

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

4-4-2016

## Faculty Senate Agenda, April 4, 2016

Utah State University

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Agenda, April 4, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 478.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/478](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/478)

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





## **FACULTY SENATE AGENDA**

April 4, 2016

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154

### **Agenda**

---

- 3:00 Call to Order**..... Ronda Callister  
Approval of Minutes March 14, 2016
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President  
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**  
1. New Criteria for Scholar of the Year.....Janet Anderson  
2. 402.12.7(1) Name change Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year  
Award..... Tom Lachmar  
3. HR code change Policy 350 Educational Benefits..... BrandE Faupell  
4. Solicitation for Faculty Senate President-Elect Nominations..... Ronda Callister
- 3:40 Reports**  
1. EPC Items for March 2016..... Larry Smith  
2. Honorary Degrees and Awards..... Sydney Peterson  
3. Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report..... Diane Calloway-Graham  
4. Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee..... Jerry Goodspeed
- 3:55 Unfinished Business**  
1. 402.10.1 Reapportionment fix for missed section (Second Reading)..... Ronda Callister
- 4:00 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
- 4:30 Adjournment**



**USU FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
March 14, 2016  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

**Call to Order**

Ronda Callister called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of February 1, 2016 were adopted.

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

The legislative session has just recently ended. The President will not be visiting each college individually, but will instead send out an email to all faculty and staff detailing the outcomes of the session. The final budget allocations impacting USU include:

- 2% merit based compensation increase (additional 1% health benefits)
- \$38 million for the new USU Science building
- \$1.2 million for market demand programs and the graduate initiative at USU
- \$5 million (one-time) for performance funding, system-wide
- \$950,000 to support USU Extension water conservation research initiative
- \$100,000 for expansion of the USU Assistive Technology Lab (to Roosevelt)
- \$250,000 for continued air quality research at the USU Bingham Research Center (Vernal)

The Presidential Search is underway. The search committee is being formed, the Chair will be from the Board of Regents and Co-Chaired by someone from the Board of Trustees. Candidates should be coming to campus during Fall Semester.

Provost Cockett updated the Senate on the CHaSS Dean's Search. The search committee has met and identified 6 applicants to pursue. They will be holding airport interviews in the near future with successful applicants coming to campus in mid-April.

**Information Items**

**FEC Recommendations on IDEA – Tom Lachmar.** The FEC recommends staying with the current electronic format, and wants to make faculty and departments aware of a few features that can be customized to better suit individual needs. They acknowledge that IDEA is not ideal for all courses; it does not work well in small classes and supports the suggestion of AAA Director Michael Torrens of a lower threshold of 5 respondents.

**Athletics Council Membership 105.2.1(2) – Ronda Callister/Paul Barr.** It is the opinion of the Athletics Council that the faculty representation on the Council remain as it is currently constituted. This will allow faculty representation on all three of the sub committees of the Athletics Council.

**Open Access Policy 586.1 – Mark McLellan.** Changes to this policy bring USU into compliance with federal requirements established in 2013.

**Sexual Harassment Code Revisions 339/305 – Stacy Sturgeon & Krystin Deschamps.** Changes to this policy are for the interim while 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. 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.

Stacy and Krystin asked for a non-binding vote of support, which was unanimous.

### **Reports**

**EPC Report – Larry Smith.** Ed Reeve very briefly presented the report in Larry's absence. 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.

**Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee – Diane Calloway-Graham.** Diane was not in attendance, no summary of the report was given.

**Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee – Cinthya Saavedra.** Cinthya highlighted information provided in the report on female faculty by rank/tenure.

Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to accept all of the reports. The motion was seconded by Vince Wickwar and passed unanimously.

### **Unfinished Business**

#### **405.12.3 CFAC Policy (Second Reading) – Ronda Callister.**

Jeffrey Dew made a motion to approve the policy and Charles Waugh seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### **New Business**

**PTR Edits – Ronda Callister/Doug Jackson-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 and Doug have worked with Larry Smith to develop clarifications. Doug presented and explained each of the changes, most being simple grammatical corrections and minor rewording to make the code more clear and concise. Changes that concern deadlines were discussed at length. Doug clarified that a vote today would be to send the proposed changes to PRPC to draft the code language and then it would come back to the senate for further discussion before being passed as part of the code.

