

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

12-2-2013

## Faculty Senate Agenda, December 2, 2013

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, December 2, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 523.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/523](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/523)

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 MEETING  
December 2, 2013  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154  
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

---

### Agenda

---

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Yanghee Kim  
Approval of Minutes October 7, 2013
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President  
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Consent Agenda**.....Yanghee Kim
1. Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report – Karen Mock
  2. Athletic Council Annual Report – Ken White
  3. EPC Items for October and November – Larry Smith
  4. ASUSU Report – Doug Fiebia
  5. Retention and Student Success – John Mortensen
- 4:00 Information Items**.....Yanghee Kim
1. Notes from the Faculty Forum Nov 4
- 4:10 Old Business**
1. PRPC Code 402.12.7 changes to wording in faculty awards  
(Second Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
- 4:15 New Business**
1. PRPC Section 402.4.3 changes to wording in FS meeting order of business  
(First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
  2. PRPC Section 405.6.1 changes to wording in role statement and role assignment  
(First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
  3. PRPC word changes from ASUSU to USUSA to 400 all sections  
(First Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski



**USU FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
October 7, 2013  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

**Call to Order**

Yanghee Kim called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of September 9, 2013 were approved.

**Announcements – Yanghee Kim**

**Roll Call.** Members are reminded to sign the role sheet at each meeting.

**Broadcasting All FS Meetings.** The microphones are open in the room and very sensitive. Please keep aside conversations and paper rustling to a minimum.

**Inclusive Excellence Symposium.** Thursday, October 10, 2013 go link for further information: <http://www.usu.edu/diversity/inclusiveexcellence/>

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

President Albrecht was not in attendance at this meeting. Provost Cockett briefly addressed the Senate in his absence. There were no items for University Business.

**Consent Agenda Items – Yanghee Kim**

**Education Policies Committee Annual Report  
Libraries Advisory Council Report  
Parking Committee Report  
Honors Program Report  
September EPC Items**

There were questions for James Nye, Director of Parking Services, regarding how much work is done between the Parking Committee and the sustainability council. James answered that the Transportation Subcommittee meets with the council monthly, and they are working on initiatives to increase carpooling and shuttle services to reduce the demand on parking space across campus. There was also a request for the Parking Operation Budget and that this budget should be included in the Parking Committees reports to the Senate from here forward. James indicated that he would get it to Joan Kleinke for distribution to the Faculty Senate.

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Information Items**

**Proposed Changes to the Honors Program – Noelle Cockett.** Provost Noelle Cockett presented the recent history and proposed changes to the Honors Program. Cuts were proposed to the Honors Program during the recent round of budget cuts. President Albrecht was not comfortable cutting the program and saw the need to bring about meaningful changes to the program. He invited the Dean of Honors at the University of Utah to visit and observe the program in Fall 2011. Her recommendations were; 1) make it more visible to the students and 2) improve program retention.

These recommendations lead to many discussions across campus resulting in the proposed changes outlined in Noelle's PowerPoint presentation. (You will find the presentation attached to these minutes. Please refer to it for more details.) Changes include Honors Students taking breadth and depth courses that will not only meet program requirements but also USU graduation requirements, and involvement in at least 3 co-curricular activities each year. The Colleges and Departments will have some latitude in deciding what the activities will look like to best fit their particular areas of study. The Honors Department will track student progress of academic requirements and co-curricular activity involvement.

Program implementation and development will take time, probably on a four year roll-out schedule. Noelle explained that a new program director is needed and will be found via an internal search. It will likely be a 50% time position and would encourage applications and nominations for the position from the faculty.

**Section 406 Task Force Update on Proposed Revisions – Vince Wickwar.** The section 406 Task Force began meeting in February 2012. After 19 long meetings they prepared a draft revision of section 406, mostly reordering sections and clarification corrections. They have taken into consideration all of the feedback offered on the issue from BRW and AFT and revised the proposal accordingly. The proposal was presented to FSEC at the last meeting and will now go to PRPC for review and word-smithing and then will be presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

**Disposition of Unfinished Business Items – Yanghee Kim.** Yanghee updated the Senators on the decisions made by the FSEC at the last meeting concerning these items:

- **Post Tenure Review.** The Task Force expressed a desire to draft and present a revised proposal to the FSEC October 21. Disposition of this item will be discussed at the FSEC meeting.
- **Restructuring Faculty Senate Committees.** This issue will continue on the FS agenda this year.
- **USU Eastern Concerns.** This issue is reportedly resolved and will not continue on the FS agenda.
- **Intellectual Property.** This is under the 500 section of the code which Faculty Senate does not have jurisdiction over. It will not continue on the agenda.

#### **Action Items**

**PRPC Section 402 Language changes for RCDE USU Eastern and Elimination of GSS (Second Reading) – Terry Peak.** No discussion.

A motion to pass the second reading of changes to Section 402 was made by Glenn McEvoy and seconded by Steve Mansfield. The motion passed unanimously.

**PRPC Section 402.12.7 FEC working on what follows “decide university awards” (First Reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.** Stephen will clarify the exact titles of the awards for the second reading at the December meeting.

Scott Bates moved to approve the first reading. A second was received and the motion was approved with a friendly amendment to include the exact titles of the awards for the second reading.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 pm.

