

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

3-21-2016

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 21, 2016

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 21, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 477.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/477

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





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 21, 2016
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Champ Hall

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ronda Callister
Approval of Minutes February 16, 2016
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. 402.12.7(1) Name change to Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year Award.....Tom Lachmar
 2. HR Code change Policy 350 Educational Benefits.....BrandE Faupell
 3. 405.6.2 Promotion Advisory Committee Formation.....Ronda Callister
 4. Faculty Senate President and President-Elect Nominations.....Ronda Callister
 5. Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report (to put on FS Agenda only)....Ronda Callister
- 3:25 Reports**
1. Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee.....Jerry Goodspeed
 2. Honorary Degrees and Awards.....Sydney Peterson
 3. EPC Items for March 2016.....Larry Smith
- 3:40 Unfinished Business**
1. 402.10.1 Reapportionment fix for missed section (Second Reading).....Ronda Callister
- 3:50 New Business**
1. 405.6.2(2) and 405.8.2 PAC (First Reading).....Ronda Callister
 2. PTR Edits Remaining Sections 405.12.3.....Doug Jackson-Smith
- 4:15 Other Items**
1. Proposal for parking fee supplement for alternative transportation.....Robert Schmidt
 2. Oversight of donations.....Jeanette Norton
 3. New Criteria for Scholar of the Year.....Janet Anderson
- 4:30 Adjournment**

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 16, 2016 3:00 P.M.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Ronda Callister (Chair), Paul Barr, Britt Fagerheim, Dennis Garner, Betty Hassell, Doug Jackson-Smith, Vijay Kannan, Kimberly Lott, Mark McLellan, Dan Murphy, Jeanette Norton, Michael Pace, Robert Schmidt, Charles Waugh, Vincent Wickwar, Lindsey Shirley (President Elect)(excused), Yanghee Kim (Past President), President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio)(excused), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Atkinson (Assistant)

Guests: Cinthya Saavedra, Diane Calloway-Graham, Krystin Deschamps, Stacy Sturgeon, Tom Lachmar

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

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 19, 2016 were adopted.

University Business - President Albrecht.

President Albrecht has been meeting with members of the Black Student Union to touch base and see what was going on and how they were feeling about life. They really care about the university and love the faculty and overall things are going well. There were a couple of areas of concern. They feel like the athletic community has isolated itself from the campus community and there is little interaction between the minority non-athletes and minority athletes. They wanted some help with this, especially encouraging them to come to their events. Minority recruiting is up about 8%. Overall there is a positive trajectory and they are working to continue it. The coaches are going to work on this as well.

Building projects across campus continue. The Fine Arts Building renovation is progressing beautifully. The Maverick stadium is on time and on budget. Clinical Services fundraising is continuing for the nursing floor addition. The project of concern is securing funding for the Science building during this legislative session, but the administration is working hard to make this happen. President Albrecht has announced his retirement. A group from the State Board of Regents will be on campus March 4 to begin holding meetings with the Executive Committee and the community and begin the presidential search process. The search committee will include members of the Regents and Trustees and will include the FS President, Student Body President, donors, and faculty and staff representation.

Information Items

PTR Edits – Ronda Callister/Larry Smith. During the PTR process last year, some questions were raised about some ambiguities in the language as it passed through the Presidents Council. Ronda has worked with Larry Smith to develop clarifications.

Robert Schmidt made a motion to recommend that the Senate send this to PRPC and Jeanette Norton seconded. The motion passed.

402.12.7(1) Name Change to Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year Award and FEC

Recommendations on IDEA – Tom Lachmar. Discussion on the name change of the award centered around the semantics of advising and mentoring. It needs to remain clear that the award is not for staff advisors but for faculty. A motion to approve the recommended change was made, but after a little more discussion the motion was withdrawn. This will be returned to FSEC for further discussion.

Tom gave a brief overview of the outcome of FEC's meeting with Michael Torrens, Director of AAA which oversees administration of the IDEA system. FEC would like to encourage Department Heads to be more actively involved in the process. IDEA can be administered as an assignment in Canvas, however it is not ideal to evaluate tech courses and small classes. Michael recommends a threshold enrollment of 5 and also recommends that Departments Heads never weight evaluation results more than 50% for T&P purposes. Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to place this item on the agenda as an Information Item and Robert Schmidt seconded. The motion passed.

Athletics Council Membership 105.2.1(2) – Ronda Callister. Currently the Faculty Senate appoints 6 members to this council, 3 men and 3 women. This recommendation does not reduce the number of faculty appointed to this committee because there are three sub committees they are asked to serve on; one man and one woman on each. The representatives do not have to be faculty senate members.

Robert Schmidt made a motion to place this item on the agenda as an Information Item and Kimberly Lott seconded. The motion passed.

Open Access Policy 586.1 – Mark McLellan. Changes to this policy bring USU into compliance with federal requirements established in 2013. Refer to your agenda packet for the details of the changes.

A motion to place this on the agenda as an Information Item was made by Robert Schmidt and seconded by Vijay Kannan. The motion passed.

Sexual Harassment Code Revision Policy 339 – Stacy Sturgeon & Krystin Deschamps. Changes to this policy are for the interim while more work is done on bringing the policy into complete compliance with federal regulations. The affected parts of the student code involving alleged violations are also being updated. The main changes deal with adding language to include students, not just faculty and staff in the policy. The policy also gives notice informing participants that sexual harassment and sexual misconduct are part of the same policy. Certain definitions are being added as well as clarification of the right for both parties to appeal decisions. An FSEC member asked for clarification on when faculty must disclose information if a student confides in them.

A motion to place this on the agenda as an Information Item was made by Mark McClellan and seconded by Doug Jackson-Smith. The motion passed.

Reports

EPC Items for February – Larry Smith. Only one R-401 request was presented; a request from Management to transfer the administration of the Management minor from the Deans office to the department.

Robert Schmidt made a motion to place the report on the agenda and Vijay Kaanan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee – Diane Calloway-Graham. The BFW Committee in the past year dealt primarily with the PTR issues. Upcoming on their agenda is allocation of new funds.

Doug Jackson-Smith moved to place the report on the agenda and Mark McClellan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee – Cinthya Saavedra. Regarding the issue of time, rank and retention since 2008, 41% of untenured faculty have left USU. The reason is unclear. The committee would like recommendations as to formatting and content of their report so they may include the most useful information for the senate. Ronda made a requested that specific information be the focus of their presentation to the full senate and Cinthya agreed to do so.

A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by Vijay Kannan and seconded by Vince Wickwar. The motion passed.

Unfinished Business

405.12.3 CFAC Policy (Second Reading) – Ronda Callister. This policy has been revised by PRPC and is presented for a second reading.

Mark McClellan moved to place the second reading on the agenda and Charles Waugh seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

After a short discussion, a motion to edit the policy was made by Vijay Kaanan and seconded by Jeanette Norton. Say "When mutual agreement on committee membership of the Peer Review Committee or other committees cannot be reached" and to strike "on the PRC makeup is required and department head and faculty member do not agree on committee membership" this was considered redundant.

New Business

405.6.2(2) and 405.8.2 PAC (First Reading) – Ronda Callister/Jerry Goodspeed. Charles Waugh questioned why mutual agreement was not the standard for this section of code as well. Several members of the committee initially agreed that the same language as the PTR code should be used. However, after further discussion it was decided to move this item forward as is and discuss adding mutual agreement language as a separate issue in the future.

A motion was made to move the proposal forward by Mark McClellan and seconded by Kimberly Lott. The motion passed unanimously.

402.10.1 Reapportionment fix for missed section (First Reading) – Ronda Callister. This item is a correction of another section of the code that should have been changed when the original reapportionment proposal was made and passed.

A motion was made by Dan Murphy to move the correction forward to the full Senate and seconded by Robert Schmidt. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by: Joan Kleinke, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, 797-1776

402.12.7(1) Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

Current Code

(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 Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year, Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Award.

Proposed Changes to this Code

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 Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year, Undergraduate Faculty Advisor/Mentor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Award.

ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy 350 Educational Benefits

Purpose:

To make revisions to Policy 350 Educational Benefits

Issues:

- Section 2 – renames the heading within the section to provide clarification and grouping of similar topics.
- Section 2.3 – Clarifies that the educational benefit does not apply to the school of Veterinary Medicine.
- Section 2.7 – Clarifies that the application and form(s) are submitted online.
- Section 2.11 – Clarifies that certain educational benefits may be taxable to retirees and dependents of deceased employees.

Recommendation: The Office of Human Resources recommends approval of these changes.



