

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

10-19-2015

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, October 19, 2015

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, October 19, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 467.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/467

This Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
October 19, 2015
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Champ Hall

Agenda

- 3:00 Caller to Order**.....Ronda Callister
 Approval of Minutes September 21, 2015

- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
 Noelle Cockett, Provost

- 3:20 Information Items**
 - 1. USU Safety and Health Policy 337.....Mark McLellan
 - 2. Retirement Policy 361.....Ronda Callister

- 3:30 Reports**
 - 1. EPC Items October 2015.....Larry Smith
 - 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report.....Tom Lachmar

- 3:45 Unfinished Business**
 - 1. 401.4.2(4) Proposal to change code to include State with Federal Cooperators
 (Second Reading).....Ronda Callister
 - 2. 405.8.3(1) Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching
 is the major role assignment (Second Reading).....Ronda Callister
 - 3. 401.4.3(4) and 402.3.1 FS Reapportionment Proposal (First Reading).....Jerry Goodspeed

- 3:50 New Business**
 - 1. 405.12.1 Review of Faculty annual review procedures.....Charles Waugh
 - 2. 405.13 College Faculty Appeals Committee (CFAC).....Ronda Callister

Excuse administrators and move into the Faculty Forum preparation. Be prepared to continue the meeting to 5 p.m.



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 21, 2015

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Ronda Callister (Chair), Paul Barr, Britt Fagerheim, Dennis Garner, Betty Hassell, Kimberly Lott, Mark McLellan, Dan Murphy, Jeanette Norton, Robert Schmidt, Charles Waugh, Vincent Wickwar, Lindsey Shirley (President-Elect), President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Secretary) **Excused:** Doug Jackson-Smith, Vijay Kannan, and Mike Pace. **Guests:** James Nye, Larry Smith, Amber Summers-Graham.

Ronda Callister called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Ronda Callister rewrote something she said to clarify its meaning. The minutes of August 31, 2015 were adopted.

University Business – Stan Albrecht - There is nothing that is pressing so the President opened the floor to questions. Robert Schmidt inquired about the “Year of Water” undoubtedly coming to an end and asked if another yearly topic is planned. The Provost stated that they don’t see the “Year of Water” ending as of December 31st; it will be carried on at least through the legislative session and perhaps the end of the academic year. Tim Vitale is looking into how we can transition it into another area of research, education and outreach. Since water is a critical issue in Utah it is the reason for continuing through the next legislative session. Robert extended Stan congratulations on his ten years as President. Vince Wickwar wanted to know about the Science Building. The State Board of Regents did not put it up on the list. The Building Board has more influence and the science building could still end up being in play. Charles Waugh asked if the Regents were doing some kind of turn taking strategy where they are counting Regional Campuses in the mix. The President said that conversations will continue.

Information Items

Human Participants in Research Policy - Mark McLellan – This is a policy that would not normally come to this body but the impact affects faculty in a great way and the body should be informed. The policy comes from our accreditation for human subjects which requires us to have an “institutional conflict of interest” policy. We already have a “personal conflict of interest” policy. There are times when institutions can be in conflict with projects that are coming in and this is focused on projects coming in as sponsored research and in this case just human participant’s research. This will affect between one and two projects a month. Contracts and gifts will be queried; the whole emphasis is to insure the integrity of the work making sure there are no conflicts of interest. A procedure has been developed to drive this process. A draft of the policy appears in the agenda packet. This item will be presented as an information item on the senate agenda.

Reducing the size of some Faculty Senate Committees – Ronda Callister - Ronda referred the committee to the materials in the agenda packet. There are three committees that might not need to be changed. FSEC functions well as is, EPC has no senators on the committee and is very structured, and the Committee on Committees with three people functions well. Since AFT staffs the grievance committees we don’t want to cut them too much because they need enough members to staff the hearings. Historically over time we have gone from 7 people on committees to 9 with libraries and extension, and then to 15. We now have 12 units plus 3 faculty senators that sit on these committees. PRPC, FEC, and FDDE could function very well with 7 people (see table on the 3rd page of the document). Ronda is not ready to do anything yet but would like the senate

representatives to serve for both the college and the senate in order to reduce the committee size but still provide adequate representation for both the units and the senate. Ronda would like feedback to see if there is any push back on reducing the committee's size. We wanted to look at reapportionment first to see how it might affect the units.

Reports

EPC Annual Report – Larry Smith - This covers the actions taken by the EPC and its three subcommittees in the last year. All items were acted on by the senate and approved. Please see the report in your agenda packet. The subcommittees include: Academic Standards Subcommittee, Curriculum Subcommittee, and the General Education Subcommittee. Each committee meets monthly and reports to the EPC. The EPC annual and monthly reports to the Faculty Senate are organized to include the actions of each of these committees and the subsequent action of the EPC. The R401 Proposals that EPC acts on are presented as well. The R401 is a specific form developed by the Utah System of Higher Education and it is used by all public institutions in the State that want to propose new academic programs. Two templates are used: a long template to propose a new degree program, and a short template when making minor changes to a program. These proposals come from the college curriculum committees/with department review then go to EPC and when necessary to the BFW, the Graduate Council, or the Council of Teacher Education. They then go to the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Senate, Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents. The timeline for taking proposals through the system is very tight because the Board of Trustees and Board of Regents don't meet for regular business meeting every month.

EPC Items September 2015 – Larry Smith – Curriculum Subcommittee actions were discussed. The item from the Department of Applied Sciences, Technology and Education was not approved but that does not mean that it's dead forever. No one had issues with the essence of the proposal, but there were some stylistic issues that the EPC felt needed to be addressed. These have been addressed now and the proposal will be back on the agenda again next month. Larry summarized the rest of the report which is in your packet. Robert Schmidt asked if there was any more discussion on the Communication Intensive proposal in making written or verbal or both. Larry stated that it was the General Education Subcommittee business and they voted that the CI could be verbal or written, and in the next meeting it was reversed where it had to be both verbal and written. Robert thought that there was a survey to get feedback but Larry did not know where that was at but would check on it and get back to Robert.

Vince Wickwar made a motion to put these two items on the Faculty Senate agenda as reports. The motion was seconded by Robert Schmidt and passed.