# **2013 Annual Report**

## **Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**

### **Report Table of Contents**

	<b><u>page</u></b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Summary of Activities</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Discussion of Activities</b>	<b>2-5</b>
<b>Agendas and Minutes</b>	<b>6-26</b>
<b>Attachment 1: One-Year Benchmarking Study</b>	
<b>Attachment 2: Revised nomination guidelines</b>	

**Prepared by Karen Mock, Chair**

## INTRODUCTION

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

### **402.12.7 Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**

#### **(1) Duties.**

*The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall*

- (a) assess methods for evaluating faculty performance;*
- (b) recommend improvements in methods of evaluation; and*
- (c) decide university awards for Professor and Advisor of the Year.*

#### **(2) Membership.**

*The committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each academic college, Regional Campus, USU-CEU, Extension, and the Library, two student officers from the ASUSU and one student officer from the GSS. The faculty representatives are elected to the committee in accordance with policy 402.11.2. The committee will elect a chair annually, preferably at the last meeting of the academic year.*

#### **Committee Members 2012-2013**

	<b>Term ends</b>
Alan Stephens, Business	2015
Anne Mackiewicz, USU Eastern	2014
Arthur Caplan, Agriculture	2015
Jeffrey Banks, Extension	2016
Joan Kleinke, ex-officio	n/a
Kacy Lundstrom, Libraries	2013
Karen Mock, Natural Resources (chair)	2014
Karen Woolstenhulme, Regional Campuses and Distance Education	2015
Michael Lyons, Humanities and Social Sciences	2014
Oenardi Lawanto, Engineering	2015
Thomas Lachmar, Science	2014
Thomas Rohrer, Arts	2013
Yanghee Kim, Education	2013
Jordan Hunt, ASUSU	2013
Christian Orr, ASUSU	2013
Zack Portman, ASUSU	2013

#### **Meeting Dates 2012-2013**

September 19, 2012	January 16, 2013
October 17, 2012	February 20, 2013
November 14, 2012	March 20, 2013
December 12, 2012	April 17, 2013

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

## **SUMMARY OF FEC ACTIVITIES 2012-2013**

The FEC was concerned with three primary topics:

- 1) Interpretation of results from the IDEA system for teaching evaluation
- 2) Other means of teaching evaluation (e.g., peer evaluations)
- 3) Selection of Teachers and Advisors of the Year and modification of future packet guidelines for these awards

A summary of FEC accomplishments this year include:

- 1) Increasing meeting frequency to monthly instead of twice per semester,
- 2) A set of “data mining” questions which could be addressed using the USU IDEA results,
- 3) A Benchmarking Study of IDEA results, comparing USU to its peer institutions within the IDEA database,
- 4) Construction of a Canvas course for USU faculty access to teaching portfolios, self-assessment statements, and peer evaluations posted by other USU faculty members,
- 5) Selection of the Teacher of the Year and the Advisor of the Year, and
- 6) Recommended revision of guidelines for Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year nomination packets.

## **DISCUSSION OF FEC ACTIVITIES 2012-2013**

### ***1) FEC meeting frequency***

Last year, the FEC met approximately twice per semester, and was focused primarily on the implementation of IDEA, which had just been adopted. Based on feedback from the Faculty Executive Committee (Fall 2012) in response to the 2011-2012 FEC Annual Report, the FEC increased its meeting frequency to monthly and began to consider a broader range of topics related to evaluation.

### ***2) IDEA teaching evaluation***

*Data mining:* The IDEA instrument was recommended by the FEC in past years, following the evaluation of several other instruments and a detailed pilot study, and was launched in Fall 2011. Although implementation rates across USU colleges and campuses were not uniform, the FEC was interested to know how the collective results might be used over time to better understand teaching trends across campus. Working with Michael Torrens in the USU Office of Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation (AAA), FEC vetted many possible ‘data mining’ questions. This list of questions is expected to be finalized at the October 2013 FEC meeting. The current list of questions is as follows:

- 1) How do scores vary by instructor demographic, rank, enrollment size, course level, and class size?
- 2) Do live courses score better/worse than broadcast courses or hybrids?

- 3) Do General Education courses score better/worse than other courses?
- 4) Do courses vary by which learning objectives are chosen?
- 5) What is the distribution of the number of learning objectives chosen, and how does that vary by College/Discipline/Course level?

*Faculty Survey on IDEA:* One of the tasks initiated by FEC in 2011-2012 was a faculty survey about the implementation of IDEA. The questions proposed for the survey had not been finalized as of Spring 2012. There was general agreement among FEC members that the purpose of the proposed survey was not to question whether IDEA should be used, but to focus on how it should be implemented. This year the FEC opted not to pursue this survey until more training had been done and the faculty had more experience with the instrument. Discussion about the need for a survey of faculty and Department Heads regarding the implementation of IDEA and interpretation of IDEA results is continuing.

*Response rates:* Information from IDEA is most useful, both for the instructor and the institution, if response rates are high. The FEC discussed the use of various incentives (including a small amount of course credit) to accomplish this. There were general concerns among committee members about the impact of course evaluations on course rigor (an issue beyond the IDEA scope), the impact of incentives on the survey, and the potential loss of anonymity if student responses are tracked. We considered a faculty survey on the use of incentives and how those were correlated with response rates for various types of courses (e.g., across enrollment sizes, academic levels). However, after discussion with Michael Torrens about this, the committee decided that these issues were premature, since a) IDEA had just recently been implemented, b) active training sessions were underway, and c) the response rates so far have been higher than initially expected. A faculty survey on incentives will be considered during the spring 2014 by FEC, depending on trends in response rates since 2011.

*IDEA implementation:* The IDEA instrument, while more statistically powerful and nationally normed (in contrast to the teaching evaluation instrument previously used by USU), is considerably more complex, both in terms of initiation by instructors (e.g., choosing teaching objectives) and interpretation by instructors and administrators. This complexity caused frustration which was expressed at the 2012 Faculty Forum. In order to address this frustration, FEC members queried faculty members in their colleges informally on questions/concerns about IDEA. The responses reflected many misunderstandings about the IDEA system, how the instrument is designed to work, and how IDEA is administered at USU. This confusion is currently being addressed in the training sessions being offered through AAA, and communication between the FEC and Michael Torrens (representing AAA) about faculty concerns is ongoing. Overall, faculty were confused about:

- the need to choose a limited number of learning objectives,
- the ability to determine when IDEA was delivered to students and how frequently reminder notices went to students,
- the ability to add custom questions,
- the difference between “raw” and “adjusted” scores,



- the recommendation by IDEA that the survey results NOT be the only, or even the major source of information when faculty teaching performance is evaluated.

