

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

4-27-2015

## Faculty Senate Agenda, April 27, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Agenda, April 27, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 462.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/462](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/462)

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](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).





## **FACULTY SENATE**

April 27, 2015

Merrill-Cazier Library Room 154

---

### **Agenda**

---

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Doug Jackson-Smith  
Approval of Minutes April 6, 2015
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- Be sure to sign the roll
  - Senate Elections – President-Elect & Committee on Committees
- 3:10 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President  
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Return of Code change 407.6.4(1).....Doug Jackson-Smith
  2. Faculty role in grade change process .....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 3:25 Reports**
1. Committee on Committees Report.....Sheri Haderlie
  2. Calendar Committee.....Andi McCabe
  3. EPC Items for April.....Larry Smith
- 3:40 Unfinished Business**
1. 402.9 Code Change: Scheduling of Faculty Forum (Second Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
  2. 405.12.2 (1-3) Code Changes: PTR (Second Reading).....Doug Jackson-Smith
  3. 405.6.5 Code Change: Remove Term Quinquennial (First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
  4. Mutual Agreement Code.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 4:20 New Business**
1. Resolution on Gender-Neutral Bathrooms.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 4:25 Concluding Remarks, Passing of the Gavel**.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 4:30 College Caucus to Elect FSEC members** Two year terms are standard. Senators must have served one year in the Senate to be eligible. Colleges needing an FSEC member are:
- a. Business
  - b. Education/Human Services
  - c. Engineering
  - d. Libraries
  - e. Regional Campuses, and
  - f. USU-Eastern.

### **Adjournment**



**USU FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
April 6, 2015  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

**Call to Order**

Doug Jackson-Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of March 2, were adopted.

**Announcements – Doug Jackson-Smith**

**Roll Call.** Members are reminded to sign the role sheet at each meeting and that absences need to be excused by letting the Executive Secretary know in advance.

**Faculty Senate Nominations & Elections.** A motion to alter the agenda and open elections early was made by Ronda Callister and seconded by Sheri Haderlie. The motion passed unanimously.

Nominations for FS President Elect were made by Becki Lawver who nominated Dr. Lindsey Shirley, and by John Stevens who nominated Dr. David Brown. Each nominee accepted their nomination and were given 2 minutes to briefly tell the senate about themselves. Voting will be done by email and overseen by Joan Kleinke and Sheri Haderlie.

**University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett**

President Albrecht was not in attendance at this meeting. Provost Cockett asked Neil Abercrombie and Dave Cowley to give a brief legislative outcomes update. Overall, there was a 4.9% increase to higher education. Included in that is a 2% compensation increase. All employees will receive a 1% COLA increase and the remaining will be distributed as seen fit by the Deans. BFW is meeting with President Albrecht on Wednesday to discuss the role of faculty in the process of deciding how to allocate compensation increases.

Several buildings and capital development projects will move forward. The Student Recreation Center is scheduled for completion by Thanksgiving. The addition to the Business building is scheduled for completion next spring. Renovation of the Kent Concert Hall and an addition to the Fine Arts center will begin this summer. The Art Barn will be torn down and replaced with a Welcome Center and Alumni Relations building, built by USU Credit Union which will have offices on the first floor. Romney Stadium will also undergo renovation, receiving a new press box, premium seating and improved restroom concession facilities.

**Information Items**

**Gun Survey – Doug Jackson-Smith.** Faculty Senate Presidents from across the USHE system have met to discuss this issue. They have drafted a survey of faculty to get more feedback. The draft was included in our agenda packet – please let Doug know if you have any specific feedback, concerns, or suggestions. We are waiting for all the USHE institutions to weigh in before launching; as a result it is likely to be implemented in the early fall.

## **Reports**

### **PRPC Annual Report – Stephen Bialkowski.**

**March EPC Items – Larry Smith.** Larry highlighted a few items from the report, including action items from the Academic Standards Subcommittee who acted on 2 R401 requests; the first was a discontinuation of MA in Sociology and the creation of a multi-disciplined PhD Program in Neuroscience that will be under the Psychology Department.

**FDDE Annual Report – Britt Fagerheim.** Britt presented highlights of the report documenting trends in the representation of female and non-white faculty by college (compared to their availability in the national pool of faculty in the appropriate disciplines). This report is designed to be updated each year, but has not been completed for two years. The AAA and AA/EO office are helping FDDE set up a system to make updating of the report easier in future years.

There was concern from a few senators about some wording in the report and that voting to accept the report would indicate support of it. The Parliamentarian clarified that the report could be accepted and that it did not become the view of the senate.

A motion to vote to approve each report separately was received and seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

A motion to approve the PRPC Report was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the EPC Report was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the FDDE Report was made and seconded. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

## **Unfinished Business**

### **405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T (Second Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.**

A motion to pass the second reading of 405.2.2 (etc.) Code Change: Teaching Role Description for P&T was made by Robert Schmidt. A second was received and the motion passed unanimously.

## **New Business**

### **402.9 Code Change: Scheduling of Faculty Forum (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.**

Doug Jackson-Smith led a short discussion about changing the codified timing of the Faculty Forum so as not to eliminate the November Faculty Senate Meeting and add another time for Faculty Forum. A senator asked why we were targeting October or November for the Forum. Doug replied that FSEC discussions concluded that September was too soon, December too busy, and spring too late to be useful for guiding faculty senate activities. Allowing the forum to take place on a date in October or November will provide time for planning, but ensure it is done at a time when faculty might be able to participate and the results to be used by faculty leaders to guide their activities. The code change will return at the next meeting for a second reading and vote.

**405.12.2 (1-3) Code Changes: PTR (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.** Doug provided a brief review of the process leading to a proposed code change draft on post-tenure review. The code change draft being discussed today was produced by the PRPC in response to a request by the faculty senate in January. Today's discussion serves as the first reading of the draft, and there is an opportunity for senators to ask clarifying questions and propose edits to the draft to ensure it meets the intent of the senate.

Alan Stephens, Chair of the BFW committee, expressed several concerns with this code change and purported that other Faculty Senate committees oppose it as well.

Alan Stephens made a motion to table the discussion on this issue. Jake Gunther seconded.

Discussion continued on whether or not the proposal has the support of other committees. AFT representatives indicated that they did not vote to oppose the proposal, but have expressed concerns about a number of process details (which could be fixed with amendments). Their primary concern centered the definition of the term "collegiality", and whether the process would meet NWCCU accreditation expectations for an evaluation of all faculty in a 'regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner' at least every 5 years.

Doug and Ronda noted that faculty senate leaders met with the Department Heads Executive Committee. The notes from that meeting indicated the response was generally favorable, with one concern about the 5 year waiting period before action could be taken (DHs are concerned that they will have no recourse during the 5 years post-tenure or promotion decision if a faculty member 'flat lines').

Mark McClellan called the question on the motion to table the item. Voting was unanimous in support of the motion to call to question.

The vote on the motion to table the code draft failed.

Doug Jackson-Smith reviewed the code draft for the senate and the recommendations for two amendments that received the support of the FSEC.

A motion was made to limit the review to no more than every 5 years and a second was received. Arguments in favor were to avoid a faculty member being sent into the Peer Review Committee process every other year by a vindictive department head. Arguments against pointed to the role of faculty peers in the PRC that protect the faculty from consequences associated with an unfair department evaluation, an internal check and balance (where a DH whose referral is repeatedly overturned by the PRC will eventually undermine the credibility of the DH), and the need to have some mechanism to deal with tenured faculty who are no longer meeting the expectations of their position. The motion failed by voice vote.

Discussion then turned to the first amendment supported by the FSEC on an appeals process to read as follows:

**1) Add sentence to specify that an appeals process will be followed if mutual agreement between the faculty member and department head on membership on a PRC is not possible.** New material would start on line 172 (end of fourth paragraph under 406.12.2).

a. Option 1 (preferred by FSEC): **"If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC."**

b. Option 2: "If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements."