Honors Program Report – Amber Summers-Graham – Amber is standing in for Kristine Miller who is on a research project. 2014 marked the 50th Anniversary of the Honors Program at USU. They celebrated with several new initiatives. They developed a new admissions process and implemented that this year. They have two new advisory boards a faculty and student board. They have created detailed handbooks for the capstone thesis process and the student practical application work. They have also created new co-curricular activities for students and faculty and transcript designations for service learning and the global engagement scholar. They produced a bi-annual newsletter and started a new recruiting event for high achieving high school juniors. She highlighted student awards and accomplishments and discussed the trip to southern Utah. Noelle Cockett complemented the energy of the Honors Program Office and staff and the work they have done and the comradery that is being developed in the program.

Jeanette Norton made a motion to put this on the agenda as a report. The motion was seconded by Charles Waugh and passed.

Libraries Advisory Council – Britt Fagerheim – The council only met once last year. The discussion centered on the planning for a new dean of libraries and the bankruptcy of SWETS one of the major publishers and aggregators. Next year's agenda items include identifying new representatives and chair for the council, review issues of funding support for electronic journals and discussion for the transition of a new dean.

Kimberly Lott made a motion to include the report on the FS agenda. The motion was seconded by Lindsey Shirley and the motion passed.

Parking Committee Report – James Nye – Last year there was a parking rate increase to offset the bond for the Aggie Terrace. The increase went up \$138,000 this year. We are down 58 stalls in the Blue Premium area due to construction of the welcome center. They are not replacing the booth due to costs. Other areas of construction are the Maverik Stadium where we lost 117 stalls due to construction which will be restored upon completion of the stadium. The Clinical Services Building that will begin in the spring will be a major construction project. They want 35 underground stalls and they cost twice what was expected at \$1.1 million. The new housing project where Mountain View and Valley View Towers exist they are wanting 100 underground parking stalls at \$1.3 million. As parking funds these projects it will definitely take away from what has been saved. A consultant was hired and they have done some amazing work. They have looked at all forms of travel to and from the university and have given recommendations on how to proceed and given infrastructure costs needed to make the proposal work. In the next several years you will see some major changes. If you are a single car occupant it will not be good news for you it will make it more difficult or costly for you to come to campus; however, if you are riding the bus, biking, or carpooling it may become easier. In the next 5 years some major increases in permit rates are needed to fund all of these things. As we try to maintain for the growth in students that we have we will have to start building up, so we anticipate another parking structure in the next 5 to 10 years. Now would be the time to start putting the financial package together for those structures because they are so expensive. Parking will be looking for another area to park State vehicles due to upcoming construction.

A question was asked if there were any plans to put parking where the old trailer park was. James said that there were plans to put soccer fields there. Currently anyone with a yellow permit can park there. Another question was asked about the possibility of the projects that are planning underground parking to pool their money toward build a terrace rather than going underground. Parking did talk to the dean, because there is an underground tunnel there and how do you get past the tunnel. So there are discussions going on relating to this. The Deans needs are a little different in that the parking needed is for people accessing the Clinical Services Building. Another question asked for an explanation of the increase in the bond payment. That was the result of securing the bond when they couldn't afford it and they have been paying interest only. Now they are starting to pay the principle. The good news is that the Big Blue Terrace is now paid off. Charles Waugh complemented James on his work on the master plan; we have the lowest priced parking in the nation. The Parking committee is really doing good work on looking ahead and also looking at the environmental issues that face us in Cache Valley and looking at the whole picture in terms of everyone's needs and how we can reach our sustainability goals. Another question dealt with the use of Aggie Boulevard. The plan is to close it within the next 5 years from 11th East to Richards and Bullen Hall and have it open only to bikes and busses.

Mark McLellan made a motion to put this item on the senate agenda as a report. Britt Fagerheim seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Unfinished Business

402.12.7(1) Add "Faculty University Service Award" to the list of the Faculty Evaluation Committee Duties (second reading) – Vince Wickwar made a motion to put this on the agenda as a second reading as Unfinished Business. Robert Schmidt seconded the motion and the motion passed.

New Business

401.4.2.4 Proposal to change code to include State with Federal Cooperators (first reading) – Robert Schmidt summarized the proposal in that people under state contracts also service in the cooperator category. The proposal is fine but the title (4) needs to include "Federal or State Cooperator (FSC) Ranks". Robert made a motion to send it on to faculty senate as a first reading. Vince seconded the motion and the motion passed.

405.7-12 Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching is the major role assignment – Vince made a motion to send this on to the senate as a first reading. Mark seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Faculty Senate Reapportionment Proposal – Ronda summarized that when reapportionment was done last year Regional Campuses lost a seat and Doug wanted to know what happened. We discovered that Term Appointment people can service in Faculty Senate but they are not counted in the apportionment process. Doug and some of the term faculty thought that it was unfair and Doug has proposed that we should include them in

apportionment. The AAA ran an analysis of what it would look like if term faculty were included in apportionment (see tables in the agenda packet). The result was that Regional Campuses gains 2 senators, Agriculture gains 1 senator, and Engineering, Libraries, and Extension each lose a senator. Ronda wanted feedback from those who would lose a senator. Britt, who represents Libraries, said that it would be difficult when they had to switch off to cover the spot on the FSEC. She was concerned about the unfairness of the old way where Regional Campuses lost a seat. Charles asked for clarification on "term appointments". Ronda said that adjuncts are not included but instructors, researchers, federal cooperators. etc. Joan suggested that if you look in the section of the code that describes term appointments and it includes that list. Someone asked if it fluctuated from year to year and no one knew. Ronda stated that in 2009 and 2010 we lost a number of term appointments during the financial crisis but we have been hiring people back since then. Mark stated that we have had a record year in research funding and we are hiring more people that will do double duty. Robert asked if there were a minimum number of senators that anyone could have. Ronda said one and explained that you take 60 senators and divide it proportionally by the number of units and we have 12 units. Dennis and Betty were asked for feedback. Dennis said that Regional Campuses were delighted to have representation and be considered like everyone else. However the system is set up and designed for the numbers he thinks works out very well and they are glad to be here and have their input and know what's going on. Betty said that since theirs doesn't change it would not affect them either way and they are happy with how it is now. Ronda said that it did not feel like we had a strong sense one way or another. Paul was asked how he felt since it affected his unit, Engineering. He stated that they would be good citizens and do what needed to be done. Joan explained the caveat of rounding and the need to ask a unit one year when there was a tie if they were willing to round down.