*Benchmarking study:* One of the concerns commonly expressed by faculty is that the IDEA database, against which USU is compared, includes many small colleges which are not research institutions, have far smaller class sizes, have instructors whose primary role is teaching. There was concern that this might not be a valid comparison for USU as a large land-grant university. The FEC was interested to know how USU compared just to peer institutions. A set of 8 peer institutions within the IDEA database was identified, primarily based on land-grant status.

These included\*:

- California State University – Stanislaus
- Kansas State University
- Louisiana State University – Alexandria
- Northern Arizona University
- South Dakota State University
- Texas A&M University- Central Texas
- University of Alaska Anchorage
- University of Rhode Island

*\*note: USU agreed not to provide the names of these institutions in any marketing or public relations material.*

Working with AAA, the FEC requested a One-Year Benchmarking Report comparing USU against these peer institutions with respect to IDEA results. This report arrived during the summer 2013, and is provided as an attachment of this report. The Benchmarking report will be reviewed and summarized by the FEC this year.

### **3) Other means of teaching evaluation**

The FEC discussed the need for faculty to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness/excellence beyond the IDEA results in Tenure and Promotion packets and annual reviews. One type of evidence is peer evaluations, although these are commonly not very substantive, and therefore, not very useful either to the instructor or for evaluating the instructor. Another way to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness/excellence is through a teaching portfolio. USU frequently provides workshops on teaching portfolios, which include helpful information on peer reviews, but there was a sense among FEC members that faculty were not always using these resources. The FEC decided to create a Canvas course, accessible to USU faculty (password-protected), where examples of teaching portfolios and peer evaluation letters could be posted as a resource to faculty preparing tenure and promotion documents. The course was created “Faculty Evaluation Resources” and documents have begun to be posted by College. At present, this course is only available to FEC members, but the course will be made available to faculty in the future, once it is populated with more material. The FEC intends this mechanism to be more efficient than the exchange of hard copies of binders that currently occurs among faculty. The following disclaimer is on the course home page:

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

#### **4) Teacher and Advisor of the Year**

The FEC reviewed nomination materials for the Eldon H. Gardner Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year annual awards, and selected the following:

Teacher of the Year: Marlene Israelsen, Agriculture (Nutrition, Dietetics & Food Sciences)

Advisor of the Year: Laurie McNeill, Engineering (Civil & Environmental Engineering)

The FEC found the nomination materials to be quite different among the nominees, as in past years, and therefore drafted changes to make these packets more efficient and more comparable in the future. These recommendations have been provided to the Provost’s office and are also provided as an attachment to this document. We anticipate that these changes will be in place for the 2104 awards.

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, September 19, 2012**  
**NR 204 10:00am**

1) Introductions

<b>Name</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Other</b>
Alan Stephens	Business	-
Anne Mackiewicz	Education & Human Services	USU Eastern/RCDE
Arthur Caplan	Agriculture	-
Jeffrey Banks	-	Extension
Joan Kleinke	-	Provost-->AAA-->ex-officio
Kacy Lundstrom	-	Library
Karen Mock	Natural Resources	Chairperson
Karen Woolstenhulme	Business	RCDE
Michael Lyons	CHaSS	-
Oenardi Lawanto	Engineering	-
Thomas Lachmar	Science	-
Thomas Rohrer	Arts	-
Yanghee Kim	Education & Human Services	-
Jordan Hunt	-	ASUSU Academic Senate President
Christian Orr	-	ASUSU Student Advocate
Zack Portman	-	ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator

2) Review of FEC charge:

From Policy 402.12.7:

“The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall

- (1) assess methods for evaluating faculty performance;
- (2) recommend improvements in methods of evaluation;
- (4) decide university awards for Professor and Advisor of the Year.

The committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each academic college, Regional Campus, USU-CEU, Extension, and the Library, two student officers from the ASUSU and one student officer from the GSS. The faculty representatives are elected to the committee in accordance with policy 402.11.2. The committee will elect a chair annually, preferably at the last meeting of the academic year.”

3) Approve 2012-2013 Committee Report for the Senate Executive Committee:

Due October 1<sup>st</sup> to Joan Kleinke

Presented at Faculty Executive Committee October 15<sup>th</sup>

Need a substitute presenter – K.Mock will be out of town.

Presented to Faculty Senate December 3<sup>rd</sup>

4) Discuss FEC meeting times/frequency:

Over the past 2 years, the FEC has only met once or twice per semester. Should we set up monthly meetings on a regular schedule, and cancel them as they approach if we really don't need to meet or can handle business by email?

5) Criteria for Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year Robins Award criteria and binder formats:

Current criteria available here:

[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/teacher\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/teacher_of_the_year.cfm)

And here:

[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/advisor\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/advisor_of_the_year.cfm)

Should these be revised?

6) Faculty Survey about IDEA:

Pam Martin (FEC chair 2011-12) had started a draft survey (attached). We need to revisit the purpose of the survey and work on the draft survey to make sure the questions are straightforward and the answers informative.

7) Other Issues?

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

19Sep12, 10-11 a.m. NR 204

(first meeting for Fall 2012)

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)(remote connection)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension) (remote connection)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)

Absent:

Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Student President)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Zack Portmann (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)

- 1) Reviewed membership roster for accuracy.
- 2) Reviewed FEC purpose from faculty code.
- 3) Reviewed draft 2012-2013 report to Faculty Executive Committee; agreed that KM would fill in information from today's meeting and circulate final version for approval.
- 4) Requested substitute to present report to Faculty Executive Committee: Arthur Kaplan agreed to make this presentation (3pm Champ Hall)
- 5) Discussion of purpose and contents for faculty survey on IDEA implementation: most discussion about response rates and how to create incentives to increase these. KM will update draft questions and circulate to committee for feedback.
- 6) Discussion of FEC meeting times: general agreement that monthly meetings should be scheduled at a regular time/place; at each meeting will determine need for next meeting. KM will circulate a Doodle poll about a regular time.
- 7) Criteria for Robins awards: will discuss at next meeting.
- 8) Items for next meeting:
  - a. Further discussion of faculty survey contents
  - b. Discussion of Robins awards criteria
  - c. Discussion of need for a prospective study to understand how incentives work (KM will query Michael Torrens for existing studies on this)

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, October 17, 2012**  
**10:30 – 11:30am NR 204**

- 8) Approve minutes from September 19, 2012 meeting
- 9) Discuss ideas from the Faculty Executive Committee meeting (Monday Oct. 15) that emerged in response to the presentation of our annual report and decide how to proceed with respect to a faculty survey
- 10) Criteria for Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year Robins Award criteria and binder formats:  
Current criteria available here:  
[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/teacher\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/teacher_of_the_year.cfm)  
And here:  
[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/advisor\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/advisor_of_the_year.cfm)  
  
Do these need to be revised?