Scott Bates moved to adopt option 1; the motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt. A lengthy discussion followed with several attempts to wordsmith the amendments.

Ronda Callister made a friendly amendment and a second was received to add “the CFAC would consist of one person nominated from each college and election by faculty of no less than 3 members”.

Robert Schmidt withdrew his second, thereby eliminating the original motion by Scott Bates.

Stephen Bialkowski moved to support option 2 and a second was received.

An amendment to this motion was made and seconded that merged the two options to read: “If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC if a CFAC does not exist, individual department and/or university appeals processes will be used to resolve the issue.”

The motion to amend the amendment passed with one dissenting vote. Voting on the motion to amend (as amended) passed with two dissenting votes.

The second suggested amendment from the FSEC dealt with timelines and clarified that the peer review committee must actually meet. Doug presented the proposal from FSEC:

**Clarify that the Peer Review Committee should meet and establish deadlines for the process.** Add three new sentences on line 185 (before 'For any meeting...')

**"These materials should be provided to the PRC within 3 weeks of the appointment of the committee. Within 4 weeks after receiving these materials, the PRC shall schedule a meeting to discuss their evaluation of the faculty member's post-tenure performance. At this meeting, the faculty member and department head should be allowed to make oral presentations to the committee."**

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the FSEC proposal. Charles Waugh suggested a friendly amendment to change the words “shall schedule a meeting” to “shall meet”. The friendly amendment was accepted. An amendment to the motion was proposed and seconded to delete the words “and department head”. The amendment to the motion was accepted with two dissenting votes. Voting on the motion to accept the FSEC proposal as amended was unanimous.

**405.6.5 Code Change: Remove term Quinquennial (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.** Due to time limitations this item was not discussed.

**Mutual Agreement code change - Doug Jackson-Smith.** Due to time limitations this item was not discussed.

**Adjournment.** A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

## **2014-2015 Committee on Committees (CoC) Annual Report for Faculty Senate**

The responsibility of the Committee on Committees is to: (1) apportion Senate elective positions annually; (2) coordinate and supervise the election of members to the Senate; (3) prepare eligibility slates and supervise nominations and elections within the Senate; and (4) recommend to the Senate the appointed members of all Senate committees and the members of university committees that include Senate representatives. ([Policy 402.12.2](#))

### **Members:**

Sheri Haderlie, chair [2016] ([sheri.haderlie@usu.edu](mailto:sheri.haderlie@usu.edu))  
Daniel Davis [2015] ([daniel.davis@usu.edu](mailto:daniel.davis@usu.edu))  
Leslie Brott [2017] ([leslie.brott@usu.edu](mailto:leslie.brott@usu.edu))

### **Activities:**

At the September faculty senate meeting, Leslie Brott was nominated to serve as a committee member and was approved by the faculty senate to replace Robert Schmidt.

During the September faculty senate meeting, Douglas Jackson-Smith proposed a code change to the term length for CoC members. During the January faculty senate meeting, the code change (402.12.3) for the Committee on Committees Term Extension was approved. The change extends the term of members to three years, and makes them a supernumerary member of the Senate if their committee term extends beyond their senate term.

During February and March 2015, the committee worked with USU's Colleges, USU Eastern, Cooperative Extension, Regional Campuses, Libraries, and the President's office to fill open Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate Alternate, AFT, BFW, PRPC, EPC, FEC, and FDDE positions. Each unit was successful in their election process and all open positions have been filled for the coming academic year.

Name	email	College	allocations	position	term ends	senator / <a href="#">alternate</a> / <a href="#">SC</a>	new	
Dean Jessop	craig.jessop@usu.edu,	Caine College of the Arts	4	senator	2017	Brott, Leslie		
<a href="#">COMPLETE - results are in</a>	elaine.olson@usu.edu		1 more than previous	senator	2017	Murphy, Daniel		
				senator	2017	Omasta, Matt		
	Nick Morrison - associate dean			<a href="#">senator</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	<a href="#">new</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	Kevin Olsen
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Hills, Nancy</a>		
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Urquhart, Sarah</a>		
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Mansfield, Steve</a>		
				<a href="#">AFT</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Bruce Duerden</a>		
				<a href="#">BFW</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Leslie Timmons</a>		
				<a href="#">EPC</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Kevin Olson</a>		
				<a href="#">FDDE</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Nancy Hills</a>		
				<a href="#">FEC</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Raymond Veon</a>		
				<a href="#">PRPC</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Chris Gauthier</a>		
Dean White	ken.white@usu.edu,	College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences	7	senator	2015	Hatch, Royce	<a href="#">2018</a>	Ralph Meyer
<a href="#">COMPLETE - results are in</a>	tammy.firth@usu.edu			senator	2015	Nemere, Ilka	<a href="#">2018</a>	Arthur Caplan
				senator	2015	Norton, Jeanette	<a href="#">2018</a>	Norton, Jeanette (2)
				senator	2016	Lawver, Becki		
				senator	2016	Walsh, Marie		
				senator	2017	Lavoie, Caroline		
				senator	2017	Shirley, Lindsey		
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2015</a>	<a href="#">Isom, Clay</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	Heidi Wengreen
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Carman, John</a>		
				<a href="#">alternate</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Oladi, Reza</a>		
				<a href="#">AFT</a>	<a href="#">2015</a>	<a href="#">Grant Cardon</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	Grant Cardon (2)
				<a href="#">BFW</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Michael Pate</a>		
		* Sean Michael - Gen Ed Subcommittee		<a href="#">EPC</a>	<a href="#">2016</a>	<a href="#">Ed Reeve</a>		
				<a href="#">FDDE</a>	<a href="#">2017</a>	<a href="#">Man-Keun Kim (2)</a>		
				<a href="#">FEC</a>	<a href="#">2015</a>	<a href="#">Arthur Caplan</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	Clay Isom
				<a href="#">PRPC</a>	<a href="#">2015</a>	<a href="#">Heidi Wengreen</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>	Heidi Wengreen (2)
Dean Foley	beth.foley@usu.edu,	Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services	9	senator	2015	Bates, Scott	<a href="#">2018</a>	Julie Gast
<a href="#">COMPLETE - results are in</a>	shannon.johnson@usu.edu		1 more than previous	senator	2015	Walker, Andy	<a href="#">2018</a>	Suzanne Jones
				senator	2016	Dew, Jeffrey		
				senator	2016	Haderlie, Sheri (2)		
				senator	2016	Lott, Kimberly		
				senator	2016	Kim, Yanghee (2)		
				senator	2016	Mohr, Kathleen (Kit)		
		filling in to complete Cat's term		senator	2017	Buhusi, Catalin	<a href="#">2017</a>	Susan Turner