A motion was made to send all of the proposed edits to PRPC by Mark McLellan. A second was received and the motion passed unanimously.

**405.6.2(2) and 405.8.2 CFAC Policy (Second Reading) – Ronda Callister.** Time did not allow for discussion of this agenda item.

**402.10.1 Reapportionment fix for missed section (First Reading) – Ronda Callister.** This change is simply correcting an omission to this line in the code when the change was made and approved earlier.

Vince Wickwar made a motion to approve the first reading and Bob Mueller seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Prior to adjournment, Ronda asked if there were any volunteers willing to serve on a task force to help the student government review a new "no test week" policy. They would like to have faculty input before they push it forward through the approval process. Please contact her if interested.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

## 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~~ 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.

## **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](http://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](http://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 on the Human Resources 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.

## **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)

**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.

## **Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Fall 2015 Summary Report**

Diane Calloway-Graham, Chair (16) Sociology, Social Work, & Anthropology  
Michael Pate (17) Agriculture/Applied Sciences  
Alan Stephens (16) Business  
Leslie Timmons (16) CCA  
Dale Wagner (18) Education & Human Services  
Koushik Chakraborty (18) Engineering  
Chris Monz (17) Natural Resources  
Stephen Bialkowski (16) Natural Resources  
Carol Kochan (17) Business  
Joanne Roueche (16) Extension  
Rich Etchberger (16) Regional Campuses  
Mike Kava (17) USU Eastern

This report covers the activities of the BFW committee for the Fall 2015.  
Meetings: October 7, 2015 (in-person); November 3, 2015 (e-mail communication)  
Diane Calloway-Graham was asked to serve as chair starting Fall 2015. Recently Joanne Roueche informed the committee that her will be retirement is set for January 15, 2016 and Dr. Ken White will be appointing a replacement.

### **Facts and Discussions:**

The duties of the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee are to (1) participate in the budget preparation process, (2) periodically evaluate and report to the Senate on matters relating to faculty salaries, insurance programs, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, consulting policies, and other faculty benefits; (3) review the financial and budgetary implications of proposals for changes in academic degrees and programs, and report to the Senate prior to Senate action relating to such proposals; and (4) report to the Senate significant fiscal and budgetary trends which may affect the academic programs of the University. ([Policy 402.12.4](#) )

### **Main Items discussed at the BFW meeting for Fall 2015 include:**

- Review of Financial Issues Documents (financial crisis and financial exigency) – Vincent Wickwar and Rhonda Callister attended in order to facilitate an understanding of the most recent documents surrounding policy and procedures for financial crisis and financial exigency. Discussion centered on how to react to budget cuts quickly and the consultation pieces of the policy as represented in the flow chart created.
- Review of the Health & Safety Policy – Mark McLellan attended our meeting and shared with us the policy for resetting our thinking about how we ensure safety and improve safety on campus among students, faculty, and employees. He explained that the context for resetting our thinking about how to ensure safety was regarding an accident at ULCA in 2008. We discussed the structure and responsibilities, which now contain a broader umbrella for improving safety on campus among students, faculty, and employees.
- Ronda Callister, Faculty Senate President discussed the reducing of faculty senate committee sizes. She wanted us to be aware that service work obligations

have increased and there are twice as many assignments as faculty senators available to fulfill them. The current term for faculty senators is 3 years.

- Follow-up review of Health & Safety Policy – Jeff presented USU's draft safety policy to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for discussion on Monday, November 2, 2015. He received feedback that the policy is still more lab centric than they would like it. Jeff requested that the BFW committee give more feedback as the policy has had several changes since our meeting October 7, 2015 when we initially reviewed it and gave feedback. We elicited feedback via e-mail regarding how to make the policy more inclusive.

