

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

11-2-2015

Faculty Senate Agenda, November 2, 2015

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Agenda, November 2, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 468.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/468

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





FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
November 2, 2015
3:00 - 4:30 p.m.
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ronda Callister
Approval of Minutes October 5, 2015
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Retirement Policy 361.....Marla Boyer
- 3:30 Reports**
1. EPC Items October 2015.....Larry Smith
2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report.....Tom Lachmar
- 3:45 Unfinished Business**
1. 405.8.3(1) Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching
Is the major role assignment (Second Reading).....Ronda Callister
2. 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



**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
October 5, 2015
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Call to Order

Ronda Callister called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of September 14, 2015 were adopted.

Announcements – Ronda Callister

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.

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett

President Albrecht was not in attendance at this meeting. Provost Cockett informed the Senate that they are working on the requests for funding the building needs of the University. The Regents ranking of our building (Biological Sciences Building) is ranked 6th with the Dixie Fitness Center. They were surprised that the STEM Initiative that had been top priority for the two previous years seemed not to get much priority this round. Administration is still working on gaining more support to keep our request going and bring it forward this or the next legislative session. It is the largest funding request for higher education so far and it might be difficult for people to understand how one single building can have that large of a request.

The ribbon cutting for the new facilities in Price will be during the next Board of Trustees meeting. The Tooele building is getting ready to go and expected to be ready for use by January. The new facility in Brigham City will begin holding classes in January. It is also expected that the new Huntsman Hall on the main campus will be in use by January.

Information Items

Human Participants in Research Policy Code 584 – Mark McLellan. Scott Bates presented the new policy by way of information in Mark McLellan's absence. USU is working on an Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy which we have not had. The policy is to prevent a conflict of interest between the institution and research but only applies to human subject research. The draft policy is presented in your agenda packet. The IRB and Sponsored Programs will both be reviewing projects for funding and for potential institutional level conflicts of interest. So they will be looking at the contracts data bases, the gifts data bases, and the commercialization data bases for any conflicts of interest. Typically remedies can be achieved through a change in the reporting lines for the funding.

Reducing the size of Faculty Senate Committees – Ronda Callister. A discussion about reducing the size of some FS Committees was presented. Currently most senate committees have 15 members, one member from each unit and three additional Faculty Senate representatives. The proposal is to allow the three FS representatives to also represent their individual units. This would result in a reduction of 30 committee members overall. The details of the proposal and committees affected can be found in the material in your agenda packet. Ronda asked the senate for feedback on this issue to simplify the sizes of some of the FS Committees.

Reports

EPC Annual Report & EPC September Report – Larry Smith. Larry gave a brief overview of the Annual Report; all of the items in the report have come before the senate for approval during the last academic year. The September report included a few R401 proposals; there was a request from ASTE Department to offer an Associate's Degree in Ag Science which was not approved at the meeting. The proposal got sent back with feedback for revisions and improvement and it will be coming back again for approval. NDFS proposed to discontinue the Food Technology Management Emphasis and this was approved. FCHD wanted discontinue the Early Childhood Development Associate of Arts degree at Eastern. This proposal went back for some clarification. Psychology wanted to offer a minor in Behavioral Health and that was approved. There was also a request from the Department of Applied Economics to change the name of their Utah Center for Productivity and Quality of Work to The Extension Center for Business and Economic Development and that was approved. The Academic Standards Sub-committee had not yet met, and the Gen Ed Sub-committee had no reportable actions.

Honors Program – Kristine Miller. 2014 marked the 50th anniversary of the Honors Program at USU. The program has created a new admissions process involving more input from faculty in appropriate departments on all applications. They created two new advisory boards, one faculty advisory board and one student advisory board. They created detailed handbooks for the Thesis and Capstone process and for the Contract process for faculty and students. They created two new transcript designations called Global Engagement Scholar and a Pipeline for Service Learning Scholar. The goal for the program this year and going forward is to increase involvement. They are getting alumni involved with mentoring students this year. Kristine solicited suggestions for enrichment activities that would interest the honors students, if you have any suggestions contact her. They graduated 53 students last year and will be working on retention in the program to improve that graduation rate.