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

7Oct12, 10:30-11:45 a.m. NR 204

(second meeting for Fall 2012)

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Glenn McEvoy (invited guest representing Faculty Senate Executive Committee)

Absent:

Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern Price)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)

9) Approved minutes from 19Sep12 FEC meeting

10) Discussion of ideas from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting (FSEC, Monday Oct. 15) that emerged in response to the presentation of our annual report and decide how to proceed with respect to a faculty survey

Glen, Yanghee and Arthur provided a review of the discussion at FSEC regarding the FEC. There was recognition that 2011-12 was the first full year of IDEA implementation and that the FEC met infrequently during that time period. Glenn (with input from others) provided a history of the adoption of IDEA for those committee members who were not FEC members throughout that process. This history included the rationale to go with an online format and a nationally normed instrument with short and long options possible. Glen's impression from an FEC meeting in Fall 2011 was that the FEC would be following the implementation of the IDEA instrument with more active involvement, surveying both faculty and students about the evaluations. The FSEC encouraged the FEC to take on broader tasks than those described in the 2011-12 Faculty Senate Report.

A lively discussion ensued about the use and unintended consequences of faculty evaluations, including both faculty and student perspectives. From this discussion a list of issues/concerns was developed. Karen Mock has assembled this list and will be gathering relevant information about each of them for the next meeting.

The Committee identified a preliminary list of focal areas which could organize and guide our activities through the coming academic year. These focal areas could be addressed via surveys, focal groups, data mining, and/or committee recommendations, and would become areas for reporting in Fall 2013. These focal areas will be discussed and finalized at the next meeting, incorporating comments from the Faculty Forum.

11) Reminders:

Faculty Forum Monday November 5<sup>th</sup> 3:00- 4:30 TSC Auditorium

Next scheduled FEC meetings:

Wed. Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> 10:30-11:30 NR204

Wed. Dec. 12<sup>th</sup> 10:30-11:30 NR204

12) Items for next meeting:

- a. Discuss feedback from Faculty Forum
- b. Discussion of need for revision of Robins awards criteria



**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, November 14, 2012**  
**10:30 – 11:30am NR 204**

- 11) Approve minutes from October 17, 2012 meeting
- 12) Criteria for Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year Robins Award criteria and binder formats:  
Current criteria available here:  
[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/teacher\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/teacher_of_the_year.cfm)  
And here:  
[http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors\\_and\\_awards/faculty/advisor\\_of\\_the\\_year.cfm](http://www.usu.edu/provost/honors_and_awards/faculty/advisor_of_the_year.cfm)  
Do these need to be revised?
- 13) Identify focal areas for the remainder of the year, incorporating input from the Faculty Forum (November 5, 2012), the Provost, and the Faculty Executive Committee (Monday Oct. 15). Potential focal areas:
  1. Make recommendations about **'mining' the emerging IDEA data** (working with Michael Torrens)
    1. How does USU rank with respect to other institutions?
    2. Which learning objectives are usually chosen in which kinds of courses?
    3. Are there common features of courses/instructors that are in the upper and lower percentiles?
    4. Others..
  2. Identify **continuing faculty educational needs** for IDEA (working with Michael Torrens)
    1. Flexible windows of survey delivery
    2. Identification of peer institutions
    3. Ability to add questions
    4. Others..
  3. Make recommendations to faculty about the **use of incentives** to increase response rates
    1. Survey faculty about incentive use/opinions, correlate with response rates
  4. Make recommendations to faculty about conducting **peer evaluations**
  5. Make recommendations to faculty about assembling **teaching portfolios**
- 14) Set regular meeting time for Spring 2013: (second Wed. 10:30-11:30?)

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

14Nov12, 10:30-11:45 a.m. NR 204

(third meeting for Fall 2012)

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)

Absent:

Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)

13) Approved minutes from October 17, 2012 FEC meeting

14) Agreed that criteria for Robins Awards were sufficient and did not need to be changed.

15) Identified and discussed four focal areas to guide our activities through the remainder of the academic year.

Focal Area #1: **IDEA survey**: Providing input from faculty to Michael Torrens regarding:

- i. Data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results
- ii. Continuing educational needs regarding IDEA survey (among faculty)
- iii. Next step: identify a subset of FEC members who could meet several times with Michael Torrens and report back to committee

Focal Area #2: **Teaching portfolios**: Make exemplar teaching portfolios available from USU faculty (e.g. posting on a website) Next step: KM and KL will work together to determine most appropriate means of making these available and getting the word out, given existing websites and teaching resources.

Focal Area #3: **Peer evaluations**: AC wanted to make a presentation at the next FEC meeting on peer evaluations, and will circulate an example to the committee via KM. At that time we will consider whether the FEC should take on the task of making recommendations to faculty about conducting peer evaluations.

Focal Area #4: **Role statements:** There was a great deal of concern at the Faculty Forum about role statements and the meaning of percentages with respect to work loads and evaluation. The BFW Committee has been discussing this issue and there may be a way that our committees could work together on this (e.g. inviting BFW Chair to FEC meeting, having a joint meeting of these committees to discuss this issue...). AS will send an email to the BFW Committee chair to inquire about their interest in this and what the role of the FEC might be in this regard.