The BFW Meeting held February 27, 2015 included the following topics for discussion.

- Discussion of the code revision produced by the PRPC for changes in Section 405 of the code regarding Post Tenure Review. Two issues were addressed: (1) whether the code revision written by PRPC follows the direction given to PRPC, and (2) an evaluation of the code revision in contrast to the current code or the current code with modifications. The consensus to those attending the meeting is that the proposed code change is not in the best interests of the faculty. There was a memo sent to the FSEC on March 16, 2015 summarizing the two issues considered by the BFW.

The BFW held three meetings in Fall 2014 on September, 26, 2014; October 24, 2014; and December 3, 2014.

- Topics of discussion during the 09-26-14 meeting included the RCDE to RC change and the implication for college and department budgets and faculty compensation; reported mistreatment of the lecturer ranks with respect to ACA; a lively discussion on salary compression; and Post Tenure Review with respect to the Regents code.
- Topics of discussion during the 10-24-14 meeting included consideration of the RCDE to RC change and the implication for college and department budgets and in particular faculty compensation with a focus on creating a consistent salary and role statement model; the problem of salary compression and BFW's dissatisfaction with trusting administrators to do the right thing; and limits on class sizes as the University with the growing population of students and faculty time commitments.
- Topic of discussion during the 12-3-14 meeting focused on extra service compensation where Mark McCellan presented the work that he and his committee did on ESC to bring the policy in line with federal guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Calloway-Graham, BFW Chair



**BFW Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, October 7, 2015**

**Attending:** Diane Calloway-Graham, Ronda Callister, Koushik Chakraborty, Rich Etchberger, Carol Kochan, Mark McLellan, Chris Monz, Joanne Roueche, Leslie Timon, Dale Wagner, and Vincent Warwick.

- Introduction of Members
- Topics of Discussion
  - Discussion and review of revised **Financial Issues Documents** (financial crisis and financial exigency).
    - Vince Warwick discussed how the documents addressed budget cuts in reference to the process of reacting to these situations as quickly as possible.
    - There is also a consultation piece that is now addressed in the flow chart.
    - The BFW committee asked clarifying questions for future conversations surrounding financial issues.
  - Presentation and discussion of the revised **Health & Safety Policy**, which is on the faculty agenda for November 2015.
    - Mark McLellan presented this to the BFW committee. Action for the policy is set for the December faculty senate meeting.
    - The context for this policy is related to an accident at ULCA, which reset the thinking about how we ensure safety and improve safety on campus among students, faculty, and employees.
    - We reviewed the structure and responsibilities, which are encased in a larger umbrella.
    - It seems that classified employees are a larger concern to address in the document.
  - Discussion of reducing faculty senate committee sizes led by Faculty Senate President, Ronda Callister.
    - There are many service obligations on campus.
    - There are now twice as many assignments as faculty senators who stay in for a three-year term.
    - This will continue to be an ongoing dialog as ideas and solutions are being determined.

Memo: To FSEC

From: BFW

Date: March 16, 2015

Subject: Post Tenure Review

Members attending: Vicki Allan, Stephen Bialkowski, Rich Etchberger, Carol Kochan, Chris Monz, Ilka Nemere, Michael Pate, Christopher Skousen, Alan Stephens, Dale Wagner

The BFW committee met Friday February 27, 2015 to discuss the code revision produced by PRPC.

This memo is NOT to be considered the final statement of BFW regarding the proposal to change Section 405 of the code. We address two issues below: 1) whether the code revision written by PRPC follows the direction given to PRPC, and 2) an evaluation of the code revision in contrast to the current code or the current code with modifications.

Issue 1: Did PRPC do its job?

- BFW fully endorses the comments of John Stevens Chair of AFT. Professor Stevens states:

“Regarding context, it seems like the AFT, BFW, and FEC committees are being asked to verify that the proposed code changes accurately reflect the package that was sent from the faculty senate to PRPC. If we respond positively (or negatively), it could be incorrectly viewed as approval (or disapproval) of the content with respect to the committee's respective jurisdictions. For example, even if AFT unanimously felt that the proposed code changes would negatively affect academic freedom or the concept of tenure, but also unanimously conceded that the proposed code changes did accurately reflect the package PRPC was given, our response to this specific invitation could be interpreted (out of context) as unanimously positive.”