				senator	2018	new	2018	Becky Blais
				alternate	2015	Camicia, Steven	2018	Lisa Milman
				alternate	2015	Fronske, Hilda	2018	Hilda Fronske (2)
				alternate	2017	Belland, Brian		
				AFT	2017	Troy Beckert		
				BFW	2015	Dale Wagner	2018	Dale Wagner (2)
				EPC	2017	Jared Schultz		
				FDDE	2017	Cinthay Saavedra		
				FEC	2016	Kit Mohr		
				PRPC	2017	Bob Morgan		
Dean Hailey	chris.hailey@usu.edu,	College of Engineering	6	senator	2015	Agblevor, Foster	2018	Chris Winstead
COMPLETE - results are in	melanie.ivans@usu.edu			senator	2016	Britt, David		
				senator	2016	Gunther, Jake		
				senator	2016	Halling, Marv		
				senator	2016	Qi, Xiaojun		
				senator	2017	Barr, Paul		
				alternate	2016	Baktur, Reyhan		
				alternate	2017	Smith, Barton		
				AFT	2016	Kurt Becker		
				BFW	2015	Vicki Allan	2018	Koushik Chakraborty
				EPC	2015	Thom Fronk	2018	Sanghamitra Roy
				FDDE	2017	Reyhan Baktur		
				FEC	2015	Oenardi Lawanto (Chair)	2018	Curtis Dyreson
				PRPC	2015	William Rahmeyer	2018	Heng-Da Cheng
Dean Allen	john.allen@usu.edu,	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	8	senator	2015	Brasileiro, Marcus	2018	Charlie Hueneman
COMPLETE - results are in	natalie.archibald@usu.edu			senator	2015	Lyons, Michael	2018	John Seiter
	(Natalie Smoot)			senator	2015	Peak, Terry	2018	Lisa Gabbert
elected 1 more senator than needed				senator	2015	Spicer-Escalante, JP	2018	Keri Holt
except if Doug is not counted				senator	2016	Jackson-Smith, Doug	2018	Courtney Flint
				senator	2016	Culver, Lawrence		
				senator	2016	Waugh, Charles		
				senator	2017	Moeller, Ryan		
				alternate	2015	Schwabe, Claudia	2018	Karin de-Jonge Kannan
				alternate	2016	Champagne, Brian		
				alternate	2017	Thoms, Josh		
				AFT	2016	Cathy Bullock		
				BFW	2016	Diane Calloway-Graham		
				EPC	2017	Eddy Berry		
				FDDE	2017	Jim Rogers		
				FEC	2017	Cacilda Rego		
				PRPC	2016	Terry Peak		

Dean Luecke	chris.luecke@gmail.com,	College of Natural Resources	3	senator	2017	Koons, David		
COMPLETE - results are in	kirsten.egger@usu.edu			senator	2017	Schmidt, Robert		
				senator	2017	Villalba, Juan		
				alternate	2017	Beard, Karen		
				alternate	2016	Jenkins, Mike		
				AFT	2016	Peter Adler		
				BFW	2017	Chris Monz		
				EPC	2015	Karen Mock	2018	Karen Mock (2)
				FDDE	2015	Helga Van Miegroet	2018	Helga Van Miegroet (2)
				FEC	2017	Mary Connor		
				PRPC	2016	Terry Messmer		
Dean Berreau	lisa.berreau@usu.edu,	College of Science	7	senator	2015	Stevens, John	2018	Stevens, John (2)
COMPLETE - results are in	vicki.jones@usu.edu			senator	2015	Wickwar, Vince	2018	Wickwar, Vince (2)
				senator	2016	Brown, David		
				senator	2016	Bialkowski, Stephen		
				senator	2017	Bernhardt, Scott		
				senator	2017	Evans, Ted		
				senator	2017	Lowry, Tony		
				alternate	2015	Shen, T.C.	no one elected or appointed	
				alternate			no one elected or appointed	
				AFT	2017	Farrell Edwards		
				BFW	2016	Stephen Bialkowski (2)		
				EPC	2015	Richard Mueller	2018	Dan Coster
				FDDE	2016	Nancy Huntly		
				FEC	2017	Tom Lachmar (2)		
				PRPC	2016	Ian Anderson (2)		
Dean Anderson	douglas.anderson@usu.edu	Huntsman School of Business	4	senator	2015	McEvoy, Glenn	2018	John Gilbert
COMPLETE - results are in	kimberly.larson@usu.edu			senator	2015	Skousen, Chris	2018	Ben Blau
				senator	2016	Callister, Ronda		
				senator	2017	Kannan, Vijay		
				alternate	2015	Feigenbaum, Jim	2018	John Johnson
				alternate	2016	Gilbert, John		
				alternate	2016	Stephens, Alan		
				AFT	2015	Richard Jenson	2018	Kathy Chudoba
				BFW	2016	Alan Stephens (2), Chair		
				EPC	2016	Kelly Fadel		
				FDDE	2016	Robert (Bob) Mills		
				FEC	2015	Alan Stephens	2018	Nate Washburn
				PRPC	2017	Dan Holland		
Dean Cole	brad.cole@usu.edu,	Merrill-Cazier Library	2	senator	2015	Davis, Dan	2018	Pamela Martin

COMPLETE - results are in	trina.shelton@usu.edu			senator	2017	Fagerheim, Britt		
				alternate	2017	Shrode, Flora		
				AFT	2016	Becky Thoms		
				BFW	2017	Carol Kochan (2)		
				EPC	2016	Kacy Lundstrom		
				FDDE	2017	Connie Woxland		
				FEC	2015	Sandra Weingart	2018	Dory Cochran
				PRPC	2017	Jennifer Duncan		
Vice Provost Wagner	robert.wagner@usu.edu,	Regional Campuses	2	senator	2016	Archuleta, Martha	move to alternate slot	
COMPLETE - results are in	david.woolstenhulme@usu.edu		have 1 more	senator	2016	Mueller, Robert		
			than needed	senator	2017	Garner, Dennis		
				alternate	2015	Barta, Jim	2018	Martha Archuleta
				alternate	2017	Petersen, Michael		
				AFT	2017	Susan Talley		
				BFW	2016	Rich Etchberger		
				EPC	2017	Nathan Straight		
				FDDE	2016	Christopher Johnson		
				FEC	2015	Karen Woolstenhulme	2018	Scott Allred
				PRPC	2016	Nikole Eyre		
Chancellor Peterson	joe.peterson@usu.edu,	USU Eastern	4	senator	2016	Larson, Don		
COMPLETE - results are in	vicki.noyes@usu.edu,			senator	2016	Hassell, Betty		
	darla.cloward@usu.edu,			senator	2017	Henrie, Scott		
				senator	2017	Olsen, Jason (2)		
				alternate	2015	Perez, Elias	2018	Rich Walton
				alternate	2017	Powell, Rob		
				AFT	2017	Anthony Lott (2)		
				BFW	2017	Mike Kava		
				EPC	2017	Russell Goodrich		
				FDDE	2017	Jennifer Truschka (2)		
				FEC	2017	Elias Perez		
				PRPC	2017	Steve Nelson		
Dean White	ken.white@usu.edu,	USU Extension	4	senator	2016	Pace, Michael		
COMPLETE - results are in	tammy.firth@usu.edu		have 1 more	senator	2016	Beddes, Taun		
			than needed	senator	2017	Patterson, Ron		
				senator	2017	Memmott, Margie (2)		
				senator	2017	Heflebower, Rick		
				alternate	2016	Olsen, Shawn		
				alternate	2017	Heaton, Kevin		
				alternate	2017	Proctor, Debbie (2)		
				AFT	2015	Kathy Riggs	2018	Sterling Banks
				BFW	2016	Joanne Roueche		
				FDDE	2015	Clark Israelsen	2018	Justen Smith

				FEC	2016	Jeff Banks (2)		
				PRPC	2017	Jerry Goodspeed (2)		
President Albrecht	stan.albrecht@usu.edu,	Presidential Appointees				Allen, John	2018	Allen, John
COMPLETE - results are in	sydney.peterson@usu.edu					Cowley, David	2018	Cowley, David
						Dillingham-Evans, Donna	2018	Dillingham-Evans, Donna
						Foley, Beth	2018	Foley, Beth
						Hailey, Christine	2018	Hailey, Christine
						McLellan, Mark	2018	McLellan, Mark
						Morales, James	2018	Morales, James
						White, Ken	2018	White, Ken

**CALENDAR COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**April 2015**



**Calendar Committee Members 2014-2015**

Andi McCabe, Provost's Office – Chair  
Scott Bates, Faculty Senate  
Kade Beck, USU Student Association  
Diane Buist, Classified Employee's Association  
Ted Evans, Faculty Senate  
Marvin Halling, Faculty Senate  
Stephanie Hamblin, University Advising  
Derek Hastings, Graduate Student Senate  
Bill Jensen, Sr., Registrar's Office  
Kimberly Larson, Professional Employee's Association  
John Mortensen, VP Student Services' Office  
Sydney Peterson, President's Office  
John Stevens, Faculty Senate  
Robert Wagner, Academic and Instructional Services

**Charge**

The Calendar Committee is charged with the responsibility of reviewing, evaluating, and recommending the University's academic calendar and employee holidays. The committee represents faculty, staff, students (undergraduate and graduate), Student Services, Academic and Instructional Services, the Provost's Office, and the President's Office. The actions of this committee are ratified by the Executive Committee after review by the Faculty Senate.