16) Reminders:

Next scheduled FEC meeting:

Wed. Dec. 12<sup>th</sup> 10:30-11:30 NR204

Tentative agenda:

Presentation from AC on Peer Evaluations

Report from KM & KL on web venues for exemplar teaching portfolios

Report from AS on BFW needs/activities wrt role statement issues (is this an appropriate area for FEC to become involved in?)

Decision on monthly FEC meeting time Spring 2013

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, December 12, 2012**  
**10:30 – 11:30am NR 204**

15) Approve minutes from November 14, 2012 meeting

16) Finalize meeting times Spring 2013:

**January 16: 9:30-10:30**

**February 20: 9:30-10:30**

**March 20: 9:30-10:30**

**April 17: 9:30-10:30**

**All meetings are scheduled for NR204**

17) Discuss progress on focal areas:

Focal Area #1: **IDEA survey**: Providing input from faculty to Michael Torrens regarding:

- i. Data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results
- ii. Continuing educational needs regarding IDEA survey (among faculty)
- iii. Next step: identify a subset of FEC members who could meet several times with Michael Torrens and report back to committee

***Progress since November meeting: Karen Mock, Jordan Hunt, and Anne Mackiewicz met with Michael Torrens for about 2 hours on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup> to discuss these items. Notes from the meeting are attached. Need to:***

- identify a couple of additional people that can serve on this subcommittee***
- discuss other data mining questions for MT***
- determine whether benchmark data should be requested***

Focal Area #2: **Teaching portfolios**: Make exemplar teaching portfolios available from USU faculty (e.g. posting on a website) Next step: KM and KL will work together to determine most appropriate means of making these available and getting the word out, given existing websites and teaching resources.

***Progress since November meeting: KL made a nice list of websites which have information about teaching portfolios (attached). KM met with Janis Boettinger to ask about an appropriate website for posting exemplar teaching portfolios – Janis suggested including teaching portfolios as a component of a Canvas course being built for faculty. Need to:***

- KL and KM need to get enrolled in the Canvas course to determine whether this is a good venue (KM waiting for Janis B on this)***
- Identify a couple of additional people that can work on this as a subcommittee***

Focal Area #3: **Peer evaluations**: AC wanted to make a presentation at the next FEC meeting on peer evaluations, and will circulate an example to the committee via KM. At that time we will consider whether the FEC should take on the task of making recommendations to faculty about conducting peer evaluations.

***AC will make a presentation to the FEC on peer evaluations and determine the best path forward for the FEC in this arena.***

Focal Area #4: **Role statements:** There was a great deal of concern at the Faculty Forum about role statements and the meaning of percentages with respect to work loads and evaluation. The BFW Committee has been discussing this issue and there may be a way that our committees could work together on this (e.g. inviting BFW Chair to FEC meeting, having a joint meeting of these committees to discuss this issue...). AS will send an email to the BFW Committee chair to inquire about their interest in this and what the role of the FEC might be in this regard.

*Progress since November meeting: KM attended the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting on Dec. 10<sup>th</sup>, where there was discussion of this issue. FSEC will be requesting that BFW look into the issue of “role assignments”, which are different from “role statements”. “Role assignments” are teaching loads and other assignments assigned by the Department Head. “Role statements” are percentages of evaluative weight given to different areas (teaching, research, service) when promotions are considered. These can be in conflict, but “role statements” are an evaluation issue and “role assignments” are an issue between the Dept. head and the faculty member. AS will provide a perspective from BFW.*

*Need to:*

- Decide whether role statements are something the FEC wants to take on this year*

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)  
12Dec12, 10:30-11:45 a.m. NR 204  
(fourth meeting for Fall 2012)

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)

Absent:

Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)

17) Approved minutes from November 14, 2012 FEC meeting

18) Finalized meeting times for Spring 2013 (third Wednesdays, NR204):

January 16: 9:30-10:30

February 20: 9:30-10:30

March 20: 9:30-10:30

April 17: 9:30-10:30

19) Discussed progress on focal areas:

Focal Area #1: IDEA survey: Working with Michael Torrens on data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results

- a. Discussed meeting with Michael Torrens (KM,JH,AM) on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup>
- b. Decided to request a “benchmarking” report from IDEA through Michael Torrens. FEC members will review the list of IDEA institutions and identify the institutions that seem to be most similar to USU (e.g. land grant institutions). FEC members will send ranked lists of these institutions to KM, who will compile these and make the request to Michael Torrens.
- c. Reviewed and refined exploratory questions to be addressed with IDEA database:
  - i. Both Raw and Adjusted scores for USU are higher, on average, than the IDEA database (the most recent data – fall 2012 - will be available in January)
  - ii. Response rates by Department and Logan vs. RCDE vs. USUE are available (the most recent data – fall 2012- will be available in January)
  - iii. How do scores vary by faculty demographics and rank, course enrollment size, course level, and class size?
  - iv. Do live courses score better/worse than broadcast courses? Hybrids?
  - v. Do Gen Ed courses score better/worse than other courses?
  - vi. Do courses vary by which learning objectives are chosen?
  - vii. What is the distribution of the number of learning objectives chosen?

- viii. What is the distribution of the specific learning objectives chosen? How does this vary by College/Discipline?
  - ix. How do evaluation scores vary with the average grade in the course?
  - x. How do evaluation scores vary with response rates?
- d. Decided to query faculty within our colleges to identify additional interesting questions/correlates to explore, with the goal of producing a brief report to the Faculty Senate by the end of Spring 2013.

Focal Area #2: Teaching portfolios: KM discussed meeting with Janis Boettinger (Provost's Office), who suggested that exemplar teaching portfolios and resources (e.g. KL list of resources) be included in a Canvas course for faculty (currently under development), so that it would be password protected and could be dynamic. KM and KL will continue to work with Janis on this and will report back to the FEC on this in January.