Ronda asked for a hand vote to move this forward to senate, all agreed, it will go to the senate as New Business.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

POLICY MANUAL

GENERAL

Number 337

Subject: Safety and Health

Covered Individuals: All University Employees Date of Origin: January 24, 1997

Date of Revision: Month Day, Year

337.1 POLICY

Utah State University is committed to creating a safe environment and a culture of institutional safety, and develops and implements safety and health programs consistent with the best practices for activities and institutions of this type. The University takes safety extremely seriously and will work diligently to provide the necessary safeguards required to ensure the safety and health of employees, students, and the public, as well as facilities, equipment, and other property.

These programs strive to continuously reduce worker risk and improve the prevention of illnesses and injuries in all work environments including but not limited to offices, laboratories, farms and field sites, and driving for work. To accomplish these tasks, all employees (faculty, benefited staff and wage/hourly) are required to fully cooperate with University safety guidelines and to fully follow all procedures relating to safety rules.

Realization of a safe and healthy work environment requires attention and responsibility at every level, including the President, Provost, Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, Deans and Vice Presidents, Department Heads and Directors, lab supervisors, unit supervisors, and all employees. If investigation shows that an employee has failed to follow this policy, appropriate action will be taken (USU policy #311, 407).

It is not the intent of this policy or the University to give employees any rights or protections in addition to those described by the Americans with Disabilities Act as amended.

337.2 PROVISIONS

2.1 University Programs

The University subscribes to recognized standards for health, safety, and fire protection. Such standards are published by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienist, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the National Fire Protection Association, the Uniform Building Code, the American National Standards Institute, and other recognized safety standard-making bodies. It is the responsibility of employees, supervisors, administrators, and all other persons in authority to provide for safety in the environment and operations under their control.

The University reserves the right to require examinations, testing, and training of employees under certain federal and state rules, laws, and regulations for purposes of this safety policy.

2.2 USU Safety Committees.

2.2.1 The USU University Safety Committee. This committee is named by the President, and consists of the following representatives: 1) the Directors, or their designees, of USU's Environmental Health and Safety Division (EHS); 2) the chairs from the University Safety Committee, USU Biohazards Committee, Institutional Biosafety Committee, Chemical Hygiene Committee, and Radiological Safety Committee, who are appointed by the Vice President for Research; 3) the chair of the Risk Control Committee, who is appointed by the Vice President for Business and Finance; 4) each of the eight academic College Safety Committees; 5) the USU Police Chief; and 6) representatives from regional campuses and other appropriate university units that participate in an ad hoc capacity as necessary. The Vice President for Business and Finance shall appoint individuals to represent USU's auxiliary services as appropriate.

The University Safety Committee meets at least two times each year and has responsibility to review and approve institutional procedures that relate to radiation, biohazards, chemical safety, recombinant DNA, risk control and occupational safety at the university, and make recommendations for new policy as needed. Additionally, the committee oversees activities of the USU's Biohazards Committee, Chemical Hygiene Committee, Institutional Biosafety Committee, Radiation Safety Committee and the Risk Control Committee.

2.2.2 **College/Unit Safety Committees.** These committees are established by deans or campus unit administrators and are comprised of Departmental or Campus Unit Safety Representatives. The chair serves as a member of USU's University Safety Committee and serves as liaison between the University Safety Committee and his/her campus unit. The committee meets at least once each quarter, and has responsibility to review accident reports and make appropriate recommendations to the dean/unit administrator regarding proposed changes in safety procedures. It also

provides regular updates on safety-related issues to college dean/unit administrator.

2.2.3 Departmental Safety Representative. This individual is identified by the department head, and serves on the College Safety Committee. The departmental safety representative acts as a liaison between the College Safety Committee, EHS, and his/her campus unit. He or she has responsibility to: 1) report all safety incidents to EHS; 2) review accident reports and makes appropriate recommendations, in conjunction with EHS, regarding proposed changes in the laboratory procedures; 3) work with the department head to ensure identified deficiencies and recommended corrective actions are addressed; and 4) provide regular updates on safety-related issues to department head and faculty.

2.3 Specific Requirements

Certain departments may have specific job safety requirements, for example health providers must have certain inoculations, and food service workers must have a food handler's permit. These requirements are included in job descriptions.

The Environmental Health and Safety Division (EHS) has the authority and responsibility to promote compliance with all University, state, and federal health and safety regulations by interpreting standards and promulgating procedures and policies to ensure University compliance. EHS employees are responsible for monitoring compliance, evaluating potential health hazards, and investigating accidents and injuries.

EHS employees partner with administrators, faculty, and researchers to support a strong, positive safety culture. They offer collaboration and support in meeting the responsibilities of this policy.

USU Risk Management is responsible for filing and managing all Workers Compensation claims and assisting employees in returning to work after an injury. Risk Management offers collaboration and support in implementing USU's Return to Work program.

2.3.1 In the event of a condition immediately dangerous to life or health, or otherwise determined to present an unacceptable safety risk, EHS has authority to immediately mitigate the unsafe condition. EHS must notify the University Safety Committee any time such action is taken.

2.3.2 In a more enduring safety concern, EHS will engage university leadership to review and ameliorate the unsafe condition.

2.3.3 If faculty or administrators believe actions taken by EHS to ameliorate safety are unwarranted, they may appeal to the Vice President for Research.

2.4 Hazardous Areas

All employees working in areas exposing them to substances or conditions that could be hazardous to health, as determined by state and federal laws, are required to participate in the University's health monitoring and health surveillance program. Any questions regarding substances or conditions that are questionable should be addressed to EHS. Any questions or concerns regarding employees traveling to hazardous areas in the states or world should be addressed to the University's Risk Management office.

2.5 Workplace Violence

Refer to Policy #342, Violence in the Workplace.

337.3 RESPONSIBILITY

Realization of a safe workplace and a culture of safety requires attention and responsibility at every level of the organization. Core responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

University President

- Establishes a safety policy (USU policy 337) that supports the administration's commitment to faculty, staff, and student safety.
- Assigns responsibility for implementation and oversight of the safety policy and the institution's safety program to the Vice President for Research and other senior administrators as indicated by the safety policy.
- Provides resources and financial support for the institution's safety program, according to the recommendations of the Vice President for Research and other senior administrators who are responsible for oversight of the program.
- Communicates to the entire institution the importance of safety and expectations to establish and maintain a strong safety program that continually improves and protects all faculty, staff, students, and guests.
- Ensures rapid and effective response is taken to remediate any serious safety issues/incidents on the campus.
- Supports Return to Work programs throughout the University.