POLICY MANUAL

BENEFITS

Number 350

Subject: Educational Benefits

Covered Employees: Benefit-Eligible Employees

Effective Date: ~~June 29, 2012~~ March 4, 2016

Date of Origin: January 24, 1997

350.1 POLICY

The University encourages all individuals associated with Utah State University to continue their educational development. To assist in that regard, the University has established several educational benefit programs. Each program has unique eligibility and participation requirements.

350.2 PROVISIONS

2.1 ~~Eligibility~~ Utah State University Courses for Credit

~~The educational benefit for individuals who meet the eligibility requirements is a reduction in tuition by 50% of the appropriate rate (in-state or out-of-state depending on official residence) for the courses being taken. This reduction is for both day and night courses offered and described on the Online Catalog found on catalog.usu.edu.~~

~~Employees, retirees, and spouses do not have to pay non-tuition fees (student body fees), except for the following, which will be paid at the standard rate: special lab and class fees, graduation fees, correspondence or home study fees, noncredit workshops, conferences, institutes, special field trip fees, and fees for most courses offered by the Regional Campuses and Distance Education. For eligible individuals taking study abroad courses, the waiver would be 50% of the equivalent tuition for the number of credits taken.~~

~~Courses at Utah State University may be taken for course credit by individuals who meet the eligibility requirements.~~

According to the stipulations described below, employees who are budgeted 75% time or more are eligible to participate in the educational benefit programs. In addition, their spouses and dependent children (under the age of 26 and single at the time of registration) and all Utah State

University retirees, their spouses, and dependent children (under the age of 26 and single at the time of registration), are eligible to participate.

- (1) Employees qualify after 3 months of service working 75% time or more. The 3-month waiting time must be completed on or before the last eligible day that fees are due in the applicable semester.
- (2) Dependent children qualify for benefits after the related University employee has been employed in an eligible position (working 75% time or more) for 2 years ~~(working 75% time or more)~~.
- (3) Spouses qualify immediately for this benefit. The eligibility period must be completed on or before the last day fees are due in the applicable semester.
- (4) Spouses and dependent children of deceased University employees who were eligible when the employee died will continue to be eligible under the provisions of this policy.
- (5) Retirees, their spouses, and dependent children qualify when the retiree meets the minimum definition of ~~R~~Retirement Status as stated in Policy #361-Retirement.

~~If, while taking University classes, the eligible person desires student privileges that require fees (i.e., activity fees, health fees, etc.), activity fees must be paid.~~

~~Dependent children taking University courses must pay full non-tuition fees.~~

2.2 USU-Eastern Employees with Service Date Prior to July 1, 2010

Employees of USU-Eastern with a service hire date prior to July 1, 2010, are grandfathered into the 100% tuition ~~waver~~waiver program previously offered by the College of Eastern Utah. This applies only to classes offered as part of the USU-Eastern program. For the same grandfathered employees, classes taken through any other USU program will qualify for 50% tuition reduction ~~under Policy #350 Educational Benefits~~as stated in this policy.

2.3 Utah State University Courses for Credit

The educational benefit for individuals who meet the eligibility requirements is a reduction in tuition by 50% of the appropriate rate (in-state or out-of-state depending on official residence) for the courses being taken. This reduction is for both day and night courses offered and described on the Online Catalog found ~~on~~at catalog.usu.edu.

For eligible individuals taking study abroad courses, the waiver would be 50% of the equivalent tuition for the number of credits taken.

The educational benefit does not apply to the School of Veterinary Medicine.

2.4 Utah State University Non-Tuition Fees

Employees, retirees, and spouses ~~are~~ not required have to pay non-tuition fees (student body fees), except for the following, which will be paid at the standard rate: special lab and class fees, graduation fees, correspondence or home-study fees, noncredit workshops, conferences, institutes, special field trip fees, and fees for most courses offered by the Regional Campuses ~~and Distance Education.~~

If, while taking University classes, the eligible employee, spouse, retiree, or spouse of an eligible retired or deceased employee person desires student privileges that require fees, (i.e. activity fees, health fees, etc.), activity fees the fees must be paid at the time of registration.

Dependent children taking University courses must pay full non-tuition fees.

2.5 Utah State University Courses Taken for Audit

All budgeted employees working 50% time or more, their spouses, and University retirees and their spouses qualify for auditing University courses without a fee or waiting period. Dependent children do not qualify for this benefit.

Spouses of deceased University employees who were eligible for this benefit when the employee died will continue to be eligible.

Retirees and their spouses qualify for this benefit when the retiree meets the minimum definition of ~~R~~Retirement Status as stated in Policy #361-~~R~~Retirement.

2.42.6 Full Time Employee Limitations

Full-time Utah State University employees (95% time or greater) may register for a maximum of 6 credit hours per semester, to be taken during the employee's normal working hours. This limit applies to the combination of courses taken for credit or audit. Employees working less than full-time may register for the following credit hours, to be taken during the employee's normal working hours:

Percent of Time Working	Credit Hours Allowed During Normal Working Hours Per Semester
95 - 100 %	6 hours
85 - 94 %	5 hours
75 - 84 %	4 hours
less than 75%	ineligible

-Courses taken by employees during regular working hours may not interfere with the operation of the employee's department, and the employee must have the permission of his or her supervisor or department head. Regular hours of work missed by non-exempt employees for class attendance must be made up during the same week in which they are missed.

When the same course is offered in both day and night sessions, the employee is encouraged to enroll in the night course.

Employees who work on an academic year basis (9 months—August through early May) are not restricted by the limitations above during the period of the year in which they are not working full-time (normally the summer term).

Qualified employees are not restricted by the limitations above for courses that are to be taken during non-working hours.

2.57 Admissions and Registration Provisions

All individuals who want to participate in the educational benefits program must apply and be accepted for admission to the University using the regular admission guidelines.

~~All individuals must follow the normal registration procedures of the University.~~ The [active employee applicant](#) must complete the [Tuition Reduction Application Form](#) ~~available~~ [form and Waiver of Non-Tuition Fees form, if applicable, as directed](#) on the Human Resources ~~W~~[website](#). [Students of retired or deceased employees should return the applicable form\(s\) to the Human Resources office.](#) ~~When properly completed, the form is to be presented at the Registrar's Office when fees are paid to receive the benefits described in this policy.~~

2.68 Termination While Attending Classes

Employees who terminate employment with the University for reasons other than retirement or death disqualify themselves, their spouses, and dependent children from participating in future educational benefits programs.

When employment ends, the employee, spouse, or dependent child who is in the process of taking a University course with reduced tuition fees under the guidelines of this policy will be allowed to complete that course. Any future courses taken will require payment of the fully applicable tuition costs.

Employees on leave without pay (LWOP) for more than 6 months do not qualify for the benefits described in this policy. Spouses and dependent children of employees on LWOP are also disqualified from the educational benefits. Employees on sabbatical or other approved leave with pay, their spouses, and dependent children, are eligible for educational benefits described in this policy.

2.79 Financial Limitations

The employee/spouse/dependent waiver is a benefit of employment and provides a 50% waiver of tuition. This benefit is not reduced when a student receives other tuition waivers, except that combined tuition waivers cannot exceed 100% of tuition charges for a given term. For the purposes of this policy, a waiver is any funding that is restricted to the payment of tuition.

2.~~8~~10 Appeal Process

Refer to Policy #325-Employee Grievance Procedures.

2.~~9~~11 Taxation

Certain educational benefits received by employees, their spouses, and dependent children may be taxable under current IRS rules. If the IRS rules determine that all or a portion of these benefits are taxable, the University will add the value of the benefit received to the employee's income and will withhold appropriate taxes for the amount of the benefit.

Retirees and deceased employee dependents will receive appropriate IRS documents reflecting the taxable benefit received.

350.3 RESPONSIBILITY

3.1 Department Heads and Supervisors

Responsible to administer this policy for employees within their departments while considering the needs of the department.

3.2 Office of Human Resources

Responsible to administer this policy for retirees, their spouses, and dependent children and for the spouses and dependent children of deceased employees. Responsible to assist department heads and supervisors in administering this policy.

3.3 Employees

If taking courses during regular working hours, employees must coordinate course times with supervisors to reduce interference with the operation of the department. All employees must follow the normal registration procedures.

Responsible for taxes, as appropriate.

405.6.2 Promotion Advisory Committee Formation

(2) Promotion advisory committee (PAC).

When a faculty member without tenure is to be considered for promotion, the tenure advisory committee shall also serve as a promotion advisory committee. The term of this committee shall expire when the faculty member is awarded tenure.

Following tenure, if a faculty member so desires, he or she may request in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed and meet with the faculty member. This shall be done by the department head in consultation with the faculty member and academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, within 30 days of receipt of the written request. The promotion advisory committee must be formed by February 15th of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) below be held at this time.