**2014-2015 Calendar Committee Actions**

1. The committee recommends a proposal for employee holidays in 2018. *(See Supporting Materials #1)*
2. The committee recommends academic calendar proposals for Summer Session 2018, Fall Semester 2018 and Spring Semester 2019. *(See Supporting Materials #2)*
3. The committee recommends revising the approved Fall 2016 and Fall 2017 calendars to change Fall Break to coincide with UEA. *(See Supporting Materials #3)*

**Deliberations and Issues**

**Summer Bell Schedule:** Academic and Instructional Support Services proposed a new bell schedule beginning Summer 2015 for the two 7-week sessions and concurrent 14-week session. This schedule alleviates conflicts for students who want to take both 14-week and 7-week classes. The committee approved this schedule on November 7 after concurrence by academic department heads and associate deans, and was ratified by the Executive Committee on November 19, 2014. *(See Supporting Materials #4)*

**Common Hour:** In Spring of 2014, the Calendar Committee had voted to recommend the elimination of the Common Hour beginning academic year 2015-2016. Before moving that recommendation forward to the Executive Committee, a meeting with the USUSA Executive Council concluded that feedback should be sought from students to gauge opinions on keeping Common Hour as currently scheduled, moving Common Hour to another day, e.g., Monday or Friday, or eliminating Common Hour. In Fall of 2014, the committee, in collaboration with the USU Student Association, developed and conducted a Qualtrics survey, which was distributed to all students, faculty and staff to obtain opinions of the Common Hour.

The results of the survey were reviewed by the committee and the decision of the previous year to recommend elimination of the Common Hour was upheld. This recommendation was ratified by the Executive Committee on December 3, 2014 and was presented to the Faculty Senate on January 12, 2015.

**Future Academic Calendars:** The committee deliberated many considerations for changing future academic calendars. Although the future calendars on this report have been recommended by the committee, the committee plans to take the opportunity next year to discuss a few changes. One item for review is eliminating the need to hold Monday classes on Tuesday for Presidents' Day holiday. Another item for review and discussion with the Faculty Senate and the USU/SA is aligning our Spring Breaks with the Logan and Cache School Districts.

### **Status**

This report resulted from deliberations at meetings of the Calendar Committee on November 7, 2014, February 9 and March 30, 2015. It will be considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on April 13, 2015 and by the Faculty Senate on April 27, 2015.

### **Supporting Materials – See Following Pages**

1. Proposed Employee Holidays 2018
2. Proposed Academic Calendar for Summer 2018, Fall 2018, and Spring 2019
3. Proposed Revised Academic Calendars for Fall 2016 and Fall 2017
4. Summer 2015 Bell Schedule

### **2018 Proposed Employee Holidays**

New Year's Day	Monday, January 1
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	Monday, January 15
Presidents' Day	Monday, February 19
Memorial Day	Monday, May 28
Independence Day	Wednesday, July 4
Pioneer Day	Tuesday, July 24
Labor Day	Monday, September 3
Thanksgiving Break	Thursday, November 22 Friday, November 23
Holiday Break	Monday, December 24 Tuesday, December 25 Wednesday, December 26

# 2018

## Proposed Employee Holidays

January						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

February						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28			

March						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

April						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

May						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

June						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

July						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

August						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

September						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

October						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

November						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

December						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

## Notes

### 2018 Employee Holidays (12 days)

January 1, New Year's Day  
 January 15, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day  
 February 19, Presidents' Day  
 May 28, Memorial Day  
 July 4, Independence Day  
 July 24, Pioneer Day  
 September 3, Labor Day  
 November 22-23, Thanksgiving Break  
 December 24-26, Holiday Break



**Proposed Academic Calendar 2018-2019 (Summer, Fall, Spring)**

<b>Summer Semester 2018</b>	
7-week Session #1	May 7 - June 22 (M-F; 33 instr. days, 1 test day)
7-week Session #2	June 27 - August 10 (M-F; 32 instr. days, 1 test day)
14-week Session	May 7 - August 10 (M-R; 66 instr. days, 1 test day)
Summer Session Holidays	May 28 Memorial Day (M); July 4 Independence Day (W); July 24 Pioneer Day (Tu)
<b>Fall Semester 2018 (70 instruction days, 5 test days)</b>	
Classes Begin	August 27 (M)
Labor Day	September 3 (M)
Friday Class Schedule	October 18 (R)
Fall Break	October 19 (F)
Thanksgiving Holiday	November 21 - 23 (W - F)
Classes End	December 7 (F)
Final Examinations	December 10 - 14 (M - F)
<b>Spring Semester 2019 (73 instruction days, 5 test days)</b>	
Classes Begin	January 7 (M)
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	January 21 (M)
Presidents' Day	February 18 (M)
Monday Class Schedule	February 19 (T)
Spring Break	March 4 - 8 (M - F)
Classes End	April 26 (F)
Final Examinations	April 29 - May 3 (M - F)
Commencement	May 3 - 4 (F - Sa)

# Utah State University

## 2018-2019

### Proposed Academic Calendar

Supporting Materials #2B

### Notes

May 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

June 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

July 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

August 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

September 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

October 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

November 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

December 18						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

January 19						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

February 19						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28		

March 19						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

April 19						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

May 19						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

#### Summer 2018

14-Week Session (66 instr. days, 1 test day)

May 7, First Day of Classes

August 10, Last Day of Classes

1st 7-Week Session (33 instr. days, 1 test day)

May 7, First Day of Classes

June 22, Last Day of Classes

2nd 7-Week Session (32 instr. days, 1 test day)

June 25, First Day of Classes

August 10, Last Day of Classes

Summer Holidays

May 28 - Memorial Day

July 4 - Independence Day

July 24 - Pioneer Day

#### Fall 2018 (70 instruction days, 5 test days)

August 27, First Day of Classes

September 3, Labor Day

October 18, Friday Class Schedule

October 19, Fall Break\*

November 21-23, Thanksgiving Break

December 7, Last Day of Classes

December 10-14, Final Examinations

#### Spring 2019 (73 instruction days, 5 test days)

January 1, New Year's Day

January 7, First Day of Classes

January 21, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

February 18, Presidents' Day

February 19, Monday Class Schedule

March 4-8, Spring Break

April 26, Last Day of Classes

April 29-May 3, Final Examinations

May 3-4, Commencement

\* Subject to change

## Proposed Revisions to Fall Semesters 2016 and 2017

<b>Fall Session 2016 (with Revised Fall Break)</b>	
Classes Begin	August 29 (M)
Labor Day	September 5 (M)
<b>Friday Class Schedule</b>	<b>October 20 (R)</b>
<b>Fall Break</b>	<b>October 21 (F) (was October 14)</b>
Thanksgiving Holiday	November 23 - 25 (W - F)
Classes End	December 9 (F)
Final Examinations	December 12 - 16 (M - F)
<b>Fall Session 2017 (with Revised Fall Break)</b>	
Classes Begin	August 28 (M)
Labor Day	September 4 (M)
<b>Friday Class Schedule</b>	<b>October 19 (R)</b>
<b>Fall Break</b>	<b>October 20 (F) (was October 13)</b>
Thanksgiving Holiday	November 22 - 24 (W - F)
Classes End	December 8 (F)
Final Examinations	December 11 - 15 (M - F)