Provost, Vice Presidents, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellors

- Allocates necessary resources for implementation of the institution's safety policy, programs, and committees (e.g., University Safety Committee and related sub-committees for Biohazards, Chemical Hygiene, Radiation Safety, Recombinant DNA, Risk Control, and Dual Use Research).

- Communicates responsibilities to deans and other administrators for safety programs within their areas of oversight.
- Supports safety training within the institution.
- Ensures effective systems are established to identify and address institutional safety concerns.
- Ensures the President is notified if there are serious safety issues/incidents on the campus.
- Supports Return to Work programs throughout the University

Deans and other Campus Unit Administrators, i.e. Executive Directors

- Allocates necessary resources for implementation and maintenance of safety programs for each department or unit within their area of responsibility.
- Communicates to department heads the responsibility for incorporation of risk management and safety into the curriculum for each department or unit with their area of responsibility.
- Deans establish a College Safety Committee comprised of Departmental Safety Representatives.
- Supports safety training for managers and supervisors within their unit that emphasizes health and safety leadership responsibilities.
- Deans review reports from the College Safety Committee, Environmental Health and Safety Office (EHS), department heads or other unit directors about the status of safety programs in each department or unit within their area of responsibility.
 - Ensures that identified deficiencies and recommended corrective actions are addressed.
- Ensures the Provost, Vice President, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellor is notified if there are serious safety issues/incidents within their area of responsibility.
- Supports Return to Work programs within their units.

Department Head/Directors

- Allocates necessary resources for implementation and maintenance of departmental safety programs
- Ensures faculty members understand and implement responsibilities as listed and assumes responsibility for work and laboratory space, including safe operations.
- Identifies a Departmental Safety Representative.
- When applicable, establishes curricular goals for safety education of students.
- Ensures the development and implementation of safety practices, safety protocols, and safety rules for undergraduate and graduate teaching laboratories and work space, as well as affiliated shops, storerooms, stockrooms, and corridors within their purview.
- Reviews EHS-documented safety training for faculty and staff to ensure it is complete and up to date.

- Ensures all safety practices, protocols, and safety rules are fully and regularly discussed by faculty and staff.
- Includes safety training and goals in regular annual reviews of faculty and staff.
- Works with EHS to respond to regular inspections of both teaching and research laboratories.
 - After receipt of the laboratory/work space inspection report meets with faculty members to discuss cited violations and to ensure timely actions to protect personnel and facilities and ensure that the department remains in compliance with all applicable federal, state, university, local, and departmental codes and regulations.
- Ensures the health and safety of the departmental personnel, authorized visitors, and students any time there is a change in use of departmental space.
- Develops and maintains a list of Return to Work options within their department or unit with the assistance of faculty members, principal investigators, and supervisors as appropriate.

Faculty Member/Principal Investigator

- Allocates necessary resources for implementation and maintenance of laboratory or field safety needs.
- Ensures supervisors and lab personnel understand and implement responsibilities as listed and assumes responsibility for workplace and/or laboratory space, including safe operations.
- Participates in appropriate safety training.
- Implements the curricular goals for safety education of students.
- Ensures principle-based safety education and specific safety training relating to their areas of research is provided to students, lab personnel, and staff within their workplace and/or laboratories.
- Reviews EHS-documented safety training of workplace and/or laboratory members to ensure it is complete and up to date.
- Ensures safety is regularly discussed during research group meetings.
- Develops a Chemical Hygiene Plan that is specific to the activities occurring in the laboratory or work area.
- Serves as safety advisor and mentor for students, staff, and laboratory personnel who work and study under their supervision, and encourages group discussion of “near misses”.
- Sets clear expectations that laboratory personnel, students, and staff under his or her direction must understand and follow safety practices and protocols.
 - Sets an example by following all pertinent safety rules when working in the laboratory or work area.
 - Always wears personal protective equipment (PPE) that is compatible to the degree of hazard.
 - Promotes good housekeeping practices in the laboratory or work area.

- Develops specific standard operating procedures (SOPs) for materials and equipment that present particular hazards, and incorporates the SOPs into the chemical hygiene plan or other safety plan for the program
- Enforces all health and safety practices, protocols, and rules within his or her laboratory space. Institutes disciplinary measures for students, staff, and laboratory personnel who repeatedly violates these rules.
- Ensures the appropriate personal protective equipment is available and used by all personnel in the laboratory.
- Responsible to conduct periodic hazard analysis of all program activities to identify potential risks or areas in need of additional safety measures or training.
- Conducts periodic formal safety, chemical hygiene, and housekeeping inspections, including review of the Chemical Hygiene Plan and SOPs, for laboratories and work areas under their purview.
- Ensures all approved visitors (including vendors and contractors) follow the safety rules.
- Ensures all laboratory incidents are rapidly and properly reported. Any incidents that involve medical attention, property damage, or have a high probability of becoming a liability claim should be reported immediately to USU Risk Management and EHS, and other safety-related accidents must be reported to EHS as quickly as possible.
- Reports promptly any facility problem or improperly functioning equipment to the appropriate office or individual.
- Reports all safety-related incidents to the Departmental Safety Representative.
- Develops and maintains a list of Return to Work options within their areas of responsibility with the assistance of the workplace supervisor.

Laboratory/Workplace Supervisor or Foreman

- Receives appropriate safety training.
- Reads, understands, and follow all safety rules and regulations that apply to their work area.
- Develops safe practices, safety protocols, and safety rules for areas under their purview.
- Sets clear expectations that students, staff, and other personnel under his or her direction must understand and follow safety practices and protocols.
 - Sets an example by following all pertinent safety rules when working in the laboratory or work area.
 - Always wears personal protective equipment (PPE) that is compatible to the degree of hazard.
 - Promotes good housekeeping practices in the laboratory or work area.

- Works with their immediate supervisor (faculty member, department head or director) to rapidly address unresolved, unsafe practices, hazardous conditions, and safety equipment malfunctions.
- Immediately responds to all safety-related incidents (call 911 in emergency). Any incidents that involve medical attention, property damage, or have a high probability of becoming a liability claim should be reported immediately to USU Risk Management and EHS, and other safety-related accidents must be reported to EHS as quickly as possible.
- Directly participates in the investigations for all incidents and near-misses.
- Ensures new safety measures are implemented within the lab and/or workplace safety program.
- Works with their immediate supervisor to conduct periodic hazard analysis of lab and/or workplace practices to identify areas in need of additional safety measures or training.
- Develops and maintains a list of Return to Work options within their area of responsibility. Works directly with injured employees to get them working again within the employee's medical restrictions.