The promotion advisory committee shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and higher rank than does the faculty member. The faculty member and department will meet prior to the committee being selected. The candidate may present a brief list of those he/she would like to serve on the committee for discussion with the department head. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a chair other than him or herself. Normally, two academic unit members of higher rank who have served on the candidate's tenure advisory committee shall be appointed to the promotion advisory committee, and at least one member shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than four faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. A department head or supervisor may only be appointed to the promotion advisory committee in unusual circumstances and with the approval of the faculty member under consideration. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee. The candidate may request removal of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor and the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.

When a department head or supervisor is being considered for promotion, the appropriate dean, or vice president for extension shall appoint the promotion advisory committee; when a dean, vice president, or chancellor is being considered for promotion, the provost shall appoint the promotion advisory committee.

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC) Report

March 2016

The Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee members for AY 2015-2016 are:

Agriculture and Applied Sciences - Heidi Wengreen

Business - Dan Holland

Arts - Chris Gauthier

Humanities and Social Sciences - Terry Peak

Education and Human Services - Bob Morgan –

Engineering - Heng-Da Cheng

Natural Resources - Terry Messner

Science - Ian Anderson

Libraries - Jennifer Duncan

Extension - Jerry Goodspeed (Chair)

RCDE - Nikole Eyre

USU Eastern - Steve Nelson

Senate - Arthur Caplan

Senate - John Gilbert

The Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee advise the Faculty Senate regarding composition, interpretation, and revision of Section 400 in University Policies and Procedures. Recommended revisions shall be submitted to the Senate for its consideration. The following is a summary list of code changes presented to the Faculty Senate in this academic year in the order of the dates in which PRPC reviewed them.

September 2015 –

- 402.12.7(1) – Add “University Service Award” to the list of the Faculty Evaluation Committee duties. Finishing up from last year.
- 405.6.5 – Remove Quinquennial from code. Finishing up from last year.
- 405.8.3(1) – Allow for Presidential exceptions to external reviewers when teaching is the major role assignment.
- 401.4.2(4) – Change code to include State with Federal Coopertors – Approved but not sent forward.

October 2015

- 405.7.2 –
- 401.4.3(4) & 402.3.1 – FS Reapportionment proposal

November 2015

- FC to FSC – Federal and State Cooperator (ended up being tabled)
- 405.12.1 – Annual Review of Faculty

December 2015

- 405.12.3 – CFAC

January 2016

- 405.6.2 & 405.8.2 – Promotional Advisory Committee PAC - STILL IN DISCUSSION

Future assignments:

Reassigning Faculty Senate standing committee membership (402.12)

Specific approved wording changes are documented in the Faculty Senate minutes.

Committee action was performed through email discussions and voting. Any items approved were done so with a majority vote (8 of 14).

Changes are in yellow

SEPTEMBER

402.12.7(1)

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 Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year, Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year, and Faculty University Service Award.

(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 Section 402, Page 17 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.

405.6.5

6.5 Ombudspersons

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

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

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

405.8.3(1)

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.

401.4.2(4)

401.4 THE FACULTY WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS

4.2 Academic Ranks

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

Faculty members who are federal employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal 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 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 and state cooperator ranks are made only in academic units where such cooperative agreements exist.

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: 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 and state 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.

405.10 TERM APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTION: CRITERIA

10.1 Criteria for Promotion to the Penultimate Ranks:

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

OCTOBER

405.7 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE TENURE PROCESS

...7.2 Additional Events During the Year in which a Tenure Decision is to be Made (1) External peer reviews. Prior to September 15, the department head... 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, 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.

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.

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.

NOVEMBER

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

The faculty of each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty **within the department** shall be reviewed annually. **These procedures shall be agreed upon by majority vote of the department faculty at minimum once every three years.** 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...

DECEMBER

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

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

405.12.3 College Faculty Appeals Committee (CFAC)

Where mutual agreement on the PRC (405.12.2) makeup is required and department head and faculty member do not agree on committee membership, the CFAC shall decide membership.

The CFAC shall consist of five tenured faculty members, each representing different departments within the college or unit. Three randomly chosen members of the CFAC, without obvious conflicts of interest, participate in each appeal. Members of the CFAC serve three-year terms. Members may run for subsequent terms. The five members of the CFAC select a chair (and a co-chair, if desired). The CFAC initially is determined by a college vote. After initial formation of the CFAC, and when members' terms expire, the chair solicits nominations from across the college or unit and runs an election for new members while striving to keep broad representation across departments.

Either the faculty member and/or the department head can initiate an appeal by written request to the CFAC chair. Each side submits a one page document listing their preferred choices for the PRC committee membership, briefly outlining their rationale and, if desired, the willingness of each person to serve. Each side may also submit a one-page document listing potential committee members whom they would like to be excluded from the PRC, briefly outlining their rationale. Within three weeks of receiving the appeal, a meeting by the CFAC shall be held and a decision made and delivered to both the faculty member and department head. At the meeting each side may orally present their rationale for their request. Neither the Department Head nor the faculty member is required to attend, but both shall have the opportunity to voice their request. A simple majority of the three CFAC decides the membership of the PRC committee in question and the decision is binding.

12.4 Professional Development Plan

12.5 Academic Process

JANUARY

405.6.2 & 405.8.2 – Promotional Advisory Committee PAC – STILL IN DISCUSSION

PROMOTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

EXAMPLE OF POTENTIAL CODE CHANGES:

405.6.2 (2) Promotion advisory committee (PAC).

Following tenure, ~~if a~~ a faculty member ~~so desires, he or she~~ may request, through a letter to the Department head, in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed for him or her and meet with the faculty member self. The request will be in writing and made to the department head.
(editing)

The promotion advisory committee will be formed ~~This shall be done~~ by the department head following consultation with and receiving written and/or oral input from the ~~with the~~ faculty member and in consultation with the academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, within 30 days of receipt of the written request. ~~The promotion advisory committee must be formed by February 15th of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) below be held at this time~~

The promotion advisory committee shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and ~~higher rank than does the faculty member hold the rank of professor.~~ The department head or supervisor shall appoint a committee chair other than him or herself and ~~Normally, two academic unit members of higher rank who have served on the candidate's tenure advisory committee shall be appointed to the promotion advisory committee, and at least one member of the promotion advisory committee shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than four faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units.~~ Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. ~~A department head or supervisor may only be appointed to the promotion advisory committee in unusual circumstances and with the approval of the faculty member under consideration.~~ The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee. The candidate may request removal of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor and the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.

~~(Explanation: Changes in this paragraph are all aimed at simplifying the language.)~~

405.8.2 Faculty with Tenure

The promotion advisory committee shall meet at any time upon request of the faculty member, ~~or and~~ in no case, later than the Springspring semester February 15 of the third year following tenure. The purpose of the first meeting of the promotion advisory committee will be to provide guidance to the faculty member with regard to his or her performance relative to the criteria and qualifications for promotion to professor.

All promotion advisory committee members shall participate interactively in all committee meetings, either physically or by electronic conferencing. An ombudsperson must be present in person or by electronic conferencing.

~~– Explanation: Updating to current practices~~

~~, to consider a recommendation for promotion.~~

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

~~(1) Meetings of the promotion advisory committee~~

~~At its first meeting, the~~ When the promotion advisory committee ~~, formed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the chancellor or regional campus dean (where applicable) and the academic dean, meets for the first time, the purpose of this meeting, similar to the first tenure meeting, will be to~~ will is to ensure that the faculty member ~~has an an appropriate signed role statement and will discuss with the faculty member his or her performance relative to their role statement is in the context of meeting criteria required for achieving promotion to the rank of professor. is in place and to provide information to the faculty member about promotion to the rank of professor. This information could include historical information about the records of the last several department members promoted to professor or information about the committee's understanding of what is necessary for promotion to professor. All promotion advisory committee members shall participate interactively in all committee meetings, either physically or by electronic conferencing, at the appointed date and time. Ombudspersons must be present in person or by electronic conferencing. The~~ Subsequent to this first meeting the faculty member may request additional meetings with the promotion advisory committee if desired.