# 2016-2017

## Academic Calendar Proposed Changes

(Move Fall Break from Approved October 14 to October 21)

*This calendar is currently online.*

May 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

June 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

July 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

August 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

September 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

October 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

November 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

December 16						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

January 17						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

February 17						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28				

March 17						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

April 17						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

May 17						
Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

## Notes

### Summer 2016

14-Week Session (66 instruction days)

May 9, First Day of Classes

August 12, Last Day of Classes

1st 7-Week Session (33 instr. days, 1 test day)

May 9, First Day of Classes

June 24, Last Day of Classes

2nd 7-Week Session (32 instr. days, 1 test day)

June 26, First Day of Classes

August 12, Last Day of Classes

Summer Holidays

May 30 - Memorial Day

July 4 - Independence Day

### Fall 2016 (70 instruction days, 5 test days)

August 29, First Day of Classes

September 5, Labor Day

October 20, Friday Class Schedule

October 21, Fall Break

November 23-25, Thanksgiving Break

December 9, Last Day of Classes

December 12-16, Final Examinations

### Spring 2017 (73 instruction days, 5 test days)

January 2, New Year's Day (Observed)

January 9, First Day of Classes

January 16, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

February 20, Presidents' Day

February 21, Monday Class Schedule

March 6-10 Spring Break

April 28, Last Day of Classes

May 1-5, Final Examinations

May 5-6, Commencement

# 2017-2018

## Academic Calendar Proposed Changes

(Move Fall Break from Approved October 13 to October 20)

*This calendar is currently online.*

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28			

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

## Notes

### Summer 2017

14-Week Session (66 instr. days, 1 test day)

May 8, First Day of Classes

August 11, Last Day of Classes

1st 7-Week Session (33 instr. days, 1 test day)

May 8, First Day of Classes

June 23, Last Day of Classes

2nd 7-Week Session (32 instr. days, 1 test day)

June 26, First Day of Classes

August 11, Last Day of Classes

Summer Holidays

May 29 - Memorial Day

July 4 - Independence Day

July 24 - Pioneer Day

Fall 2017 (70 instruction days, 5 test days)

August 28, First Day of Classes

September 4, Labor Day

October 19, Friday Class Schedule

October 20, Fall Break

November 22-24, Thanksgiving Break

December 8, Last Day of Classes

December 11-15, Final Examinations

Spring 2018 (73 instruction days, 5 test days)

January 1, New Year's Day

January 8, First Day of Classes

January 15, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

February 19, Presidents' Day

February 20, Monday Class Schedule

March 5-9, Spring Break

April 27, Last Day of Classes

April 30-May 4, Final Examinations

May 4-5, Commencement

### Supporting Materials #4

14 week schedule				
3-credit MTW or TWR	4-credit MTWR	2-credit MW or TR	1-credit M, T, W, or R	5-credit MTWRF
1:00  BLS BSS  DSS	1:00  Math hour	1:00	1:00	1:00
1:00  BHU BAI  DSC	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00
1:00  BCA BPS  DHA	1:00  Stats hour	1:00 Math 1060	1:00	1:00
1:00  BLS BSS  DSS	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00
1:00  BHU BAI  DSC	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00
1:00  BCA BPS  DHA	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00
1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00

## Report from the Educational Policies Committee April 10, 2015

The Educational Policies Committee met on April 2, 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 April 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 April 2, 2015 which included the following notable actions:
  - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 121 requests for course actions.
  - A request from the Department of Management to rename the Manufacturing Management Specialization to Shingo Operational Excellence was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Plants, Soils and Climates to offer a Landscape Management Certificate was approved.
  - Ed Reeve was elected Chair of the Curriculum Subcommittee for AY 2015-2016.
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of March 26, 2015. Action items from that meeting included the following:
  - Revisions to the Grading Policy were approved. The revised language is (italics indicates newly added language):

### **Grading Policy [NEW]**

Grading is the main symbolic method of recording the evaluation of a student's academic performance. This academic evaluation is both the responsibility and the prerogative of the individual instructor. Where appropriate, the instructor may delegate authority but not responsibility in this matter. The instructor is the ultimate arbiter of grades in the course. All grades must be submitted within 96 hours after the final examination for the course.

The instructor of record of a course has the responsibility for any grade reported. Once a grade has been reported to the Office of the Registrar, it may be changed upon the signed authorization of the instructor of record who issued the original grade. In case the instructor is not available, the department head has authority to change the grade. This applies also to the grade of Incomplete (I). A change of grade after more than one year also requires the signature of the academic dean of the college in which the course is offered *with one exception: graduate thesis and dissertation courses (6990, 7990) do not require the signature of the academic dean to be changed from Incomplete (I) to a letter grade.*

The establishment of grading policy devolves on the Faculty Senate as the representative of the individual instructor. The Faculty Senate Committee charged with the establishment and review of grading policy is the Academic Standards Subcommittee of the Educational Policies Committee, which has student representatives, since students are directly affected by changes in grading policy. All matters regarding grading policy throughout the University shall, therefore, be referred to this subcommittee.

3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of March 17, 2015.  
Actions include:

- The following General Education courses or syllabi were approved:

CMST 4570 (QI, Lisa Guntzviller)  
HIST/RELS 3270 (DHA, Danielle Ross)  
HIST/RELS 4565 (DHA, Danielle Ross)  
MUSC 3030 (DSS, Kevin Olson)

- A motion to overturn last month's vote to change the Communications Intensive (CI) criteria statement, *"2. Require both written and oral communication"* to read *"2. Require written and/or oral communication,"* was approved.
- A motion to survey department heads concerning CI courses they currently offer or might offer was approved.



## **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~~be scheduled in October or November ~~meeting of the Senate~~by the Officers and Executive Committee of the Faculty Forum. 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~~previous 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).

**CURRENT CODE** *(text that is proposed for deletion is highlighted in yellow)*

#### **405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY**

There are **two additional reviews** of faculty performance other than those for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion. These are annual reviews for faculty for salary adjustments and for term appointment renewal, and **quinquennial reviews** of tenured faculty.

Tenure (see Section 405.1) is a means to certain ends, specifically; freedom of teaching, research and other academic endeavors, and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Academic freedom and economic security for faculty are indispensable to the success of a university in fulfilling its obligation to its student and to society. With tenure comes professional responsibility, the obligation conscientiously and competently to devote one's energies and skills to the teaching, research, extension and service missions of the university. A central dimension of academic freedom is the exercise of professional judgment in such matters. The intent of post-tenure review is to support the principles of academic freedom and tenure through the provision of effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention, and timely and affirmative assistance to ensure that every faculty member continues to experience professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career. Useful feedback should include tangible recognition to those faculty who have demonstrated high or improved performance. It is also the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

**PROPOSED CODE** *(text that is added is underlined)*

#### **405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY**

There is one additional review of faculty performance other than those used for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion. This annual review shall be used for evaluation of faculty for salary adjustments, for term appointment renewal, and for post-tenure review of tenured faculty.

Tenure (see Section 405.1) is a means to certain ends, specifically: freedom of teaching, research and other academic endeavors, and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Academic freedom and economic security for faculty are indispensable to the success of a university in fulfilling its obligation to students and to society. With tenure comes professional responsibility, the obligation conscientiously and competently to devote one's energies and skills to the teaching, research, extension, and service missions of the university. A central dimension of academic freedom is the exercise of professional judgment in such matters. The intent of post-tenure review is to support the principles of academic freedom and tenure through the provision of effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention, and timely and affirmative assistance to ensure that every faculty member continues to experience professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career. Useful feedback should include recognition to those faculty who have demonstrated high or improved performance. It is also the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

## **CURRENT CODE**

### **12.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

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.