Employees/Laboratory workers (laboratory personnel and staff)

- Receive appropriate safety training.
- Read, understands, and follows all safety rules and regulations that apply to the work area.
- Conduct each operation in accordance with the laboratory specific chemical hygiene procedures and implements new safety measures as appropriate.
 - Develops good personal lab safety habits, including use of PPE as appropriate for each procedure that involves hazardous chemicals and promoting good housekeeping practices in the laboratory or work area.
- Report all safety incidents to managing supervisor and faculty member.
 - Immediately reports any job-related illness or injury or property damage to the supervisor and faculty member.
- Report unresolved, unsafe practices or hazardous conditions to the laboratory supervisor and faculty member.
- Participate in periodic safety inspections of laboratories.
- Participates in Return to Work program.

Student safety expectations are outlined in SECTION V-3. University Standards of Student Conduct.



POLICY MANUAL

BENEFITS

Number 361

Subject: Retirement [Plans and Retirement Benefits](#)

Covered Employees: [Benefit Eligible Employees](#)

Date of Origin: January 24, 1997

Effective Date of Last Revision: [October 1, 2015](#)~~July 1, 1999~~

361.1 POLICY

In accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Utah State Board of Regents and Utah state law, the University has established ~~a~~retirement plans and retirement benefits for eligible University employees.

~~Once a University staff member retires, the University will have no further obligation to provide the employee with financial or other assistance in any form except through University sponsored retirement programs. At the discretion of the University, reemployment with the University may be considered.~~

[361.2 DEFINITIONS](#)

[Retirement Status](#): For purposes of this policy, an employee is considered to have retirement status when the employee discontinues regular employment from the University and is eligible, under Internal Revenue Code, to draw on retirement contributions.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

361.~~32~~ PROCEDURES

[32.1 Eligibility](#)

Participation in one of the retirement programs offered by the University is required by Utah state law for all faculty and staff employees in benefit-eligible positions.

~~Faculty and staff in a partial retirement status who continue employment in benefit-eligible positions are eligible to participate in a retirement program based on the number of work hours regularly scheduled.~~

~~Employees with University appointments expected to last less than 6 months are not eligible to participate in retirement programs. If, however, the duration of the appointment continues beyond a 6-month period, the employee will be enrolled in the appropriate retirement program on the day following the end of the 6-month period.~~

~~Enrollment in a retirement program becomes effective the day the employee's appointment becomes effective, except as noted above.~~

~~An employee enrolled in a retirement program whose employment status changes so that he or she is no longer eligible will not continue to participate in that program.~~

3.2 Retirement Programs

1) USU's Defined Contribution Retirement Plan ~~(1) Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF).~~

~~All~~ **Benefited** faculty and ~~professional~~ staff **hired on or after October 1, 2015, will be enrolled in the University's Defined Contribution retirement plan** ~~are required to enroll in the Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association/College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAA/CREF) retirement program.~~ An exception to this requirement is that **newly hired employees** ~~exempt staff~~ who have been previously enrolled in the **Utah State Retirement System (URS)** ~~while employed at Utah State University~~ have the option of participating in the **TIAA/CREF or State Retirement plans offered through URS** ~~System while at Utah State University.~~ **Such employees have 30 days from their start date to elect this option.**

~~Classified employees whose positions fall within the top pay grade of the Classified Staff Salary Schedule will be required to enroll in the TIAA/CREF retirement program.~~

~~Faculty and staff hired before October 1, 2015 will remain in their respective retirement plans. Prior to October 1, 2015, standard practice was to enroll exempt staff in the University's Defined Contribution plan and non-exempt staff in the retirement plans offered through URS.~~

2) Utah State Retirement System Plans:

Public Employee's Retirement System Plan

~~Employees enrolled prior to October 1, 2015 in URS Public Employees' Retirement System plan will remain in the URS plan as long as they are employed in a benefited position.~~

~~1) Classified staff whose positions fall below the top pay grade of the Classified Staff Salary Schedule will be required to enroll in the State Retirement~~

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" +
Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets
or numbering

~~System.~~

~~A classified employee who is enrolled in the State Retirement System and whose employment is later changed to a position eligible for TIAA/CREF may elect to remain in the State Retirement System or enroll in the TIAA/CREF retirement program.~~

~~An employee enrolled in TIAA/CREF whose employment is later changed to a position with a non-exempt job classification that is not in the top pay grade, must be enrolled in the State Retirement System. See 1953 Utah Code Annotated 49-10-58.~~

~~3) Utah State Public Safety Retirement System Plan.~~

~~Employees holding certain positions~~~~Classified staff who are employed~~ in the ~~Utah State University's Public Safety office (Police and Fire Departments) Department~~ and ~~require POST certification are required to~~will be enrolled in the Utah Public Safety Retirement System plan.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~(4) Federal Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS).~~

~~University Extension employees may be eligible for enrollment in the Federal Civil Service Retirement System or Federal Employees' Retirement System. Enrollment information for these programs is available in the University Extension business office.~~

~~5) University Employees hired before January 1, 1979.~~

~~Employees hired before January 1, 1979, were given a one-time irrevocable election to participate in their choice of TIAA/CREF or the Utah State Retirement System. Questions regarding coverage should be directed to the Office of Human Resources.~~

32.3 Privileges and Benefits of Retired Employees

In addition to the specific financial benefits associated with each of the retirement programs, the following general privileges and benefits are available to all retired Utah State University employees.

- 1) Reduced tuition registration for retired employees, their spouses, and dependent children in classes offered by the University as outlined in the University's Educational Benefits Policy ([#350](#)).
- 2) Access to the University libraries and building facilities for personal study and research.

3) Access to USU's Employee Wellness program.

- ~~1) Special parking privileges.~~
- ~~2) Other benefits as deemed appropriate by the University.~~

361.3 DEFINITIONS

3.1 Retirement Status

~~An individual employee is considered to have official University retirement status when the employee discontinues regular employment as a faculty or staff employee of the University, and is:~~

- ~~• at least age 56 with a combined age and years of service that equals 75 or greater;~~
~~or~~
- ~~• any age, with at least 30 years of service with the University; or~~
- ~~• age 62 with at least 10 years of service with the University; or~~
- ~~• age 65 or greater with at least 4 years of continuous service with the University.~~

3.2 Early Retirement Program

~~A program of monetary and benefit incentives established by the University for benefit eligible employees who meet the requirements according to policy 349.~~

361.4 RESPONSIBILITY

4.1 Department Heads and Supervisors

Responsible for immediately notifying the Office of Human Resources of any request for retirement.