~~Explanation: The above paragraph was co-written in 2004-5 with a Faculty Senate President who did not want any evaluation to occur in this meeting. This version is designed to provide more guidance to newly promoted faculty members to help them better plan for their promotion to full professor. They, however, are never required to go forward for promotion—this is their choice. Having the information on what is expected may still be useful.~~

When the faculty member ~~is ready wishes~~ to be considered for promotion to professor, the promotion advisory committee shall meet; upon request of the faculty member ~~, to consider a recommendation for promotion to professor the following fall. This initial meeting shall take place by February 15, approximately six months before the faculty member submits materials for consideration and review during the Spring semester of the academic year prior to the academic year when the candidate's dossier would go forward for promotion.~~

~~Explanation: Delete February 15th which has little rationale and continually causes problems for faculty and department heads who realize too late that this deadline exists and they proceed without meeting the deadline.~~

~~(2) Report of the promotion advisory committee~~

~~Within 30 days after~~ After any meeting with the faculty member to discuss promotion (but not the evaluative meeting in 405.8.3), the ~~meeting with the faculty member for the first time, the~~ promotion advisory committee chair shall write a report letter in which it reports on the guidance given to the faculty member based on the committee's discussion. All members of the promotion advisory committee and ombudsperson shall read and sign the final draft of the report. The report will then primary purpose of this report is not to evaluate the faculty member but to be sent to the candidate and his or her inform the department head or supervisor of the information and guidance provided to the faculty member about promotion to professor. Department heads or, supervisors, academic

deans, the vice president for extension, or, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.⁵

A faculty member considering promotion to professor is strongly encouraged to ~~also~~ consult with his or her department head or supervisor and academic dean to obtain from them additional guidance about the faculty member's readiness for promotion.

~~This optional recommendation is designed to help the faculty member understand and be aware in any differences between their promotion committee members and their department head or dean and prevent painful surprises if differences in perspectives are present.~~

~~may not use this letter as an evaluation of a faculty member's progress towards professor unless the faculty member explicitly requests that the meeting be evaluative and chooses to provide a curriculum vita to the committee. Copies of the report signed by the committee members shall be provided to the~~

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

Explanation: Moved from above to improve flow

~~faculty member, the department head or supervisor, the academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If this meeting occurs in the fifth year, the letter should cover both the requirements of post tenure review (see policy 405.12) and the summary of the guidance given to the faculty member as outlined above.~~

~~(3) Report of the department head or supervisor (Subsequently, the department head or supervisor shall submit in writing to the academic dean, vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, a summary of the information and guidance provided to the faculty member about promotion to professor. If the faculty member has asked to be considered for promotion to professor in the subsequent year, the department head will provide in a separate report, then this letter would also include an evaluation of the candidate's progress towards promotion to professor and identify any areas of improvement in the candidate's performance, as necessary.~~

Copies of the department head's report will be provided to the faculty member, and the promotion advisory committee, the. ~~This letter should be delivered to the faculty member,~~ academic dean or vice president of extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, no later than 30 days following the meeting with the promotion advisory committee.

Explanation: Rearrangement to improve flow and clarity and reduce redundancy.

**REPORT OF THE
HONORARY DEGREES AND AWARDS COMMITTEE**
to the
Faculty Senate
March 14, 2016

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jody Burnett, Chair (Board of Trustees)
Linda Gillmor (Board of Trustees)
Lane Thomas (Board of Trustees)
Ron Jibson (Board of Trustees, ex officio)
Scott Watterson (Board of Trustees, ex officio)
Ben Blau (Faculty)
Shannon Peterson (Faculty)
Keri Holt (Faculty)
Mark Weese (Alumni Council)
Trevor Sean Olsen (ASUSU President)
Larry Smith (Provost's Office)
Sydney Peterson (President's Office/Trustees)

PURPOSE

The Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee's major responsibilities are to implement procedures to solicit and encourage an adequate number of qualified nominations; to review all nominations for honorary degrees and commencement speaker awards; and to forward nominations and recommendations to the Board of Trustees for their final selection and approval.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Commencement Speaker and Honorary Degree Recipient 2017

The Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee recommended the following candidate for commencement speaker and honorary degree recipient for Spring Commencement 2016. The Board of Trustees has approved the following candidate:

GOVERNOR JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.

Jon M. Huntsman, Jr. began his career in public service as a staff assistant to former U.S. President Ronald Reagan. He went on to serve the following four U.S. presidents in critical roles around the world, including as ambassador to Singapore, deputy assistant secretary of commerce for Asia, U.S. trade ambassador and, most recently, U.S. ambassador to China.

The two-term former governor of Utah, Huntsman was elected chairman of the Western Governors Association during his tenure. Utah was also named the best managed state in America during his time as Utah's governor.

Huntsman serves on many boards, including Ford Motor Company, Caterpillar Corporation and Hilton Worldwide, among others. He is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania.

Honorary Degree Recipients 2016

The Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee recommended the following candidates for honorary degrees to be presented at Spring Commencement 2016. The Board of Trustees has approved the following four candidates:

Douglas S. Foxley

Douglas S. Foxley currently serves as a partner at Foxley and Pignanelli Attorneys-at-Law, specializing in government affairs and public relations, with a focus on federal, state and local governments on behalf of numerous corporate and individual clients.

A Utah native, Foxley has dedicated much of his time serving the state, including time as a member of the Utah State Board of Regents for 12 years, three of which he served as chair. He also founded ECDC Environmental in 1989 that was sold to Union Pacific in 1991.

Foxley currently serves on the USU Foundation Board and is a former member of USU's Board of Trustees. He graduated with bachelor's and master's degrees in political science and later completed a Juris Doctorate from the University of Utah College of Law.

Joseph Andrew Hays

Joseph Andrew Hays is a retired corporate advocate and communicator who started his career in Utah with Kennecott Copper, an international mining company. After successive roles as a communications officer, that included a stint as a U.S. Peace Corps director of public affairs, Hays was recruited by the Tribune Company in Chicago where he established the company's office of Corporate Relations.

After retiring from the Tribune Company in 1995, Hays established the Hays Group, a consulting firm that provides counsel to companies on communications policy and enhancing shareholder value and to not-for-profit organizations for strategic planning and fundraising. Hays retired in 2010.

Hays has served on the boards of financial, publishing and cultural organizations. He also served as a member of the Board of Visitors for USU's Department of Journalism. He graduated with a

bachelor's in journalism from USU, followed with service in the United States Air Force. He then went on to earn a law degree from the Indiana University.

Ligia Amada Melo de Cardona

Ligia Amada Melo de Cardona is the minister of higher education, science and technology for the Dominican Republic who has provided visionary leadership for higher education and English language training for Dominican citizens.

Utah State University has partnered with the Dominican Republic on cooperative programs since the 1980s and became the destination for many recipients for the national scholarship program in 2000. Appointed to her current position in 2004, Melo de Cardona has paved the way for more than 850 students, supported by the Dominican Presidential Scholarship for Superior Students to pursue their higher educational or English training goals at USU.

A total of 368 Dominican students, 198 bachelor's and 127 graduate students, have attended USU with 321 of them graduating by May 2016. An additional 522 Dominican students participated in the Global Academy, a summer English language and American cultural immersion program.

Jed H. Pitcher

Pitcher is the retired chairman of the board, president and CEO of Regence Blue Cross Blue Shield of Utah and retired president and COO of the Regence Group. He retired in 2004 following 38 years of employment, the latter of which he served in various positions with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Utah and the Regence Group before eventually heading the company.

Throughout his years of employment, Pitcher maintained a vital community role in Utah by serving on the boards of Ballet West, Utah Symphony, United Way and Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce. He also worked on the boards of the Sunshine Terrace Foundation in Logan and served as the chair of the Workers Compensation Fund of Utah.

Pitcher currently serves as the vice chair for USU's National Advisory Board for Aggie Athletics and as the chair of USU's Maverik Stadium renovation. He formerly served as the vice chair and chair of the Utah State Board of Regents. He also served as vice chair and chair of the USU Board of Trustees. He received a bachelor's in economics from USU, where he also completed post-graduate studies.

Report from the Educational Policies Committee March 10, 2016

The Educational Policies Committee met on March 3, 2016. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page.

During the March 3, 2016 meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of March 3, 2016 which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 49 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering in the College of Engineering to remove all emphases in the Electrical Engineering PhD was approved.
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of January 21, 2016 which included the following notable actions.

A. Excused Absence Policy

After a couple years of input from numerous constituencies, a final committee version of a revised excused absence policy was approved. The revised language for the general catalog is the following:

Attendance & Excused Absences

Introduction

Instructors set course content and structure and are responsible for determining if a student has met the minimum requirements for completion of the course. The university views class attendance as an individual student responsibility. Students are expected to attend class and to complete all assignments in accordance with individual instructor and course policies. The excused absence policy does not guarantee that a student's absences from a course will not negatively impact his or her success in the course. Furthermore, it is the student's responsibility to ensure that excused absences do not conflict with clearly established instructor policies on course attendance and participation.