## **PROPOSED CODE**

### **12.1 Annual Review of Faculty**

Each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. This evaluation shall review the work of each faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards. In the case of tenured faculty, this evaluation shall encompass a multi-year window of performance that covers a five-year span. 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 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 faculty with term appointments, the annual review letter shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

**CURRENT CODE**

**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.

For post-tenure quinquennial review meetings and for meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the candidate to review the committee's evaluation and recommendation, the candidate or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. 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 as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. This evaluation of tenured faculty shall include the review of the annual evaluation (405.12.1), and shall include the current curriculum vita and other professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member, and any professional development plan in place. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate: (1) teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment; (2) the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and (3) service to the profession, the university, and the community. The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty. In the event that a faculty member is promoted to the most senior rank, the review made by his or her promotion committee shall constitute the quinquennial review. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years.

Upon completion of its review, the review committee for tenured faculty shall submit a written report to the department head or supervisor, who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty member. In the event that the outcomes of a professional development plan are contested (405.12.3(3)), the review committee for tenured faculty may be called upon by the faculty member to conduct its quinquennial review ahead of schedule. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. The review committee may also, at times, between its quinquennial reviews, review the professional development plan as described in sections (405.12.3(1-2)).

**PROPOSED CODE**

**12.2 Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty**

Beginning the year after a faculty member's tenure or post-tenure decision, the annual review process (405.12.1) shall also provide formal assessment on the post-tenure performance of tenured faculty.

The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate post-tenure performance. The basic standard for post-tenure review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.

To fulfill this requirement, and beginning no earlier than 5 years after a faculty member is promoted or awarded tenure, the department head or supervisor will be required in writing to indicate as part of the annual review letter whether or not the faculty member is meeting the formal standard for post-tenure review outlined above. If a department is concerned that a faculty member is not meeting the post-tenure review standards, the department head or supervisor must indicate this concern with regards to post-tenure performance by providing a formal written warning to the faculty member. If no less than one year after issuing a formal written warning the department again determines that the faculty member is not meeting the post-tenure review standard, the department head or supervisor must formally request in writing that a Peer Review Committee (PRC) be formed to provide an independent evaluation of whether the faculty member has met the post-tenure review standard.

A tenured faculty member may optionally request the formation of a PRC to provide feedback on post-tenure performance, but such a request may not be made more than once every five years nor earlier than five years after being promoted in rank or granted tenure. The PRC decision in this case is only to provide post-tenure performance feedback.

The PRC shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member being reviewed, and shall be formed by mutual agreement of the department head or supervisor, and the faculty member being reviewed. The PRC must include at least one member from outside the academic unit of the faculty member being reviewed. If there are fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the candidate, the committee members may be selected from faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall not serve on the PRC, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the PRC. An administrator may only be appointed to the PRC with the approval of the faculty member under consideration.

If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC. If a CFAC does not exist, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements.

To carry out its review, the PRC shall be provided with a copy of the documentation used by the department to evaluate the five-year performance of the faculty member in question. This

Commented [DJ1]: Added at faculty meeting April 6, 2015

173 documentation shall at a minimum contain: the department head or supervisor's negative annual  
174 evaluation letter of the faculty member (405.12.1) and the warning letter that led to the forming of  
175 the PRC; the previous five annual written evaluations; the faculty member's current role statement  
176 and curriculum vitae; other professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member; and any  
177 professional development plan in place. The PRC may also receive a written statement from the  
178 department head or supervisor citing the reasons for determining that the faculty member is not  
179 meeting the post-tenure review standard, as well as a written statement from the faculty member under  
180 post-tenure review, outlining his or her response to the department head or supervisor's negative post-  
181 tenure evaluation. These materials should be provided to the PRC within 3 weeks of the appointment  
182 of the committee. Within 4 weeks after receiving these materials, the PRC shall meet to discuss their  
183 evaluation of the faculty member's post-tenure performance. At this meeting, the faculty member  
184 should be allowed to make oral presentations to the committee. For any meeting held between the  
185 faculty member, the department head or supervisor, and/or the PRC for the purposes of post-tenure  
186 performance review an ombudsperson may be requested by the faculty member, the department head  
187 or supervisor, and/or the PRC in accordance with policy 405.6.5.

188  
189 Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit its written findings outlining the PRC's decision  
190 and rationale for determining whether the faculty member in question is, or is not, discharging  
191 conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her  
192 position, as specified in the role statement. This written report shall be provided to the faculty member  
193 in question, and to the department head or supervisor who shall forward a copy to the academic dean  
194 or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. If the  
195 PRC determines that the faculty member is meeting the standard for post-tenure performance, no  
196 further action shall be required. If the PRC agrees with the recommendation of the department that  
197 the faculty member in question is not meeting the standard for post-tenure performance, a professional  
198 development plan shall be initiated as outlined in policy 405.12.3.

199  
200 If a PRC is formed at the request of a faculty member, and not because of a formal negative  
201 departmental evaluation, it shall be formed according to procedures outlined above.

Commented [DJ2]: Added at faculty meeting April 6, 2015

Commented [DJ3]: Added at faculty meeting April 6, 2015

**CURRENT CODE**

**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.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (1) identify the specific strengths and weaknesses (if any) and relate these to the allocation of effort assigned in the role statement; (2) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified deficiencies; (3) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (4) set appropriate time lines for implementing and monitoring the activities and achieving the outcomes; (5) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (6) identify any institutional commitments in the plan.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the goals or outcomes included in the plan. The department head or supervisor shall, at the conclusion of the professional development plan, evaluate the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes described in the plan, in terms of the criteria established by the plan. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member to review this analysis and subsequently, the department head or supervisor shall provide a written report of this review to the faculty member and shall also forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and faculty member to discuss the report, the faculty member or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. At the request of the faculty member, department head, or supervisor, this report may be reviewed by the committee for tenured faculty, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation as described in 405.12.2, including an analysis of the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes, or any other features included in the professional development plan. In this event, this in-depth review shall constitute the quinquennial review and another review need not be scheduled for five years. Upon completion of its review, the committee shall submit a written report to the department head or supervisor. A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty member, to the chancellor or campus dean and to the academic dean or vice president for extension.



## **PROPOSED CODE**

### **12.3 Professional Development Plan**

(1) A determination by a Peer Review Committee (PRC) that a faculty member is not discharging conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in their role statement shall lead to 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. At the request of the faculty member, department head or supervisor, the professional development plan may be reviewed by the PRC, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation, as described in policy 405.12.2, including an analysis of the of the goals or outcomes, or any other features of the professional development plan. Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit its written findings outlining the PRC's decision and rationale for determining whether the professional development plan is appropriate. This written report shall be provided to the faculty member in question, and to the department head or supervisor who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (i) identify the faculty member's specific strengths and weaknesses (if any), and relate these to the allocation of effort assigned in the role statement; (ii) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified deficiencies; (iii) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (iv) set appropriate time lines for implementing and monitoring the activities and achieving the outcomes; (v) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (vi) identify any institutional commitments in the plan.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the goals or outcomes included in the plan. The department head or supervisor shall, at the conclusion of the professional development plan, evaluate the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes described in the plan, in terms of the criteria established by the plan. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member to review this analysis and subsequently, the department head or supervisor shall provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this written report shall also be forwarded to the PRC members, the academic dean or vice president for extension and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and faculty member to discuss the report, the faculty member or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. At the request of the faculty member, department head, or supervisor, this report may be reviewed by the PRC, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation as described in 405.12.2, including an analysis of the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes, or any other features included in the professional development plan. Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit a written report of its findings to the faculty member, to the chancellor or campus dean, and to the academic dean or vice president for extension.

