or supervisor and the promotion advisory committee shall mutually agree to the peer reviewers from whom letters will be solicited. 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 promotion advisory committee, and the department head or supervisor** shall be sent to each reviewer by the department head or supervisor. Each external reviewer should be asked to state the nature of his or her acquaintance with the candidate, and to evaluate the performance, record, accomplishments, recognition and standing of the candidate in the major area of emphasis of his or her role statement. If the candidate, department head, and promotion advisory committee all agree, external reviewers may be asked to evaluate the secondary area of emphasis in the role statement as well. Copies of these letters will become supplementary material to the candidate's file.

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

405.11 TERM APPOINTMENT: GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

11.1 Role Statement and Role Assignments

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 academic dean and the provost and, where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean. In determining the role statement, consideration shall be given to all forms of professional service (policy 404.1.2). Role statements provide the medium by which the assigned duties of the faculty member are described and by which administrators and promotion evaluation committees can judge a faculty member with regard to his or her performance. 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 annually and shall be revised as needed. The process of 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 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus 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 promotion advisory committees. A copy of the role statement, and any later revisions, will be provided to the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, the academic dean or vice president for extension and the provost, and where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and the members of the tenure and/or promotion advisory committee.

11.4 Events During the Year in which a Promotion 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 less than four letters arrive, additional letters will be solicited to attain the minimum of four letters. The reviewers must be external to the university and must be respected in their fields. 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 candidate's list. **The department head or supervisor and the promotion advisory committee shall mutually agree to the peer reviewers from whom letters will be solicited.** A summary of the pertinent information in his or her file initially drafted by the department head or supervisor, with **final drafts 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 work, recognition, and standing among his or her peers. Copies of these letters will become supplementary material to the candidate's file. The external review process is not required for those seeking promotion in the lecturer ranks.

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

12.3 Professional Development Plan

(1) The department head or supervisor may, as a consequence of the annual review process, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role expectations. The plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit subsequent alteration. **The professional development plan shall be mutually agreed to and signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus 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 promotion advisory committee and tenure committees. Such appeal and hearing procedures can, upon request, include a review of the professional development plan by the Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2.