Focal Area #3: Peer teaching evaluations: AC presented a sample letter resulting from a peer teaching evaluation, and the elements and format were discussed. ML suggested a shorter format or executive summary that might be more useful to administrators. A suggestion was made to include information on and examples of peer evaluations in the Canvas course (see Focal Area #2).

Focal Area #4: Role statements/role assignments: We acknowledged that the Faculty Senate and possibly the BFW Committee might be taking up this issue soon, and we decided to wait to take action on this until our January meeting.

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, January 16, 2013**  
**9:30 – 10:30am NR 204**

18) Approve minutes from December 12, 2012 meeting

19) Reiterate meeting times Spring 2013:

**January 16: 9:30-10:30**

**February 20: 9:30-10:30**

**March 20: 9:30-10:30**

**April 17: 9:30-10:30**

**All meetings are scheduled for NR204**

20) Discuss progress on focal areas:

Focal Area #1: **IDEA survey**: Providing input from faculty to Michael Torrens regarding:

- i. Data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results
- ii. Continuing educational needs regarding IDEA survey (among faculty)
- iii. Next steps:
  1. identify a **subset of FEC members** who could meet couple of times with Michael Torrens and report back to committee
  2. discuss other data mining questions for Michael Torrens based on any faculty feedback to FEC members (see previous minutes for current list)
  3. determine which institutions we would like to include in our request for a “benchmarking” report via Michael Torrens.

Focal Area #2: **Teaching portfolios**: KM and KL working on an FEC Canvas “course” targeting tenure track faculty.

- i. Need input from committee on finding good exemplars of teaching portfolios.

Focal Area #3: **Peer evaluations**: Make exemplar teaching portfolios and resources available from USU faculty

- i. Need a **couple of FEC members** to take on collecting and assembling some exemplar peer evaluations and resources for posting on the FEC Canvas course (see above).

Focal Area #4: **Role statements**: There was a great deal of concern at the Faculty Forum about role statements and the meaning of percentages with respect to work loads and evaluation.

- i. Need update from Alan Stephens about BFW activities in this arena.



Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

16Jan13, 9:30-10:30 a.m. NR 204

(first meeting for Spring 2013)

Present:

Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)

Absent:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)

20) Approved minutes from December 12, 2012 FEC meeting

21) Reviewed schedule for Robins Awards:

Feb. 15, 2013 ToY and AoY packets due to Provost's office  
Feb.18, 2013 packets scanned and available to FEC members (perhaps by Big File Transfer)  
Mar.20, 2013 FEC meets to make decision on Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year

22) Discussed progress on focal areas:

Focal Area #1: IDEA survey: Working with Michael Torrens on data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results

- a. JH, AM, KM working to assemble a list of peer institutions from the IDEA institutions for a "benchmarking" study of IDEA results.
- b. JH, AM, KM working to assemble IDEA "data mining" questions for Michael Torrens, adding to existing list based on faculty input.

Focal Area #2: Teaching portfolios: KM and KC will construct a Canvas course ("Teaching Evaluation Resources") designed to provide examples of teaching portfolios, peer evaluations, and other resources to faculty who are going up for promotion (associate or full). FEC members will be provided with a link to the course so we can get it populated. KM asked FEC members to query their tenured faculty to see whether we will have enough examples to post.

Focal Area #3: Peer teaching evaluations: See above re Canvas course. AC will send out an example email asking faculty for peer evaluations that we can use to send out to our respective units.

Focal Area #4: Role statements/role assignments: No action since no update on BFW activities.

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, February 20, 2013**  
**9:30 – 10:30am NR 204**

21) Approve minutes from January 16, 2013 meeting

22) Reiterate meeting times Spring 2013:

**March 20: 9:30-10:30** (Robins Award decision to be made)

**April 17: 9:30-10:30**

**Both meetings are scheduled for NR204**

23) Teacher of the Year and Faculty Advisor of the Year awards

1. Review criteria
2. Nomination access, confidentiality
3. To be decided at March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting

24) Discuss progress on focal areas:

Focal Area #1: **IDEA survey:**

1. Finalize list of institutions for the one-year “benchmarking” study via Michael Torrens  
See IDEA information on this type of study: (see Benchmarking Study handout)  
<http://www.theideacenter.org/services/student-ratings/benchmarking>
2. Finalize list of data mining questions for Michael Torrens (see Data Mining handout)

Focal Area #2/3: **Teaching portfolios & Peer evaluations:** KM, KL, AC working on an FEC Canvas “course” targeting tenure track faculty.

- a. FEC member enrollment in “course”: link available, materials being uploaded
- b. Need additional input from all units with respect to teaching evaluations beyond the IDEA instrument – in particular, examples of teaching documentation (including portfolios) and peer evaluations

Focal Area #4: **Role statements:** There was a great deal of concern at the Faculty Forum about role statements and the meaning of percentages with respect to work loads and evaluation.

- a. Need update from Alan Stephens about BFW activities in this arena

20Feb13

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

20Feb13, 9:30-10:30 a.m. NR 204

(second meeting for Spring 2013)

Present

Alan Stephens

Anne Mackiewicz

Arthur Caplan

Jeff Banks

Kacy Lundstrom

Karen Mock

Michael Lyons

Oenardi Lawanto

Thomas Lachmar

Thomas Rohrer

Yanghee Kim

Jordan Hunt

Zack Portman

Absent

Joan Kleinke

Karen Woolstenhulme

Christian Orr

25) Approved minutes from January 16, 2013 meeting

26) Next meeting: March 20, 9:30-10:30 NR204

Robins Award decision to be made.

FEC members should come to the meeting with candidates ranked all the way down for

Both categories of awards.

Provost's office will mail USB sticks to all FEC members with the nomination packets for both awards, along with a return envelope. Packets also available in Old Main 114.

Discussion about next year's criteria and format will occur at Mar.20 meeting.

M.Lyons made the point that many of the materials to demonstrate effective teaching are in electronic format (e.g. radio interviews, video...), suggested accommodating those in the Teacher of the Year packets next year.