There are multiple mechanisms that should be considered if absence from a class is necessary:

- **Incomplete (I) Grade:** If a student is unable to complete all of the coursework because of extenuating circumstances, a grade of "I" (Incomplete) may be submitted by the instructor. Refer to Incomplete policy for details.
- **Withdrawal:** Students may drop courses without notation on the permanent record through the first 20% of the class (i.e. 3 weeks of a 15-week term). If a student drops a course after that initial grace period, a "W" will be permanently affixed to the

- student's record. After 60% of the class is completed (i.e. 9 weeks of a 15-week term), the student's academic advisor must sign any drop request, and a "W" with a grade assigned by the instructor will be entered on the student's permanent record. Under normal circumstances, a student may not drop a course after 75% of the class is completed. (Check General Catalog for exact dates.)
- Excused Absence: An absence may be excused for the reasons and in accordance with the procedures outlined below. Students who are requesting an excused absence are expected to uphold the Student Code of Conduct.

Excused Absences

Reasons

A student requesting an excused absence is responsible for providing evidence to the instructor substantiating the reason for absence.

Excused absences may not exceed 20% of the class meetings.

Among the reasons absences are considered excused by the university are the following. Note that in accordance with Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Utah State University shall treat pregnancy and related conditions as a justification for an excused absence for so long a period of time as is deemed medically necessary by the student's physician. Questions about Title IX should be directed to the University Title IX Coordinator.

University Supported Participation

1. Participation in a university-sponsored or sanctioned activity.
2. Mandatory participation as a student-athlete in NCAA-sanctioned competition.

Injury, Illness, Medical Condition/Status

3. Injury, illness, or medical condition/status that is too severe or contagious for the student to attend class.

a. **Injury or illness of 3 or more days.** For injury or illness that requires a student to be absent from classes for three or more class meetings, the student should obtain a medical confirmation note from his or her medical provider. The Student Health & Wellness Center or an off-campus medical professional can provide a medical confirmation note only if medical professionals are involved in the medical care of the student. Medical documentation can be collected after the absence has occurred. The medical confirmation note must contain the date and time of the visit for the injury or illness and the medical professional's confirmation of needed absence.

b. **Injury or illness less than 3 days.** Faculty members may require confirmation of student injury or illness that is serious enough for a student to be absent from class for a period less than 3 or more class meetings. At the discretion of the faculty member, as

outlined in the course syllabus, injury or illness confirmation may be obtained through a note from a health care professional affirming the date and time of visit. Medical documentation can be collected after the absence has occurred.

- c. An absence for a non-acute (e.g., elective) medical service does not constitute an excused absence.
- 4. Major injury, illness, or medical condition/status in a student's immediate family (as defined in Policy 346.1 of the USU Policies Manual).
- 5. A death in a student's immediate family (as defined in Policy 346.1 of the USU Policies Manual).

Other Allowable Reasons

- 6. Required participation in military duties, including mandatory medical appointments for veterans and military personnel.
- 7. Mandatory admissions interviews for professional or graduate school, or internships, that cannot be rescheduled.
- 8. Religious holy day.
- 9. Participation in legal proceedings or administrative procedures that require a student's presence.

Procedures

Students may be excused from attending class on the day of a graded activity or when attendance contributes to a student's grade, for the reasons stated above or for other reasons deemed appropriate by the student's instructor. For reason #1 (Participation in a university sponsored or sanctioned activity) or #2 (Mandatory participation as a student-athlete in NCAA-sanctioned competition), a dean or vice president (or the designee) must provide a letter for the student to provide to instructors that verifies the student's absence as excused.

Student

Excused absence notifications should be provided to instructors as soon as possible. In some cases, such as athletics or other university-sponsored and sanctioned events with known schedules, instructors should be informed during the first week of classes. Instructors have the right to deny any request that exceeds 20% of class sessions.

To be excused, the student must notify his or her instructor in writing (acknowledged e-mail message is acceptable) prior to the date of absence if such notification is feasible. In cases where advance notification is not feasible (e.g. accident or emergency), the student must provide notification by the end of the second working day after the absence. This notification should include an explanation of why notice could not be sent prior to the class.

Accommodations sought for absences due to the observance of a religious holiday can be sought either prior to or after the absence, but not later than two working days after the absence. On request of the instructor, the student must provide additional documentation substantiating the reason for the absence, which is satisfactory to the instructor, within one week of the last date of the absence.

Instructor

Instructors are under no obligation to provide an opportunity for the student to make up work missed because of an unexcused absence.

If the absence is excused, the instructor must either provide the student an opportunity to make up any quiz, exam, or other work that contributes to the final grade or provide a satisfactory alternative by a date agreed on by the student and instructor. Students with an excused absence shall be “held harmless” and benefit from all classroom policies. In some cases, such as classes that include time-dependent group, field, lab, or studio work, instructors are not required to recreate a precisely equivalent experience, but should identify a suitable alternative that respects both their own and the student’s time and meets educational goals.

Any make-up work must be completed within 14 calendar days of the last day of the initial absence.

Appeal Procedures

A student may appeal an instructor’s decision that an absence is unexcused if the student believes either that he or she has presented the instructor with adequate substantiating evidence for an excused absence (as outlined in this policy) or that the instructor’s decision was arbitrary, capricious, or prejudicial. Any appeal must be initiated within three class days of the instructor’s decision. In the appeal process, the burden of proof shall be on the student. Any student appeal must be submitted to the following persons or bodies in the sequence listed below:

1. The head of the academic department in which the course is offered;
2. The dean or designee of the college in which the course is offered;
3. The Provost (in the case of an appeal by an undergraduate student), or the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (in the case of an appeal by a graduate student).

B. Family Member in Class Policy

By request of the faculty senate president, the committee reviewed the report from the Academic Freedom and Tenure committee that addressed the potential conflict of interest when instructors teach family members. Several concerns were voiced regarding the potential conflict of interest if family members take a class from a related professor:

- The potential for bias exists, but it is small.
- The issue would rarely be a problem.
- If the class in “conflict” is rarely taught, or a pre-requisite for additional courses, the resultant delay to student progress would not be acceptable.
- In many cases, it is not practical--nor more fair--to ask a DH, colleague, nor TA to grade a family member’s tests/quizzes. In some cases, such as a multiple-choice exam, it would not be difficult to grade fairly. In other cases, it would be very difficult (e.g., major writing assignment).

The committee discussed the ways in which the appearance of bias could be mitigated. Students can appeal any grade and there is currently a path for remedy in the student code. It was suggested that faculty be made aware of potential problems with teaching family members and be cautioned but the committee approved a motion to not craft specific policy regarding this issue.

3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of February 16, 2016.
Of note:

The following courses or syllabi were approved:

ARTH 3770 (CI)

402.10 SENATE ELECTIONS

10.1 Apportionment of Elected Faculty Positions

Annually, the Senate Committee on Committees shall apportion the number of elective Senate positions to the academic colleges, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, USU Eastern, Extension, and the Library in proportion to the number of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty.

| The minimum representation from each of these academic units shall be ~~one~~ two.

PROMOTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

POTENTIAL CODE CHANGES:

405.6.2 (2) Promotion advisory committee (PAC).

Following tenure, a faculty member may request, through a letter to the ~~department head or supervisor~~, that a promotion advisory committee be formed for him or herself. ~~Although promotion to full professor is not required, a PAC is required to be held within the first three years following tenure to apprise the faculty member of the opportunities and expectation related in regards to advancement.~~ The promotion advisory committee will be formed by the ~~department head or supervisor~~ following ~~after meeting with the faculty member~~ consultation with and receiving written and/or oral input from the faculty member and in consultation with the academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, within 30 days of receipt of the written request.

The promotion advisory committee shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and hold the rank of professor. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a committee chair other than him or herself and at least one member of the promotion advisory committee shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee.

The candidate may ~~submit a request~~ replacement of ~~to replace~~ committee members. If a request is made or a vacancy occurs for any other reason, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee following ~~meeting consultation~~ with the faculty member and consulting with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.

405.8.2 Faculty with Tenure

~~Although promotion to professor is not required~~ The PAC shall meet with the faculty member no later than the spring semester of the third year ~~Within three years following tenure, the promotion advisory committee shall meet with the faculty member. The meeting shall be held no later than the spring semester of the third year.~~ The purpose of the first PAC meeting ~~of the promotion advisory committee~~ is to provide guidance to the faculty member with regard to his or her performance relative to the criteria and qualifications for promotion to professor.

All promotion advisory committee members shall participate interactively in all committee meetings, either physically or by electronic conferencing. The promotion advisory committee ensures that the faculty member has an appropriate signed role statement and that his or her performance is evaluated relative to the role statement. An ombudsperson must be present in person or by electronic conferencing.

~~The promotion advisory committee is to ensure that the faculty member has an appropriate signed role statement and that his or her performance is evaluated relative to their role statement, in the context of meeting the criteria required for achieving promotion to the rank~~

~~of professor.~~ The faculty member may request additional meetings with the promotion advisory committee if desired.