“Regarding jurisdiction, it really isn't within AFT jurisdiction to double-check that PRPC has done its job. Code says that AFT "will review, for consideration by the Senate, all matters pertaining to faculty rights, academic freedom, and tenure." Any review done by AFT should (and will) focus on those aspects alone. I'm a little concerned that if we do that, though, our response may be disregarded (or worse, misrepresented) since in your email you specifically say that you're not inviting

feedback on the content of the proposal, just how the draft "reflects the will of the senate."

- BFW for its part notes that our charge, in part, "is periodically evaluate and report to the Senate on matters relating to faculty salaries, insurance programs, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, consulting policies, and other faculty benefits." Of particular note is the evaluation of other faculty benefits of which any diminution of faculty rights under the code are of particular concern. Thus as Professor Stevens notes: "it really isn't within BFW's jurisdiction to double-check that PRPC has done its job."
- With respect to the PRPC code revision we note that two issues should be addressed.
  - That for all meetings between a faculty member and a committee, an ombudsperson must be present.
  - If we are going to persist with the fiction that the "department" not the Department Head does the evaluations with respect to PTR then the "department" must meet as a body once per year to ensure PTR standards are understood and applied.
  - BFW agrees with AFT on items b and c of their response dated March 6, 2015

#### Issue 2: Evaluation of the code revision.

- The "will of the senate" is supposedly presented in the code revision, however as Professor Stevens notes: "That January faculty senate meeting was unnecessarily rushed and uncivil. Senators were interrupting, talking over others, and misusing rules of order (such as repeated inappropriate applications of "calling the question" to prematurely end discussion)."
  - The central issue with the January meeting was the one-sided nature of the presentation that dealt only with the proposal coming out of FSEC committee. That is, all the senate did was modify the proposal coming out of the FSEC and then pass it along "as the will of the senate". At that point PRPC's hands were tied. However, there was no effort to examine the existing code and make the same sort of revisions. It simply sat by itself as the unwanted step child, ignored and with no defense.
  - As has been provided to FSEC multiple times, it is possible to tweak the existing code, with little effort, which will eliminate the problems of administrative interference and keep a faculty right with the faculty. This solution has been largely ignored by FSEC.
- The proposal continues to transfer a faculty right to an administrator, i.e., the department head.

- The proposal makes special effort to remove the term Department Head and replace it with Department. While in theory it is the department that makes evaluation decisions, this is largely a fictional structure and it is, in fact, the DH that makes all evaluative decisions.

As one member of BFW observed, “in all reviews, evaluations and salary discussions, FACULTY have been taken out of the process and we are enabling one more cut to faculty input.”

- Given that DHs, who are hired by and subject to the deans of the colleges, it may be expected that DHs would be in favor of the code change. However, there is evidence that DHs are not in favor of such a change.
- The proposal continues to be punitive rather than collaborative and includes no incentives. Thus the proposal has a serious incentive misalignment problem.
- The proposal is unnecessarily complex.
  - The single benefit that has been identified for this proposal is that it will reduce faculty workload. That is, faculty will not have to meet every 5 years to collaboratively work with their colleagues.
    - As our very young charges would say “REALLY!” Are we willing to admit that we are too lazy or incompetent to fulfill our duty to the academic community and that instead we, the faculty, are willing to rely on administrators whose allegiance is to the administrative structure and not necessarily to the faculty.
    - Are we willing to forego the idea that “Faculty status and related matters, such as appointments, reappointments, nonrenewals of appointments, terminations, dismissals, reductions in status, promotions, and the granting of tenure are primarily a faculty responsibility?” (401.8.1(3))
- The consensus of those attending the BFW meeting on February 27 is that the proposed code change is not in the best interests of the faculty.