27) Discuss progress on focal areas:

**Focal Area #1: IDEA survey:**

1. Reviewed list of institutions for the one-year "benchmarking" study via Michael Torrens. AK suggested narrowing these to only land grant institutions. KM will make this list and send it to the group.
2. Reviewed draft list of data mining questions for Michael Torrens; KM, AM, ML, and JH will work on refining these in response to Michael Torrens' feedback. OL offered to clarify the third question.

**Focal Area #2/3: Teaching portfolios & Peer evaluations:** KM, KL, AC working on an FEC Canvas "course" targeting tenure track faculty. KC offered to send request for material to the faculty participants in a recent Seldin workshop on peer evaluations. KM requested additional materials from other FEC representatives.

**Focal Area #4: Role statements:** There was a great deal of concern at the Faculty Forum about role statements and the meaning of percentages with respect to work loads and evaluation. BFW will take this up, but possibly not in the next 2 months. AS will keep FEC posted.

There was discussion about recent BFW activity regarding faculty evaluations. AS offered to forward information about this to the FEC.

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, March 20, 2013**  
**9:30 – 10:30am NR 204**

28) Approve minutes from February 20, 2013 meeting

29) Next meeting:

**April 17: 9:30-10:30, NR204**

30) Teacher of the Year and Faculty Advisor of the Year awards

1. Review criteria
2. Selection
3. Need for confidentiality
4. Suggestions for criteria revisions

31) Progress on focal areas: will be discussed at April meeting.

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)  
20Mar13, 9:30-10:30 a.m. NR 204

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)

Absent:

Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)

- 23) Approved minutes from February 20, 2013 meeting
- 24) Reviewed and made a decision on the Teacher of the Year and Advisor of the Year
- 25) Reviewed and discussed changes to nomination materials for next year; KM will draft changes based on this discussion and distribute to the committee
- 26) Tabled other items until next meeting: April 17, 2013 9:30-10:30 NR204

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**Wednesday, April 17, 2013**  
**9:30 – 10:30am NR 204**

- 32) Approve minutes from March 20, 2013 meeting
- 33) Select time for next year's meetings
- 34) Select chair for next year's meetings
- 35) Approve modified criteria for 2014 Teacher and Advisor of the Year award
- 36) Discussion of progress on focal areas:

**Focal Area #1: IDEA survey:**

Approve list of institutions for the one-year benchmarking study (land grants):

University of Alaska - Anchorage  
Kansas State University  
New Mexico State University  
University of Rhode Island  
South Dakota State University  
California State University – Fresno  
Purdue University – Calumet – pending  
Louisiana State University – Alexandria  
Texas A&M University – Central Texas  
Northern Arizona University (not landgrant, but peer)

**Focal Area #2/3: Teaching portfolios & Peer evaluations:** Need additional materials from other FEC representatives (or provide KM with appropriate contacts).

- 37) Summer reading:
  - 1. Michael Torrens' analysis of IDEA data so far by college: [usu.edu/aaa/idea\\_fec\\_analysis.cfm](http://usu.edu/aaa/idea_fec_analysis.cfm)
  - 2. IDEA research paper #50 ([http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/idea-paper\\_50.pdf](http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/idea-paper_50.pdf))
  - 3. Washington Post article on evaluating teachers  
(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/02/23/the-key-to-evaluating-teachers-ask-kids-what-they-think/?print=1>)

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)  
17April13, 9:30-10:30 a.m. NR 204


Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Roosevelt)  
Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)

Absent:

Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)

- 27) Approved minutes from March 20, 2013 meeting.
- 28) Approved (via email poll) Karen Mock to continue term as chair next year.
- 29) Approved modified criteria for Teacher and Advisor of the Year – AC suggested including links for list of faculty.
- 30) Approved list of institutions for the benchmarking study to be forwarded to Michael Torrens. Some reservations about the smallness of Purdue-Calumet and TAMU-Central Texas.
- 31) For Teaching portfolios & Peer evaluations (Canvas site) – discussed need to have more examples posted, especially since many were recently tenured. KM requested assistance from FEC members – at a minimum a list of names to contact about these materials from each college.



Insight. Improvement. Impact. ®

# IDEA Benchmarking for Learning: One-Year Report

Summary for:

Utah State University

Report date: 4/25/2013

---

## Table of Contents

1: How to Use This Report	2
2: Report Summary	3
3: Overall Progress on Learning	4-5
4: Frequency of Learning Objective Selection	6-7
5: Progress on Learning	8
6: Teaching Method Emphasis	9
7: Student Characteristics	10-11
8: Summary Ratings of Effectiveness	12
9: Faculty Ratings of Other Impacts on Learning	13



## 1: How to Use This Report

---

The *IDEA Benchmarking for Learning: One-Year Report* allows campuses to compare their student ratings results to a group of peers they have selected, institutions in their Carnegie classification, and all other institutions in the IDEA benchmarking database.<sup>1</sup> Data are provided for the **2012** academic year.

This report is different from other IDEA summary reports because it summarizes the learning of individual students rather than summarizing class results.<sup>2</sup> The percentages of students or faculty offering positive ratings (usually the two highest categories of each response scale) are used to provide comparative data, rather than using the average response to items.

### Other Considerations

Comparative information, while useful, needs to be interpreted with caution. Important things to consider that may impact results:

- Response rate. It is important to review the response rates for your institution and for all of the comparison groups to see if differences exist. One advantage of using IDEA data is response rates to student ratings are typically higher than other on-campus surveys. Nonetheless, response rate differences may still exist.
- Representativeness. Differences may exist between how institutions use IDEA. Some campuses may administer IDEA to all classes every semester while others may administer to a subset of classes. Consequently, the relative influence of each institution may vary within the comparison group. In an effort to maintain confidentiality, the percentage of ratings contributed by each institution is not provided.

### Using the Information

The large number of cases included in a benchmarking report make finding statistical significance a frequent occurrence. However, these differences may not be of practical significance. Differences of 5% or less are likely of little importance. Differences between 5% and 10% may merit closer investigation. Differences of more than 10% are relatively rare and should be further examined.