## POSSIBLE REMAINING EDITING SUGGESTIONS FOR DRAFT PTR CODE

*(Developed by Doug Jackson-Smith, with input from FS committees,  
FS PTR Working Group members, and Faculty Senate Executive Committee)*

**April 20, 2015**

### Overview:

The draft of code from PRPC does a good job implementing nearly all of the elements that were included in the memo approved by the Faculty Senate on January 12, 2014. In reviewing the draft, a number of potential areas where the code draft could be modified were identified. During the Faculty Senate Meeting on April 6, 2015 the following edits were made to the draft PRPC code text:

- Add sentence to specify that an appeals process will be followed if mutual agreement between the faculty member and department head on membership on a PRC is not possible. New material would start at end of fourth paragraph under 406.12.2.  
**“If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC. If a CFAC does not exist, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements.”**
- *Clarify that the Peer Review Committee should meet and establish deadlines for the process. Add three new sentences on line 185 (before 'For any meeting...')*  
**"These materials should be provided to the PRC within 3 weeks of the appointment of the committee. Within 4 weeks after receiving these materials, the PRC shall schedule a meeting to discuss their evaluation of the faculty member's post-tenure performance. At this meeting, the faculty member should be allowed to make oral presentations to the committee."**
- *Clarify what types of meetings permit or require ombudsperson (lines 184-186)*  
Insert bold text: "... between the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, and/or the PRC **for the purposes of formal post-tenure performance review**, an ombudsperson may be requested ..."

A few remaining issues were introduced in the faculty senate agenda (and on the screen during the meeting), but time did not permit discussion or voting on any of the other potential edits to the draft code that are summarized on the next page.

## FORMAL GUIDANCE ON CHANGING FACULTY SENATE CODE

Selected sections of Section 202 of code provide guidance about the procedures to amend section 400 of the USU Policy Manual (key language in yellow below):

### **202.1 (4) Forwarding of proposals to the PRPC.**

Upon favorable formal action by the Senate on any proposal to amend the code, the proposal to amend shall be forwarded to the PRPC for drafting of the proposed amendment.

### **202.2.2 Proposed Amendments to Section 400**

#### **(1) Drafting of proposed amendments to the section.**

The drafting of all proposed amendments to Section 400 shall be performed by the PRPC. The draft of the proposed amendment shall be forwarded to the Senate no later than the second regular meeting of the Senate after receipt of the proposal for amendment by the PRPC. This time limit may be extended by majority vote of the Senate.

#### **(2) Proposed amendments originated by the PRPC.**

As one of its two principal functions, the PRPC will monitor the language of the policies for congruence of policy language with actual University practices, internal consistency of policy language, and clarity of the meaning of policy language. Where actual practice and the policies differ, the PRPC shall seek resolution either in changed practice, proposed amendments to the policies, or both. The PRPC shall also propose amendments to the policies to increase their clarity and internal consistency. Amendments to the policies proposed by the PRPC shall be presented in writing to the Senate initially as information items. Revision of the policies will be undertaken by the PRPC only under the formal instruction of the Senate.

...

### **2.3 Publication of Proposed Amendments**

The language of any proposed amendments to the policies shall be published in the minutes of the Senate meeting in which they are brought forward by the PRPC as information items.

### **2.4 Ratification of Proposed Amendments**

Ratification of proposed amendments to the policies is a four-step process:

#### **(1) Ratification by the Senate.**

Approval of a proposed amendment to these policies shall be by a two-thirds majority of a quorum of faculty senators at any regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate where the proposed amendment is on the agenda as an action item, provided that the proposed amendment has been presented for information at a previous regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate, and provided further that the proposed amendment remains unchanged except for editorial clarifications. Changes in the proposed amendment approved by a simple majority of the Senate during its meeting will result in the postponement of action on the proposed amendment, the re-initiation of the publication process (202.2.3), and the rescheduling of action on the proposed amendment for the following regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

Upon approval of the proposed amendment by the Senate, proposed amendments will be forwarded to the President.

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE GUIDANCE:**

Since the rough draft of the PRPC proposal was circulated in March, several senators (and some of the faculty senate standing committees) have made suggestions to improve the PTR code change proposal that have yet to be voted on by the full senate.

The FSEC spend much of our last meeting (on April 13<sup>th</sup>) reviewing the Section 202 code text excepted above, and discussing whether further edits to the code change proposal are allowed upon a second reading.

They decided that the Faculty Senate has the ability to amend code change proposals on the second reading if:

- The amendments were presented to faculty senate in the agenda packet and on the floor of the senate during the first reading of the code change proposal
- The amendments represent editorial clarifications and do not change the substantive focus or purpose of the code change proposal (e.g., they are designed to clarify language or procedures that were mentioned explicitly or implied in the code change proposal that was presented on the first reading, and that are consistent with the original charge sent from the faculty senate to the PRPC to draft the code change).

Six remaining clarifications to the PTR code change were presented to the faculty senate on April 6<sup>th</sup>, both in the agenda for the meeting and on the screen during the discussions that ensued, but because time expired none of these were ever formally moved and seconded as amendments, and no vote of the senate was taken to gauge whether they had the support of a majority of the senate.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee voted unanimously to place two items related to PTR code change proposal on the agenda for the final faculty senate meeting of the academic year on April 28<sup>th</sup>:

- 1) The formal code change proposal that originated from the PRPC, with three amendments that received the support of a majority of senators at our April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was unanimously agreed that we should begin our discussion with this version of the code change proposal.
- 2) The six remaining clarification amendments for consideration by the full faculty senate (which are included on the next page).

Additional amendments that could be considered by faculty senate this spring or next fall:

- 1) **Clarify that the list of materials that will be provided to PRC is ‘the minimum’ not the only things that could be requested**
  - a. At beginning of second sentence on line 172, revise the start with **“The documentation provided to the PRC shall at a minimum contain: the department head or supervisor’s negative annual evaluation letter...”**
- 2) **Clarify timing and content of warning letter (lines 140-149)**
  - a. Line 145 - **add bold:** “indicate this concern with regards to post-tenure performance **initially** by providing a formal written warning...”
  - b. Insert new sentence next: **“To serve as the formal written warning, this letter should clearly indicate that the department is concerned that, if performance does not improve, the department is likely to request the formation of a Peer Review Committee (PRC) to conduct a review of post-tenure performance as outlined below.”**
- 3) **Clarify what happens when PRC determines the faculty member IS meeting the PTR standard (line 196)**
  - a. Replace “no further action is required.” with **“a written summary of the reasons for their decision shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, and appropriate academic dean, vice-president for extension, regional campus dean, or chancellor, and no further action is required.”**
- 4) **Make small changes in “voluntarily convened PRC” section (lines 151-154)**
  - a. Line 153 – add new second sentence: **“The PRC will meet and review materials related to the 5-year performance of the faculty member.”**
  - b. Line 153 – replace ‘decision’ with ‘role’ as in: “The PRC role in this case is only to provide post-tenure performance feedback.”
  - c. Line 154 – continue last sentence by adding a new clause **“in writing to the faculty member requesting the review.”**
- 5) **Make a small change in PRC membership paragraph.**
  - a. Line 162 – add bold text: “Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed, **and any other faculty members formally involved in the departmental annual review decision that triggered the review**, shall not serve on the PRC...”
- 6) **Provide for appeals process for PDP content (reinsert edited version of current code)**
  - a. End of line 256, add: “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 Peer Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2.”

## **DETAILED APPENDIX OF REMAINING CODE AMENDMENT OPTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS (for background use only)**

### **1) Clarify that the list of materials that will be provided to PRC is ‘the minimum’ not the only things that could be requested**

#### **a. RATIONALE:**

- i. AFT feedback points out that the proposed change could be interpreted as limiting the materials that could be given (and there could be confusion about whether the exact same documents used in the departmental review should be considered by the PRC).
- ii. They also point out that the ombudsperson could be given a checklist to ensure a full set of documents were given to the PRC.