4.2 Office of Human Resources

Responsible for assisting with the implementation and administration of this policy.

4.3 Employees

Responsible to notify their departments in a timely manner of their intent to retire.

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Report from the Educational Policies Committee October 9, 2015

The Educational Policies Committee met on October 1, 2015. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page¹ and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the October 1, 2015 meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of October 1, 2015 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 46 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to discontinue the emphasis in the Master of Science degree in Electrical Engineering was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Family, Consumer and Human Development to discontinue the Early Childhood Development Associate of Arts degree at USU Eastern was approved.
 - A request from the School of Applied Sciences, Technology and Education to offer an Associate of Science degree in Agricultural Science was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Music to create a Minor in Music Studies was approved.
 - A request from the College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences to offer the Bachelor of Arts degree in International Agribusiness and the Bachelor of Science in Agribusiness to The American Campus (TAC) in Flic en Flac, Mauritius was approved.
 - A request from the Provost to offer a Certificate of Completion in General Education was approved.
2. There were no action items to report from the September 17, 2015 meeting of the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. There were no action items to report from the September 15, 2015 meeting of the General Education Subcommittee.

2014-15 Annual Report

Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

Report Table of Contents

	<u>page</u>
Introduction	1
Summary of Activities	2
Discussion of Activities	2
Agendas and Minutes	4

**Prepared by
Tom Lachmar, Chair 2015-2016**

INTRODUCTION

The charge and membership of the FEC is established in the Policy manual 402.12.7 (revised 6Jan2012) as follows:

402.12.7 Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

(1) Duties.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall

- (a) assess methods for evaluating faculty performance;*
- (b) recommend improvements in methods of evaluation; and*
- (c) decide university awards for the Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the year and Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year.*

(2) Membership.

The committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each academic college, Regional Campus and Distance Education, USU Eastern, Extension, and the Library, two student officers from the USUSA and one elected graduate student representative. The faculty representatives are elected to the committee in accordance with policy 402.11.2. The committee will elect a chair annually, preferably at the last meeting of the academic year.

Committee Members 2014-2015

	Term ends
Arthur Caplan, Agriculture	2015
Alan Stephens, Business	2015
Raymond Veon, Arts	2017
Cacilda Rego, Humanities and Social Sciences	2017
Kit Mohr, Education & Human Services	2016
Oenardi Lawanto, Engineering (Chair)	2015
Mary Conner, Natural Resources	2017
Thomas Lachmar, Science	2017
Sandra Weingart, Libraries	2015
Jeffrey Banks, Extension	2016
Karen Woolstenhulme, Regional Campuses and Distance Education	2015
Elias Perez, USU Eastern	2017
Matthew Ditto, ASUSU Academic Senate President	2015
Casey Sacton, ASUSU	2015
Derek Hastings, ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator	2015
Joan Kleinke, ex-officio	n/a

Meeting Dates 2014-2015*

September 9, 2014	January 14, 2015
October 15, 2014	February 11, 2015
November 19, 2014	March 4, 2015
	April 8, 2015

*Agendas and Minutes from each of these meetings included in the final section of this report.

SUMMARY OF FEC ACTIVITIES 2014-2015

The FEC was concerned with five primary issues:

- 1) Creation and implementation of a survey instrument to evaluate the IDEA system for teaching evaluation
- 2) Discussion of other means of teaching evaluation, including access to online resources
- 3) Selection of the recipients for Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service awards
- 4) Review and discuss the criteria and selection process for Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service awards
- 5) Review and discuss revised Post-Tenure Review code

A summary of FEC accomplishments this year include:

- 1) Created and implemented a survey for department heads and faculty to evaluate the IDEA system for teaching evaluation;
- 2) Completed construction of a Canvas course for USU faculty to access teaching portfolios, self-assessment statements, and peer evaluations posted by other USU faculty members;
- 3) Selected the recipients for the Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service awards;
- 4) Reviewed and discussed the criteria and selection process for Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Awards
- 5) Reviewed and discussed the proposed revisions to Policy section 405.12, per request by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

DISCUSSION OF FEC ACTIVITIES 2014-2015

1) IDEA teaching evaluation

Faculty Survey on IDEA: One of the tasks initiated by the FEC was a faculty survey concerning the implementation of IDEA. This year the FEC created a survey instrument and implemented it. The committee decided that it should consist of two similar but non-identical surveys, one for faculty and one for department heads, regarding the implementation of IDEA, the interpretation of IDEA results, and the use of incentives to increase response rates.

Nineteen department heads and 309 faculty responded to the IDEA survey. The FEC will be analyzing and interpreting the responses during this academic year, and then will provide recommendations based on the survey results.

2) Completion of Canvas course

In response to the need for faculty to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness/excellence beyond the IDEA results in Tenure and Promotion packets and annual reviews, the FEC

completed the construction of a Canvas course for USU faculty to access teaching portfolios, self-assessment statements, and peer evaluations posted by other USU faculty members. This course is accessible to USU faculty (password-protected), and provides examples of teaching portfolios, peer evaluation letters, and other elements of promotion materials as a resource to faculty preparing tenure and promotion documents. The course is entitled “Faculty Evaluation Resources” and documents continue to be posted by College. The course is now available to faculty. It is hoped that in the future it will be populated with more material posted by faculty members who have been successful in achieving tenure and/or promotion. The FEC considers this mechanism to be more efficient than the exchange of hard copies of binders that has occurred among faculty in the past. Populating this course should become simpler since future promotion packets will be required to be in digital format. The following disclaimer is on the course home page:

“This Canvas Course is managed by the [Faculty Evaluation Committee](#), a standing committee of the USU [Faculty Senate](#). Our purpose is to provide a resource for USU faculty who are assembling promotion packets (to Associate or Full Professor ranks) and who would be interested to see examples from the packets of other USU faculty who have been promoted. We make no claims about the quality of these materials; they are simply intended as a source of ideas. We encourage faculty to participate in discussions about these materials and to submit additional materials/resources that may be helpful. Please do not disseminate the materials from USU faculty without their explicit permission - the materials are intended as a resource specifically for USU faculty.”