When the faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion to professor, the promotion advisory committee shall meet upon request of the faculty member during the Spring semester prior to the academic year when the candidate's dossier would go forward ~~for promotion.~~

Within 30 days after any meeting with the faculty member to discuss promotion (but not the evaluative meeting in 405.8.3), the promotion advisory committee chair shall write a report on the guidance given to the faculty member based on the committee's discussion. All members of the promotion advisory committee and ombudsperson shall read and sign the final draft of the report. The report will then be sent to the candidate and his or her department head or supervisor, academic dean, the vice president for extension, or, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean.

A faculty member considering promotion to professor is strongly encouraged to consult with his or her department head or supervisor and academic dean to obtain ~~from them~~ additional guidance about the faculty member's readiness for promotion.

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

If the faculty member has asked to be considered for promotion to professor, the department head or supervisor will provide an evaluation of the candidate's progress towards promotion to professor and identify any areas requiring improvement in the candidate's performance, as necessary. Copies of the department head's or supervisor's report will be provided to the faculty member, the promotion advisory committee, the academic dean or vice president of extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, no later than 30 days following the meeting with the promotion advisory committee.

OVERVIEW TO PTR/PDP CODE EDITORIAL CLARIFICATION PROPOSAL

March 14, 2016 (post-faculty senate discussion)

After several years of discussion and debate, the USU Faculty Senate passed a major overhaul of the section of faculty code that governs the process for post-tenure review. The changes were approved by the President's Executive Committee and Board of Trustees, and are not official policy at USU.

Review of Changes Made to PTR

This change did not change the standard by which post-tenure performance would be evaluated, but did make significant changes to the process by which PTR would be conducted. Highlights of these changes include:

- **TIED TO ANNUAL REVIEWS:** Post-tenure review is now integrated into the annual review process. After receiving tenure, annual reviews of all tenured faculty will be conducted with a 5-year rolling window, and as part of the normal annual evaluation, an assessment of whether the faculty member's performance meets the standard¹ will be made.
- **PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) FORMED ONLY WHEN TRIGGERED.** Under the new system, a committee of peers will be constituted to conduct a more in-depth review of a post-tenure faculty member's performance only when the department has determined (in the annual review process) that the faculty is not meeting the PTR standard.
- **PRC MEMBERSHIP DETERMINED BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT.** Formerly the PRC (called a 'quinquennial review committee') was formed by a department head in consultation with the faculty member. The new rules require mutual agreement between the DH and faculty member.
- **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS:** The initiation of a PDP is now linked to the PRC's independent assessment that the faculty member is not meeting the PTR standard.

Need for Clarifications & Suggested Edits

When the original PTR proposal was discussed by the President's Executive Council in the early summer of 2015, Larry Smith (the Vice Provost) raised several concerns about the precise steps to be followed under the new code. At that time, the Executive Council approved the code change with the understanding that the Faculty Senate President (Douglas Jackson-Smith) would work with Larry Smith to review areas where the code language could be clarified or improved without substantively changing the nature or intent of the new process. Over the last year, a number of specific wording changes were developed, and these are now being brought to Faculty Senate for consideration.

The changes address two sections of code:

- **Section 406.12.2: "Post Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty"** – 11 proposed word edits that clarify the process, but that do not change the details of the process discussed and approved by the faculty senate last year.
- **Section 406.12.3: "Professional Development Plan"** – 8 more proposed edits. Some of these are merely editorial/language clarifications (#12, 14, 15, 17, 19). The remaining three (#13, 16, and 18) represent policy changes that are viewed by the Faculty Senate leadership team (and Provost's office) as ways to make the PDP process more efficient and effective. Because they represent policy decisions that go beyond the discussions on PTR from recent years, faculty senators are encouraged to read and discuss them carefully.

Details of the proposed changes follow below.

¹ "The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement."

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED EDITORIAL CHANGES TO PTR & PDP CODE

SECTION 12.2 Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty

- CHANGE 1** **Line 42: PROPOSE TO DELETE “or post-tenure decision”.**
It is not clear we need this clause – should be sufficient to just say the ‘year after the tenure decision’
- CHANGE 2** **Line 52: PROPOSE TO DELETE “To fulfill this requirement, and”...**
It is not obvious to everyone what ‘this requirement’ refers to, the action does not depend on the clause, and it seems nothing would be lost by cutting it.
- CHANGE 3** **Line 58: PROPOSE NEW WORDING FOR WARNING LETTER**
Reword the language to be used to in the formal warning letter. The previous text was felt to be too cumbersome and possibly a slight typo would be used as a source of unnecessary future grievances. The replacement text simply says to note in the letter that ‘this letter serves as the formal warning’ without going into as much detail.
- CHANGE 4** **Line 64: REPLACE the word ‘request’ with ‘notify the faculty member’**
It is not clear that a ‘request’ is being made at this stage. Rather, the notification should initiate the process of forming a Peer Review Committee. It was also not clear to whom the request should be made (or who should be notified). The proposal is to have the department notify the faculty member.
- CHANGE 5** **Line 64: SET DEADLINE: Require departmental notification to be made no later than April 1st.**
*To avoid treating faculty unfairly in the annual review process, nearly all departmental annual reviews will likely need to be completed before the due date to notify individual faculty that they are not meeting expectations. Based on feedback from different departments and colleges, April 1st is a reasonable deadline for departments to finish their annual review process. The original code change did not identify the deadline/date by which a department has to notify the faculty member of the results of a negative post-tenure review. It is worth noting that this will likely push the PRC process back into the summer. Currently there is a 2 week deadline to form the PRC, followed by a 3 week period to get the PRC materials, and 4 weeks for the PRC to conduct its review and hold a meeting. (9 weeks total).
Below we propose speeding up the process by reducing the allowable for PRC to review submitted materials (from 4 to 2 weeks) and specify a new maximum time (2 weeks) to allow for the PRC to issue their final written*

review to the faculty member, department head, etc. While the process could move more quickly, the longest it can take is 9 weeks from the department decision to request a PRC. If this begins April 1st, the PRC will need to meet by mid-May and it will be roughly the first week of June when they issue their decision.

CHANGE 6 **Line 65: ADD WORD “will” to make it clear that this will happen.**

CHANGE 7 **Line 68: ADD THE WORDS “independent of the annual review process”**
There was significant concern that people might read this paragraph as an ‘option’ to the process described in the preceding paragraph. It was never the intent of the FS to use the ‘optional’ PRC meeting as an alternative to (or response to) a formal departmentally-initiated PRC review. Adding this new phrase will make it less likely that future administrators or faculty will try to link these two processes. We might also clarify in a procedures document that our intent was not to encourage faculty to request a PRC after a warning letter to preempt the departmental formal decision the following year. Also – this voluntarily-created PRC would not have the power to initiate a PDP (because they would not have the depth of information that they might be provided in the event of a formally-triggered PRC review.

CHANGE 8 **Line 68: DELETE THE WORD “optionally”**
Again – this seemed to be a reference to an optional/alternative to the normal process described previous paragraph (not our intent). Deleting the word does not seem to alter the intended original meaning of the sentence.

CHANGE 9 **Line 103: REDUCE MAXIMUM TIME UNTIL PRC ACTUALLY HOLDS A MEETING from 4 to 2 weeks**
Since members of the PRC will have advanced notice that this material is coming, we believe that the committee should meet within 2 weeks of receiving the materials. This enables the process to more easily get resolved in the spring semester (depending on how fast other steps move).

CHANGE 10 **Line 110: ADD PHRASE: “Within two weeks of meeting, and...” to start of sentence**
It seems helpful to establish a deadline to ensure that the process move in a timely and efficient manner (in order to get the process possibly done from start to finish before faculty go off contract May 15th). Two weeks seems like a reasonable amount of time after the PRC meeting for them to draft their written findings. This was not specified in the code we passed in spring 2015.

CHANGE 11

Line 119: REPLACE PHRASE “no further action shall be required” WITH “no professional development plan shall be initiated”.

The phrase ‘no further action’ is vague and sweeping, and may not be meaningful in the event of a positive PRC review. What we know is that no PDP should be initiated if the PRC does not concur with the department about the faculty member’s post-tenure performance.

SECTION 12.3 Professional Development Plan

The changes above (section 12.2; changes #1-#11) are designed to clarify in code things that were either discussed and are consistent with the intent of changes made in the original PTR code reform passed by the faculty senate in 2015.