#### **b. SUGGESTION:**

- i. At beginning of second sentence on line 172, revise the start with “The documentation provided to the PRC shall at a minimum contain: the department head or supervisor’s negative annual evaluation letter...”

### **2) Clarify timing and content of warning letter (lines 140-149)**

#### **a. RATIONALE:**

- i. We need some mechanisms to address seriously underperforming faculty in the 5 years after tenure or promotion. The warning letter provides an important vehicle for departments to signal serious concerns about post-tenure performance before the formal decision is made to request a PRC in year 5.
- ii. In order to request a PRC exactly 5 years after a tenure or promotion decision, it is necessary to allow warning letters to be issued in years 1-4. Whether this is possible is ambiguous in the current wording.

#### **b. SUGGESTION:**

- i. Line 145 - add the word ‘initially’: “indicate this concern with regards to post-tenure performance INITIALLY by providing a formal written warning to the faculty member.”
- ii. Insert new sentence next: “To serve as the formal written warning, this letter should clearly indicate that the department is concerned that, if performance does not improve, the department is likely to request the formation of a Peer Review Committee (PRC) to conduct a review of post-tenure performance as outlined below.”

### **3) Clarify what happens when PRC determines the faculty member IS meeting the PTR standard**

#### **a. RATIONALE:**

- i. Current draft says ‘no further action shall be required’ – yet it would make sense to ask the PRC to provide a written report/letter to the faculty member, department head, and relevant upper administrators.

#### **b. SUGGESTION:**

- i. Line 196, replace “no further action is required.” to “a written summary of the reasons for their decision shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, and appropriate academic dean, vice-president for extension, regional campus dean, or chancellor, and no further action is required.”

**4) Make a small change in “voluntarily convened PRC” section (lines 151-154)**

a. RATIONALE:

- i. The PRC does not need to make a ‘decision’ if voluntarily convened by the faculty member. It makes more sense to refer to their ‘role’.
- ii. We should specify that the PRC should meet and provide a written report to the faculty member requesting the review.

b. SUGGESTION:

- i. Line 153 – add new second sentence: “The PRC will meet and review materials related to the 5-year performance of the faculty member.”
- ii. Line 153 – replace ‘decision’ with ‘role’ as in: “The PRC role in this case is only to provide post-tenure performance feedback.”
- iii. Line 154 – continue last sentence by adding a new clause “in writing to the faculty member requesting the review.”

**5) Make a small change in PRC membership paragraph (lines 163-172)**

a. RATIONALE:

- i. Since some units have other faculty (e.g., program chairs) participate in the annual review process, we might want to ensure that any other faculty who play a formal role in the departmental annual review process not be allowed to serve on the PRC.

b. SUGGESTION:

- i. Line 162 – add a clause (in CAPS):
  1. “Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed, AS WELL AS ANY OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS FORMALLY INVOLVED IN THE DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL REVIEW DECISION THAT TRIGGERED THE REVIEW, shall not serve on the PRC...”

**6) Replace modified version of current appeals process for PDP content disagreements**

a. RATIONALE:

- i. If the PDP content cannot be mutually agreed upon, we need a way forward.
- ii. Not sure why the appeals process was deleted in proposal – though the existing language references a ‘revised role statement’ not a PDP, which is confusing.

b. SUGGESTION:

- i. OPTION 1: Replace the appeals process with edited version of original code:
  1. At the end of line 256, add: “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 Peer Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2.”
- ii. OPTION 2: Have the PRC resolve the disagreements about the PDP content.
- iii. OPTION 3: Use faculty appeals committee outlined above

## **Section 405.6.5**

### **6.5 Ombudspersons**

All academic units will appoint ombudspersons to serve in the promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review processes. Ombudspersons will be tenured faculty members (as defined in section 401.2.1) and elected or appointed in their respective academic units. The provost's office will develop and implement a plan for the ombudsperson program that defines the election or appointment process, the terms of office, the training, and the implementation of the ombudsperson program.

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

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

The ombudsperson is responsible for ensuring that the rights of the candidate and the university are protected and that due process is followed according to section 400 of the USU Policy Manual. Ombudspersons shall not judge or assess the candidate, and therefore is not a member of the promotion, tenure, or review committee, or a supervisor of the candidate.

Ombudspersons who observe a violation of due process during a committee meeting should immediately intervene to identify the violation. Committee reports shall be submitted to the department head or supervisor only if they include the ombudsperson's signed statement that due process has been followed. If the ombudsperson cannot sign such a statement, then the ombudsperson shall report irregularities to the department head or supervisor and the appropriate dean or other administrator. After conferring with the ombudsperson, the department head or supervisor, dean or other administrator will determine what, if any, actions should be taken.



## **Proposal for Code Change on Formation of Promotion and Tenure Committees (From Faculty Senate Executive Committee)**

**CORE IDEA: Replace the phrase ‘in consultation with’ with ‘by mutual agreement with’ in sections of code where the appointment of committees to perform promotion and tenure reviews are discussed.**

1. 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.
2. **Proposal – Charge PRPC with drafting code change to meet the following objectives:**
  - a. Revise several sections of code (see specific text below):
    - i. 405.6.2 (1) Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)
    - ii. 405.6.2 (2) Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC)
    - iii. 405.8.2 (1) Meetings of the PAC
    - iv. 405.11.2 Term Faculty Promotion Advisory Committee
    - v. 405.12.2 Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty
  - b. Replace “in consultation with” with “by mutual agreement with” the faculty member and other appropriate decision-makers.
  - c. Consider the following text as a starting point for developing a procedure to handle appeals when mutual agreement on committee membership cannot be reached:

"If the faculty member and department head cannot mutually agree on committee membership, a standing College Faculty Appeals Committee (CFAC) will make the final determination as to the composition of the committee. The CFAC will consist of three tenured faculty members serving staggered three year terms. To fill vacancies on a CFAC, faculty in each department not currently represented on a CFAC will vote to nominate one tenured faculty member to serve on their college or unit's CFAC. The senior faculty senator from each college or unit shall then conduct an election from among the nominated faculty to fill vacant seats. All faculty in that college or unit will be eligible to vote for their CFAC representative. In colleges or units with three or fewer departments, one elected representative from each of the departments will constitute their CFAC."

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AREAS WITHIN SECTION 405 OF CURRENT FACULTY CODE WHERE “IN CONSULTATION WITH” IS MENTIONED &amp; WOULD BE CHANGED</b></p>
---

## **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...

*(Note – this final section may be changed by vote of faculty senate in their review of post-tenure review procedures. If not, this is another area in code where the same change from ‘in consultation with’ to ‘by mutual agreement with’ could be made.)*

## **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.

# BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

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

- **Changes in Role Statements** (mutual agreement of faculty member, DH, and Dean)
- **Lists of External Reviewers for Tenure & Promotion decision-years** (DH and T&P Advisory Committee)
- **Final Materials Sent to External Reviewers** (DH, T&P Advisory Committee and faculty member)

### 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.

**Resolution in support of gender inclusive bathrooms**

Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee - March 2015

Faculty Senate Executive Committee – April 13, 2015

Whereas this issue is important to the student community at USU;

Whereas the Access and Diversity Center has identified bathrooms that can easily be switched at a relatively low cost;

Whereas some classroom buildings on campus do not contain any gender inclusive bathrooms nor any nearby; and

Whereas one of the roles of the FDDE is to make recommendations for implementation of proposals related to faculty diversity, development, and equity,

Therefore, the **FDDE and Faculty Senate support the creation or increase in the number of gender inclusive bathrooms on the Logan campus, regional campuses, and USU Eastern.**