3) Teacher and Advisor of the Year

The FEC reviewed nomination materials for the Eldon H. Gardner Teacher of the Year, the Advisor of the Year, and the first ever Faculty University Service awards, and selected the following:

Teacher of the Year: David Britt, College of Engineering (Biological Engineering)

Advisor of the Year: Crescencio Lopez-Gonzalez, College of Humanities and Social Sciences (Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies)

Faculty University Service Award: Edward Reeve, College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences (School of Applied Sciences, Technology and Education)

The FEC found that the current nomination guidelines worked well; no further revisions are recommended at this time. However, the FEC found that the new format for accessing the electronic documents submitted for these three awards required opening and reviewing an excessively large number of individual electronic files. The FEC suggests in the future that the uploaded documents for each nominee be consolidated into a more manageable number of files for efficiency.

Agendas and Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee meetings 2014-2015

September 9, 2014

October 15, 2014

November 19, 2014

January 14, 2015

February 11, 2015

March 4, 2015

April 8, 2015

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Tuesday, Sept. 9, 2014, 2:00-3:00pm ED 105

- 1) Approve 2013 Annual Report (FEC 2013 Annual Report DRAFT.docx)**
- 2) FEC 2014-2015**
- 3) Regular meeting times for the remaining Fall 2014**
- 4) FEC agenda (issues)for Fall 2014/Spring 2015**

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
9 September 2014, 2:00-3:00pm (DE 105)**

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)
Raymond Veon (Arts)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)

Absent:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities and Social Science)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)

Activities:

- 1) Approved FEC 2014 Annual Report
- 2) Updated and Introduced FEC members
- 3) Reviewed 2014-2015 activities:
 - a. Developing a survey instrument and collecting data from it to help FEC understand how IDEA has been used by USU faculty and administration
 - b. Updated news about a new university-wide award: Faculty University Service Award. The university will announced and send the information about this new award to colleges; but FEC is asked to remind colleges about this new award.
 - c. Teacher, Advisor, and Faculty University Service Awards
 - i. Selection process and deadlines
- 4) Oenardi will create a Google Doc and invite all members to join and contribute starting the objectives of conducting the survey (to be developed). He will start putting few objectives on the Google Doc for all members to revise, edit, or add
- 5) Next meetings:

Wednesday, October 15, 2014	11:30am - 12:30pm	(DE 211)
Wednesday, November 19, 2014	11:30am – 12:30pm	(DE 211)

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, Oct. 15, 2014, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1) Approve September 2014 Minutes
- 2) FEC Canvas
- 3) The objectives of the survey (to be developed)

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
15 October 2014, 11:30-12:30pm (DE 211)**

Present:

Raymond Veon (Arts)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities & Social Science)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)

Absent:

Alan Stephens (Business)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)

Activities:

1. Approved September 2014 Minutes
2. Each FEC member was requested and agreed to disseminate information about FEC canvas to faculty within their respected college. Interested faculty needs to send email with is/her "A number" to Oenardi for access to FEC Canvas.
3. Reviewed and edited the objectives of the survey. The complete objective are as the following:
The objectives of the survey are to understand:
 - a. *Ways the administration uses and interprets the results from the IDEA instrument (DH)*
 - b. *Ways the individual faculty uses and interprets the results from the IDEA instrument (IF)*
 - c. *What the faculty like and dislike about the use of the IDEA instrument (IF)*
 - d. *Ways to increase student response rates of the survey (IF)*
 - e. *How to choose the learning objectives (IF)*
 - f. *How IDEA trainings help the faculty (IF)*
4. Next meeting:
Wednesday, November 19, 2014 11:30am – 12:30pm (DE 211)

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, Nov. 19, 2014, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1) Approve October 2014 Minutes
- 2) Teacher/Advisor of the Year 2015 and Faculty University Service Award 2015
- 3) Discuss about the language used in draft of *405.2 Tenure and Promotion: Criteria for Core Faculty Ranks*; *405.4 Tenure and Promotion: Criteria for Professional Career and Technical Education Faculty Ranks*; *405.10 Term Appointments and Promotion: Criteria*
- 4) Develop survey items
- 5) Schedule for Spring meetings

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
19 November 2014, 11:30-12:30pm (DE 211)**

Present:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Raymond Veon (Arts)
Alan Stephens (Business)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities & Social Science)

Absent:

Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)

Activities:

1. Approved October 2014 Minutes
2. Briefly discussed about selection process for Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Awards. Oenardi will send the links for the information about those 3 awards.
The proposed process (for each award):
 - a. Rank the top 8 candidates
 - b. Select the top 4
 - c. Vote for the award recipient
3. Reviewed and edited the some survey items from the survey draft developed
Next step: Oenardi will send the draft of the survey and ask each FEC member to add more items or make changes on the survey. All comments/edits should be send to Oenardi by December 12.
4. FEC spring semester meetings:

Wednesday, January 14, 2015	11:30am – 12:30pm	(DE 211)
Wednesday, February 11, 2015	11:30am – 12:30pm	(DE 211)
Wednesday, March 11, 2015	11:30am – 12:30pm	(DE 211)
Wednesday, April 8, 2015	11:30am – 12:30pm	(DE 211)

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, Jan. 14, 2015, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1)** Approve November 2014 Minutes
- 2)** Teacher/Advisor of the Year 2015 and Faculty University Service Award 2015
- 3)** Finishing the survey

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
14 January 2015, 11:30-12:30pm (DE 211)**

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities & Social Science)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)

Absent:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Raymond Veon (Arts)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)

Activities:

1. Approved November 2014 Minutes
2. Reviewed and edited the some survey items from the survey draft developed
Next steps: Oenardi will make the changes and send the draft of the survey and ask each FEC member to add more items of make changes on the survey one more time. All comments/edits should be send to Oenardi by the end of January. Oenardi will pilot test the survey and apply for the IRB. The survey is expected to be ready for Faculty and Department Head in February 2015 and data Collection should be completed by March 2015.
3. Due to Spring break, FEC March meeting was rescheduled for Wednesday, **March 4, 2015 at 11:30am – 12:30pm (DE 211)**

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, Feb. 11, 2015, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1) Approve January 2015 Minutes
- 2) Update on FEC survey
- 3) Update on Teacher/Advisor of the Year 2015 and Faculty University Service Award 2015

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
14 January 2015, 11:30-12:30pm (DE 211)**

Present:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Alan Stephens (Business)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)

Absent:

Raymond Veon (Arts)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities & Social Science)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)

Activities:

1. Approved January 2015 Minutes
2. Reviewed and edited the some survey items from the survey draft developed: (1) Added 3 additional demographic items; (2) Added 2 additional items about quantity and constructiveness of students' comments.
Next steps: Oenardi will make the changes and send the draft of the survey and ask each FEC member to review the survey one more time. The IRB has been submitted and is waiting for its approval. The survey is expected to be ready for Faculty and Department Head in February 2015 and data collection should be completed by March 2015.
3. Due to Spring break, FEC March meeting was rescheduled for Wednesday, **March 4, 2015 at 11:30am – 12:30pm (DE 211)**

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, Mar. 4, 2015, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1) Approve February 2015 Minutes
- 2) Update on FEC survey
- 3) Vote: Teacher/Advisor of the Year 2015 and Faculty University Service Award 2015

**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
4 March 2015, 11:30-12:30pm (DE 211)**

Present:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Alan Stephens (Business)
Oenardi Lawanto (Chairperson, Engineering)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Tom Lachmar (Science)
Mary Connor (Natural Resources)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Regional Campus & Distance Ed.)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)

Absent:

Raymond Veon (Arts)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities & Social Science)
Jeff Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)
Casey Sacton (USU/SA Student Advocate)
Matthew Ditto (USU/SA Academic Senate Pres.)
Derek Hastings (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)

Activities:

1. Approved February 2015 Minutes
2. Voted for the winners for Teacher of the Year, Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Awards
3. Briefly discussed about Draft Revised PTR Code

Faculty Evaluation Committee Agenda
Wednesday, April 8, 2015, 11:30am – 12:30pm ED 211

- 1) Approve March 2015 Minutes
- 2) Brief Discussion about University-wide awards selection process with Andi McCabe and Lauren Skousen
- 3) Update on FEC survey and discuss about the analysis of the survey
- 4) Vote for 2015-2016 FEC Chair

401.4 THE FACULTY WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS

4.2 Academic Ranks

(4) Federal and State Cooperator (FSC) Ranks.

Faculty members who are federal or state employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal or state government, whose primary function at the university is equivalent to core faculty, and who serve as faculty under cooperative agreements between the university and the federal or state government (e.g., U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service) may be appointed to one of the following ranks: instructor (FSC), assistant professor (FSC), associate professor (FSC), or professor (FSC), after full consultation between the department head and the faculty of the department that grants credit in this area. Appointments to federal or state cooperator ranks are made only in academic units where such cooperative agreements exist.

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.

Under exceptional circumstances, a waiver of the external review process may be granted by the president when such a process is operationally not feasible for a particular set of academic titles and ranks.

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).

| Under exceptional circumstances, aA waiver of the external review process may be granted by the president when such a process is operationally not feasible for a particular set of academic titles and ranks.

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.

| Under exceptional circumstances, aA waiver of the external review process may be granted by the president when such a process is operationally not feasible for a particular set of academic titles and ranks.

PRPC Changes For Faculty Senate on October 5, 2015

Changes in Yellow

401.4 THE FACULTY WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS

...4.3 Limitations on Positions: Faculty with Term Appointments

...(4) Limitations on Faculty Participation.

Faculty with term appointments are eligible to be elected to and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate. The participation in faculty affairs of faculty members holding lecturer, clinical, research, federal research, or professional practice ranks is subject to the following limitations: (a) they may participate in the processes of setting policy within their academic units only to the extent determined by their appointing departments, colleges, or other academic units; (b) they may serve as members of appointed faculty committees and may vote on all matters except those relating to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion of tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty. ~~;~~ ~~and (c) they may not be counted among the number of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members for purposes of apportioning Faculty Senate members.~~ Federal cooperator ranks are exempt from the foregoing limitations on faculty participation with the following exceptions: they may not serve on committees or vote on matters relating to retention or tenure of tenure-eligible faculty.

AND

402.3 MEMBERSHIP; ALTERNATES; TERM; VACANCIES

3.1 Membership

The Senate shall be composed of the following members: (1) sixty faculty members assigned in proportion to the number of tenured, ~~and~~ **tenure eligible, and term appointed** faculty in the academic colleges, the Regional Campuses and Distance Education, USU Eastern, Extension, and the Library. **Each unit is to be represented by a minimum of two elected senators.** These sixty will be elected by and from faculty members eligible to vote in Senate elections (see policy 401.4.2(c)); (2) the president and the executive vice president and provost of the

university or their designees; (3) eight appointees of the president of the university who shall be a vice president an academic college dean, a regional campus dean, or a chancellor, six of whom must hold faculty appointments and must be designated annually preceding elections to the Senate; (4) 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 if they are not one of the faculty members elected to the Senate; and (5) three students, who shall include the Utah State University Student Association (USUSA) President or a designee, the USUSA Academic Senate President or a designee, and the elected graduate student representative or a designee.

Existing Code

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

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 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~~ The faculty of each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. These procedures must be agreed upon by majority vote by the department faculty at minimum once every three years. If the procedures do not pass the majority vote, the department faculty must establish new procedures before the next review. ~~This~~ The 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 salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual

review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

COLLEGE FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE (CFAC)

An ad hoc committee with representation from most units met on September 17, 2015 to discuss

The issues listed below and made the recommendations listed below. The recommendations are open for discussion

1. CFAC formation

a. Initial formation

Recommendation: The faculty senate exec committee representative for each college or unit will solicit nominations from the faculty in his or her college or unit and run an election to determine the members of the first CFAC. Thereafter, the chair of the CFAC will solicit nominations from across the college or unit and run the election.

b. Subsequent addition of members of the CFAC

Recommendation: The chair of this committee will solicit nominations from across the college or unit and run the election while striving to keep broad representation across departments.

2. Size of the committee

Recommendation: Whenever possible, the five committee members will each represent different departments. Three members of the CFAC will participate in each appeal.

3. Initiation of appeal

Recommendation: Either the faculty member and/or Dept. Head can initiate the appeal. Each side should submit one page listing their preferred choices for the committee, briefly outlining their rationale and willingness of each person to serve.

4. Timing

Recommendation: Within three weeks of receiving a written request for an appeal, a meeting will be held, a decision made and delivered.

5. Meeting

Recommendation: At the meeting each side presents their rationale for their request. Both sides do not need to be present at the same time.

6. Terms

Members of the CFAC, will serve three year staggered terms. Members may run for subsequent terms.

7. Voting

Recommendation: A simple majority will decide the membership of the committee in question.

8. Leadership

Recommendation: The five members of the CFAC will self-select a chair (and a co-chair, if desired.)