The material below (Section 12.3, Changes #12-#19) provides new suggestions for improving the PDP process and for clarifying the role of the PRC. The original PTR proposal we passed in 2015 did not change from current practices and the faculty senate has not yet debated or provided guidance on how to improve the PDP process. The three more substantive changes below (marked with asterisks **) reflect input from various people and could provide an attempt to use this moment to clarify and potentially improve the PDP process.

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| CHANGE 12 | Line 129: ADD SUBSECTION NUMBERS (also affects lines 152 and 160) |
| CHANGE 13** | Line 136: INSERT NEW TEXT instructing what to do if there is no mutual agreement.
<i>Suggested insertion parallels text and appeals process used for disagreement about formation of PRC. Relies on CFAC.</i> |
| CHANGE 14 | Line 142: DELETE REFERENCE TO POLICY 405.12.2 here.
<i>The referenced section covers the post tenure review process, not the PDP. The focus of this review should be only on the content of the PDP.</i> |
| CHANGE 15 | Line 143: DELETE EXTRA WORDS
<i>The words “of the” were accidentally duplicated in final code text passed last year.</i> |
| CHANGE 16** | Line 144: SET TIME LIMIT FOR PRC REVIEW OF PDP
<i>Insert text to provide a time limit for PRC review of the PDP. 3 weeks seems reasonable timeframe, especially if they are given advance notice.</i> |
| CHANGE 17 | Line 145: DELETE REDUNDANT TEXT AND COMBINE SENTENCES
<i>Process isn’t changed, just easier to understand.</i> |
| CHANGE 18** | Line 148: INSERT TEXT TO CLARIFY WHAT HAPPENS TO PRC REPORT
<i>Original code is ambiguous about what is to be done with the PRC feedback/report on a draft PDP. Our sense is that its purpose is to help inform the process of reaching mutual agreement on PDP content between the faculty member and department head/supervisor, so we crafted a brief clause to make this clear.</i> |
| CHANGE 19 | Line 149: SPLIT INTO TWO SENTENCES
<i>Because text was getting long – split this into 2 sentences.</i> |

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

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

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

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. This evaluation shall review the work of each faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with accreditation standards. In the case of tenured faculty, this evaluation shall encompass a multi-year window of performance that covers a five-year span. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. The annual evaluation and recommendation letter by the department head or supervisor developed for tenure-eligible faculty as part of the promotion and tenure process (405.7.1 (3)) may not serve as a substitute for this annual review letter. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review letter shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

12.2 Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty

Beginning the year after a faculty member's tenure-~~or post-tenure decision~~, the annual review process (405.12.1) shall also provide formal assessment on the post-tenure performance of tenured faculty. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate post-tenure performance. The basic standard for post-tenure review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to

Comment [DJ1]: CHANGE 1:

PROPOSE TO DELETE "or post-tenure decision"

Not clear we need this clause – should be sufficient to just say the 'year after the tenure decision'

48 acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing
49 expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion
50 to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.

51
52 | ~~To fulfill this requirement, and b~~ Beginning no earlier than 5 years after a faculty member is
53 promoted or awarded tenure, the department head or supervisor will be required in writing to
54 indicate as part of the annual review letter whether or not the faculty member is meeting the formal
55 standard for post-tenure review outlined above. If a department is concerned that a faculty member
56 is not meeting the post-tenure review standards, the department head or supervisor must indicate
57 this concern with regards to post-tenure performance initially by providing a formal written warning
58 to the faculty member. ~~To serve as the formal written warning this purpose, this letter must include~~
59 ~~a sentence stating: "Consider this letter a formal warning as per code 405.12.2 The department is~~
60 ~~concerned that, if performance does not improve, the department is likely to request the formation~~
61 ~~of a Peer Review Committee (PRC) to conduct a review of post tenure performance"~~ as outlined
62 below. If in the next annual review after issuing a formal written warning the department again
63 determines that the faculty member is not meeting the post-tenure review standard, the department
64 head or supervisor must formally ~~notify the faculty member request~~ in writing no later than April 1st
65 ~~that a Peer Review Committee (PRC) will be formed to provide an independent evaluation of~~
66 ~~whether the faculty member has met the post-tenure review standard.~~

67
68 | Independent of the annual review process, a ~~A~~ tenured faculty member ~~may optionally~~ request the
69 formation of a PRC to provide feedback on post-tenure performance, but such a request may not be
70 made more than once every five years nor earlier than five years after being promoted in rank or
71 granted tenure. The PRC will meet and review materials related to the 5-year performance of the
72 faculty member. The PRC role in this case is only to provide post-tenure performance feedback in
73 writing to the faculty member requesting the review.

74
75 The PRC shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater
76 than the faculty member being reviewed, and shall be formed by mutual agreement of the
77 department head or supervisor, and the faculty member being reviewed. The PRC must include at
78 least one member from outside the academic unit of the faculty member being reviewed. If there are
79 fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the
80 candidate, the committee members may be selected from faculty of related academic units.
81 Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed, and any other faculty
82 members formally involved in the departmental annual review decision that triggered the review,
83 shall not serve on the PRC without the faculty members consent, and no committee member may be
84 a department head or supervisor of any other member of the PRC. An administrator may only be
85 appointed to the PRC with the approval of the faculty member under consideration.

86
87 If mutual agreement about membership for the PRC cannot be reached within 2 weeks, the college
88 faculty appeals committee (CFAC) will be asked to form the PRC. If a CFAC does not exist,
89 individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to
90 resolve disagreements.

91
92 To carry out its review, the PRC shall be provided with a copy of the documentation used by the
93 department to evaluate the five-year performance of the faculty member in question. The
94 documentation provided to the PRC shall at a minimum contain: the department head or
95 supervisor's negative annual evaluation letter of the faculty member (405.12.1) and the warning

Comment [DJ2]: CHANGE 2

PROPOSE TO DELETE "To fulfill this requirement, and" ...

It is not obvious to everyone what 'this requirement' refers to, the action does not depend on the clause, and it seems nothing would be lost by cutting it.

Comment [DJ3]: CHANGE 3: Reworded the language to be used to in the formal warning letter. The previous text was felt to be too cumbersome and possibly a slight typo would be used as a source of unnecessary future grievances. The replacement text simply says to note in the letter that 'this letter serves as the formal warning' without going into as much detail.

Comment [DJ4]: CHANGE 4: replace the word 'request' with 'notify the faculty member'

It is not clear that a 'request' is being made at this stage. Rather, the notification should initiate the process of forming a Peer Review Committee.

It was also not clear to whom the request should be made (or who should be notified). The proposal is to have the department notify the faculty member

Formatted: Superscript

Comment [DJ5]: CHANGE 5: require departmental notification to be made by no later than April 1st.

To avoid treating faculty unfairly in the annual review process, nearly all departmental annual reviews will likely need to be completed before the due date to notify individual faculty that they are not meeting expectations. Based on feedback from different departments and colleges, April 1st is a reasonable deadline for ...

Comment [DJ6]: CHANGE 6: add word 'will' to make it clear that this will happen.

Comment [DJ7]: CHANGE 7: Add the words "independent of the annual review process"

There was significant concern that people might read this paragraph as an 'option' to the process described in the preceding ...

Comment [DJ8]: CHANGE 8: delete the word 'optionally'

Again - this seemed to be a reference to an optional/alternative to the previous paragraph. Deleting the word does not ...

96 letter that led to the forming of the PRC; the previous five annual written evaluations; the faculty
97 member's current role statement and curriculum vitae; other professional materials deemed
98 necessary by the faculty member; and any professional development plan in place. The PRC may
99 also receive a written statement from the department head or supervisor citing the reasons for
100 determining that the faculty member is not meeting the post-tenure review standard, as well as a
101 written statement from the faculty member under post-tenure review, outlining his or her response
102 to the department head or supervisor's negative post-tenure evaluation. These materials should be
103 provided to the PRC within 3 weeks of the appointment of the committee. Within 4-2 weeks after
104 receiving these materials, the PRC shall meet to discuss their evaluation of the faculty member's
105 post-tenure performance. At this meeting, the faculty member should be allowed to make oral
106 presentations to the committee. For any meeting held between the faculty member, the department
107 head or supervisor, and/or the PRC for the purposes of post-tenure performance review an
108 ombudsperson may be requested by the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, and/or
109 the PRC in accordance with policy 405.6.5.

111 Within two weeks of meeting and Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit its written
112 findings outlining the PRC's decision and rationale for determining whether the faculty member in
113 question is, or is not, discharging conscientiously and with professional competence the duties
114 appropriately associated with his or her position, as specified in the role statement. This written
115 report shall be provided to the faculty member in question, and to the department head or supervisor
116 who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where
117 appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. If the PRC determines that the faculty member is
118 meeting the standard for post-tenure performance, a written summary of the reasons for their
119 decision shall be provided to the faculty member, department head, and appropriate academic dean,
120 vice-president for extension, regional campus dean, or chancellor, and no further action shall be
121 required professional development plan (PDP) shall be initiated. If the PRC agrees with the
122 recommendation of the department that the faculty member in question is not meeting the standard
123 for post-tenure performance, a professional development plan shall be initiated as outlined in policy
124 405.12.3.