# **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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 dinform 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.<sup>5</sup>

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.

## **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 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 will be formed shall meet with the faculty member no later than the spring semester of the third year following tenure and it is recommend that a meeting be held at this time.~~ ~~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 as stated in the candidate's current signed role statement.

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.

## 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, that a promotion advisory committee be formed for him or herself. The promotion advisory committee will be formed by the department head following 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 request replacement of 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** 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 will be formed no later than the spring semester of the third year following tenure and it is recommend that a meeting be held at this time.** The purpose of the first PAC meeting 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 **as stated in the candidate's current signed role statement.**

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

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 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 28, 2016 UPDATE

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 standard<sup>1</sup> 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 405.12.2: "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. – **reviewed and approved in March Senate Meeting**
- Section 405.12.3: "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. – **discuss at April FS mtg**

**WE ADDRESSED 405.12.2 last meeting – THIS WEEK WE WILL FOCUS ON 405.12.3.**

<sup>1</sup> "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 PDP CODE

### 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.

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>CHANGE 12</b>   | <b>Line 129: ADD SUBSECTION NUMBERS (also affects lines 152 and 160)</b>  |
| <b>CHANGE 13**</b> | <b>Line 136: INSERT NEW TEXT</b> instructing what to do if there is no mutual agreement.<br><i>Suggested insertion parallels text and appeals process used for disagreement about formation of PRC. Relies on CFAC.</i>   |
| <b>CHANGE 14</b>   | <b>Line 142: DELETE REFERENCE TO POLICY 405.12.2 here.</b><br><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>  |
| <b>CHANGE 15</b>   | <b>Line 143: DELETE EXTRA WORDS</b><br><i>The words “of the” were accidentally duplicated in final code text passed last year.</i>  |
| <b>CHANGE 16**</b> | <b>Line 144: SET TIME LIMIT FOR PRC REVIEW OF PDP</b><br><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>   |
| <b>CHANGE 17</b>   | <b>Line 145: DELETE REDUNDANT TEXT AND COMBINE SENTENCES</b><br><i>Process isn’t changed, just easier to understand.</i>  |
| <b>CHANGE 18**</b> | <b>Line 148: INSERT TEXT TO CLARIFY WHAT HAPPENS TO PRC REPORT</b><br><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> |
| <b>CHANGE 19</b>   | <b>Line 149: SPLIT INTO TWO SENTENCES</b><br><i>Because text was getting long – split this into 2 sentences.</i>  |

## 405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

### 12.3 Professional Development Plan

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

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

**Commented [DJ1]:** 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 CHANGES BELOW REFLECT INPUT FROM VARIOUS PEOPLE AND COULD PROVIDE A FIRST CUT AT CLARIFYING AND POTENTIALLY IMPROVING THE PDP PROCESS.

**Commented [DJ2]:** CHANGE 12: Add subsection numbers

**Commented [DJ3]:** CHANGE 13: Insert text instructing what to do if there is no mutual agreement. Suggested insertion parallels text used for formation of PRC.

**Commented [DJ4]:** 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.

**Commented [DJ5]:** CHANGE 15: Delete extra words (somehow kept in final text last spring)

**Commented [DJ6]:** CHANGE 16: Insert text to provide a time limit for PRC review of the PDP. 3 weeks seems reasonable.

**Commented [DJ7]:** CHANGE 17: delete redundant text and combine sentences.

**Commented [DJ8]:** 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.

**Commented [DJ9]:** CHANGE 19: Because previous sentence was getting long, split this off to a separate sentence.

48 presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. At the request of the faculty  
49 member, department head, or supervisor, this report may be reviewed by the PRC, who shall  
50 conduct an in-depth evaluation as described in 405.12.2, including an analysis of the fulfillment  
51 of the goals or outcomes, or any other features included in the professional development plan.  
52 Upon completion of its review, the PRC shall submit a written report of its findings to the  
53 faculty member, to the chancellor or campus dean, and to the academic dean or vice president  
54 for extension.