Libraries Advisory Council – Britt Fagerheim. The Council met only one time during the year. The other meetings were tabled because of the Library Dean search. One of the main issues was the bankruptcy of one of their major journal providers. This next year they will be identifying new Libraries Advisory Council representation as members are either retiring or rotating off the council. One of the major issues for the council to work on is the need for ongoing support for electronic journals and resources.

Parking Committee – James Nye. Currently two construction projects are taking up 58 stalls of Blue parking. The Maverick Stadium construction has eliminated 117 parking stalls and will likely take up more as construction work continues. Last year a Master Plan was created. They will be looking at increasing the fees to cover shuttle costs which are now being funded by student fees only. 150 faculty and staff currently purchase yellow parking passes and utilize the shuttle to commute to campus. They would like to have a new parking structure built in the next 5 years. They will also need to replace the computer system in the Aggie Terrace at a cost of \$160,000. Current revenues do not meet the ongoing needs and future parking fee increases can be expected.

A motion to accept all reports was made by Yanghee Kim and seconded. The motion passed.

Unfinished Business

402.12.7(1) Add “Faculty University Service Award” to the list of FEC Duties (Second Reading) – Jerry Goodspeed.

A motion to accept the code change was made by Yanghee Kim and seconded by Vince Wickwar. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

405.7.2(1) Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching is the major role assignment (First Reading) – Jerry Goodspeed. This item had been discussed previously. It was reiterated that this would apply to teaching faculty only when teaching is the major role assignment. Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to amend the wording with the phrase “Under exceptional circumstances” at the beginning of the PRPC changes. His motion was seconded and the amendment passed.

401.4.2(4) Proposal to change code to include State with Federal Cooperators (First Reading) – Jerry Goodspeed. No additional action or comments this will come back for a second reading at the next meeting.

Faculty Senate Reapportionment Proposal – Doug-Jackson-Smith. Doug presented a proposal to change the way the faculty senate representation is divided among the units and made a motion to send the issue to PRPC to formalize the code language. Trevor Olsen seconded the motion. This proposal would allow term faculty to be counted among the number of faculty for the purpose of apportioning Faculty Senate members. Yanghee Kim made a friendly amendment to delay moving this to PRPC to give senators one more month to think it over. Doug rejected the friendly amendment, saying that after the code is drafted they can discuss the fine details of it. The original motion was voted on and the proposal was sent to PRPC.

New Business from the Floor – Committee on Committees assignments – Sheri Haderlie. Sheri presented several committee assignments as information items, but two items require senate vote for approval.

- Grad Council – Keri Holt. Doug Jackson-Smith moved to elect and Vince Wickwar seconded. The motion passed.
- Honorary Degrees & Awards – Becky Blais, Ben Blau, Scott Henrie, Keri Holt, Don Larsen and Ralph Meyer. Ralph indicated that he saw his name on the BFW list Sheri put up and declined his nomination to the Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee. Vince Wickwar made a motion to send the remaining names on to the provost as nominees for this committee. The motion was seconded and passed.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.



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.~~

32.2 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.

~~4) 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 towill 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

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.)

405.13 COLLEGE FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE

In all cases in which this code calls for mutual agreement and the parties are not able to reach agreement within two weeks, then the decision will be appealed to the College Faculty Appeals Committee (CFAC).

13.1 Formation of the College Faculty Appeals Committee (CFAC)

This committee will initially be formed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee representative for each college or unit. This individual 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 while striving to keep broad representation across departments. Whenever possible, the five committee members will each represent different departments. Three members of the CFAC will participate in each appeal so that those members from the same department where the appeal is originating (or have other potential conflicts of interests with any of the parties involved) have the option to recuse themselves. Members of the CFAC will serve three year staggered terms. Members may run for subsequent terms. The five members of the CFAC will self-select a chair (and a co-chair, if desired.)

13.2 Initiating and Hearing the Appeal

Either the faculty member and/or the Department Head can initiate an appeal. Each side should submit a one page document listing their preferred choices for the committee, briefly outlining their rationale and, if desired, the willingness of each person to serve. Within three weeks of receiving a written request for an appeal, a meeting will be held, and a decision will be made and delivered.

At the meeting each side will present their rationale for their request. Both sides do not need to be present at the same time. A simple majority will decide the membership of the committee in question.