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

129 12.3 Professional Development Plan

131 (1) A determination by a Peer Review Committee (PRC) that a faculty member is not discharging
132 conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his
133 or her position as specified in their role statement shall lead to the negotiation of a professional
134 development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role expectations. The
135 plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit
136 subsequent alteration. The professional development plan shall be mutually agreed to and
137 signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor, and approved by the
138 academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or
139 regional campus dean. If mutual agreement about content of the PDP cannot be reached within
140 2 weeks, the college faculty appeals committee (CFAC) or other appropriate department,
141 college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve
142 disagreements.

Comment [DJ9]: CHANGE 9: Delete "4" and replace with "2" - Reduce this time to 2 weeks. Since members of the PRC will have advanced notice that this material is coming, we believe that the committee should meet within 2 weeks of receiving the materials. This enables the process to nearly always get resolved in the spring semester (depending on how fast other steps move).

Comment [DJ10]: CHANGE 10: Add "Within two weeks of meeting, and"

It seems helpful to establish a deadline to ensure that the process move in a timely and efficient manner (in order to get the process done from start to finish before faculty go off contract May 15th). Two weeks seems like a reasonable amount of time after the PRC meeting for them to draft their written findings. This was not specified in the code we passed in spring 2015.

Comment [DJ11]: CHANGE 11: Replace the phrase "no further action shall be required" with "no professional development plan shall be initiated"

The phrase 'no further action' is vague and sweeping, and may not be meaningful in the event of a positive PRC review.

What we know is that no PDP should be initiated if the PRC does not concur with the department about the faculty member's post-tenure performance.

Comment [DJ12]: THE CHANGES ABOVE (Sections 12.1 and 12.2 and Changes 1-11) ARE DESIGNED TO CLARIFY IN CODE THINGS THAT WERE EITHER DISCUSSED AND ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE INTENT OF CHANGES MADE IN THE ORIGINAL PTR CODE REFORM PASSED BY THE FACULTY SENATE IN 2015.

THE MATERIAL BELOW (Section 12.3, Changes 12-19)) PROVIDES NEW SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE PDP PROCESS AND FOR CLARIFYING THE ROLE OF THE PRC. THE ORIGINAL PTR PROPOSAL DID NOT CHANGE FROM CURRENT PRACTICES AND THE FACULTY SENATE HAS NOT YET DEBATED OR PROVIDED GUIDANCE ON HOW TO IMPROVE THE PDP PROCESS. THE

Comment [DJ13]: CHANGE 12: Add subsection numbers

Comment [DJ14]: CHANGE 13: Insert text instructing what to do if there is no mutual agreement. Suggested insertion parallels text used for formation of PRC.

At the request of the faculty member, department head or supervisor, the professional development plan may be reviewed by the PRC, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation, ~~as described in policy 405.12.2,~~ including an analysis of the ~~of the~~ goals or outcomes, or any other features of the professional development plan. The PRC shall complete their review within 3 weeks. Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit ~~its~~ written findings outlining the PRC's decision and rationale for determining whether the professional development plan is appropriate. ~~This written report shall be provided~~ to the faculty member in question, and to the department head or supervisor for their use in negotiating a mutually acceptable plan. ~~A who shall forward a copy of their written findings shall also be forwarded~~ to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean.

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

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

Comment [DJ15]: CHANGE 14: Delete reference to policy 405.12.2 here.

The referenced section covers the post tenure review process, not the PDP. The focus of this review should be only on the content of the PDP.

Comment [DJ16]: CHANGE 15: Delete extra words (somehow kept in final text last spring)

Comment [DJ17]: CHANGE 16: Insert text to provide a time limit for PRC review of the PDP. 3 weeks seems reasonable.

Comment [DJ18]: CHANGE 17: delete redundant text and combine sentences.

Comment [DJ19]: CHANGE 18: insert text to clarify what is to be done with the PRC report on the draft PDP. Our sense is that its purpose is to help inform the process of reaching mutual agreement on PDP content between the faculty member and department head/supervisor.

Comment [DJ20]: CHANGE 19: Because previous sentence was getting long, split this off to a separate sentence.

Scholar of the Year

The Scholar of the Year Award is given each year to recognize and emphasize excellence in scholarship. Other service and student activity involvement may ~~be become a consideration in~~ be considered in the selection process, but the main emphasis will be on scholarly achievement.

~~Each college The~~ dean is to appoint a committee ~~with students, faculty, and administrative representation~~ to select an outstanding student scholar from each college. ~~The Provost's Office The Robins Award Committee~~ will ~~then~~ appoint a committee to select the Scholar of the Year from the eight college nominees. The person is recognized at the annual Robins Award on XXX.

~~The nominee should be receiving a bachelor's degree at this year's commencement exercises.~~

Criteria

~~The recipient shall have participated in the following manner:~~

- ~~1. Achieved outstanding academic success.~~
- ~~2. Evidence of scholarly activities such as:~~
 - ~~a. Completed undergraduate research~~
 - ~~b. Awarded an URCO or other grant for undergraduate research~~
 - ~~c. Participated as a Writing Fellow, Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Teaching Fellow, Research Assistant, Supplemental Instruction (SI) Leader, etc.~~
 - ~~d. Participation in performances or other artistic endeavors~~
 - ~~e. Presentations at professional conferences~~
 - ~~f. Publications~~
 - ~~g. Participation in the Honors Program~~
 - ~~h. Participation in professional or scholarly organizations~~
 - ~~a.i. Completion of a senior project or thesis~~
- ~~2. Inspired other students through exemplary conduct.~~
- ~~3. Developed interest and expertise outside of academic area.~~
- ~~4. Made a significant, lasting contribution to the department, college, general campus, and community.~~
- ~~5. Exhibited traits of maturity, sincerity, and dependability.~~
- ~~6. Been well-liked by students, faculty, and staff.~~
- ~~7. Developed personal talents and abilities in a significant manner.~~
- ~~8. Furthered personal and professional goals through widespread academic, social, and extra-curricular involvement.~~

Nomination Materials

In order to provide greater uniformity in the nomination materials provided to the Committee, the following must be prepared, with a maximum of 15 pages total length, approximately 12 pt. font. Materials must be submitted in PDF format via [electronic form](#).

1. A ~~nomination~~ letter written by the faculty member best suited to address the students' scholarly achievements, including the impact of their scholarly work. from the Dean of the college or designee.
2. ~~Transcript of credits.~~
3. A narrative sSummary of the scholarly work (written by the student), including a discussion of the impact of the work. academic and extra-curricular involvement at Utah State University and in the community.
4. ~~One letter of support from a professor.~~
4. A summary of service and student activity involvement.
5. Transcript of credits.
6. Curriculum vitae.
- 6-7. A short biography (2 paragraph maximum).
- 7-8. A professional portrait.

Scholar of the Year

The Scholar of the Year Award is given each year to recognize and emphasize excellence in scholarship. Other service and student activity involvement may be considered in the selection process, but the main emphasis will be on scholarly achievement.

Each college dean is to appoint a committee to select an outstanding student scholar from each college. The Provost's Office will appoint a committee to select the Scholar of the Year from the eight college nominees. The person is recognized at the annual Robins Award on XXX.

Criteria

1. Achieved outstanding academic success.
2. Evidence of scholarly activities such as:
 - a. Completed undergraduate research
 - b. Awarded an URCO or other grant for undergraduate research
 - c. Participated as a Writing Fellow, Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Teaching Fellow, Research Assistant, Supplemental Instruction (SI) Leader, etc.
 - d. Participation in performances or other artistic endeavors
 - e. Presentations at professional conferences
 - f. Publications
 - g. Participation in the Honors Program
 - h. Participation in professional or scholarly organizations
 - i. Completion of a senior project or thesis

Nomination Materials

In order to provide greater uniformity in the nomination materials provided to the Committee, the following must be prepared, with a maximum of 15 pages total length, approximately 12 pt. font. Materials must be submitted in PDF format via [electronic form](#).

1. A letter written by the faculty member best suited to address the students' scholarly achievements, including the impact of their scholarly work.
2. A narrative summary of the scholarly work (written by the student), including a discussion of the impact of the work.
3. A summary of service and student activity involvement.
4. Transcript of credits.
5. Curriculum vitae.
6. A short biography (2 paragraph maximum).
7. A professional portrait.