It is always important to review findings from the IDEA benchmarking service with other sources of information that address the same or similar topics (local surveys, National [or Community College] Survey of Student Engagement, etc.). If similar differences are found from multiple sources of information, confidence of it being a meaningful finding is substantially increased. If findings in this report are unique, taking the time to develop possible explanations is warranted.

---

<sup>1</sup> When comparisons are calculated, each institution's results are calculated using the student as the unit of analysis. Then the results from each institution are averaged together giving each institution equal weight.

<sup>2</sup> By using the student as the unit of analysis, every student response counts equally. In contrast, when the class is the unit of analysis, a class with 100 students responding, and a class of 10 have equal weight. This report focuses on individual student learning and therefore it was viewed to be more appropriate to consider individual student responses.

## 2: Report Summary

---

The peer institutions you have selected to be included in this report are:

**Note: Your institution has agreed not to identify any of the names of selected peers in any marketing or public relations material.**

California State University - Stanislaus  
 Kansas State University  
 Louisiana State University - Alexandria  
 Northern Arizona University  
 South Dakota State University  
 Texas A & M University - Central Texas  
 University of Alaska Anchorage  
 University of Rhode Island

Your Carnegie Group:                      Doctoral

Number of classes included:	Total	Diagnostic	Short
Your institution	5,211	547	4,664
Peers	14,168	12,498	1,670
Carnegie Group	50,822	33,670	17,152
National	198,000	139,510	58,490

Number of ratings provided by students:	
Your institution	108,329
Peers	241,843
Carnegie Group	846,436
National	2,935,106

Response rate:	
Your institution	64.7%
Peers	62.8%
Carnegie Group	68.2%
National	71.1%

Average number of objectives selected per class:	
Your institution	6.2
Peers	6.2
Carnegie Group	5.6
National	5.6

### 3: Overall Progress on Learning

---


This section addresses the amount of overall progress on learning students believed they made in their classes and allows you to compare your institution's results to the three comparison groups. The percent of students reporting "Exceptional" or "Substantial" progress on learning objectives that were selected as "Essential" or "Important" by their instructors is provided.

Graph (3.1) summarizes the results for all classes and by course level and purpose (e.g., general education, major/certificate) as reported on the IDEA Faculty Information Form.

The information in this section can be used to explore such questions as:

- How do my institution's results compare to the comparison groups'?
- Are results for certain levels and purposes different from the overall results?
- When comparing my institution's results to the comparison groups', is the pattern similar regardless of course level and purpose?

**Graph 3.1**  
**Progress on Relevant Objectives**  
% of students responding "Exceptional" or "Substantial" progress



**Number of classes**

National	198,000	8,418	4,782	2,338	10,359	10,042
Carnegie	50,822	45,731	28,801	10,204	40,782	19,631
Peers	14,168	1,285	793	266	1,249	597
Our Institution	5,211	3,323	2,110	800	3,699	1,372

Note: n/a indicates that 5 or fewer courses were identified in the Course Level and Purpose for the Our Institution comparison group. Therefore data from other comparison groups are not included.

*Course level and purpose are identified in Table 3.1.*

<b>Table 3.1</b>	<b>Course Level and Purpose</b>
Fr/So - Gen. Ed.	First-year students/sophomores seeking to meet a "general education" or "distribution" requirement
Fr/So - Specialty	First-year students/sophomores seeking to develop background needed for their intended specialization
Upper level - Gen. Ed.	Upper level non-majors taking the course as a "general education" or "distribution" requirement
Upper level - Specialty	Upper level majors (in this or a related field of study) seeking competence or expertise in their academic/professional specialty
Grad/Prof Students	Graduate or professional school students

## 4: Frequency of Learning Objective Selection


The graph (4.1) below describes how frequently instructors selected each objective for classes at your institution and how those results compare to your peers and other comparison groups.

This graph explores the questions:

- Does our institution emphasize certain kinds of learning more or less frequently than others?
- Are there objectives that are not selected as frequently as desired?
- Is the learning emphasis consistent with our institutional mission?

**Graph 4.1**  
**Objectives Selected vs. Comparison Groups**

% of total classes where instructor selected objective as “Essential” or “Important”



*Objectives are identified in Table 4.1 on the following page.*

<b>Table 4.1 IDEA Learning Objectives</b>	
Obj1	Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
Obj2	Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
Obj3	Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
Obj4	Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
Obj5	Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
Obj6	Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama, etc.)
Obj7	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
Obj8	Developing skill in expressing oneself orally or in writing
Obj9	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
Obj10	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
Obj11	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
Obj12	Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking questions and seeking answers


## 5: Progress on Learning

The graph (5.1) below reports the percentage of students who report making “Exceptional” or “Substantial” progress on each of the 12 IDEA Learning Objectives when an instructor identified them as “Essential” or “Important” to the course.

Questions that may be addressed include:

- Are we more successful in addressing certain kinds of learning than others?
- Are student self-reported outcomes similar to our peers and other comparison groups?
- Is there a learning objective where improvement efforts might be focused?

**Graph 5.1**  
**Progress on Relevant Objectives**  
% responding “Exceptional” or “Substantial” progress



*Objectives are identified in Table 4.1 on the previous page.*

## 6: Teaching Method Emphasis


The graph (6.1) below provides comparisons between your institution and your peers for each of the five teaching style scales. Each scale contains three to five of the teaching methods listed on the IDEA Diagnostic Form. The IDEA Center recognizes that the importance of any particular method is dependent upon the kind of learning you wish to accomplish. However when the data are aggregated the results serve as an indicator of how frequently your campus employs important teaching methods compared to your peer institutions and other groups. The IDEA model suggests that the more frequently relevant teaching methods are employed, the more learning will occur.

Questions this graph may address include:

- Do we employ all types of methods similarly?
- Do we employ methods more or less frequently than our peers, or other groups?

**Graph 6.1**  
**Teaching Methods and Styles**

% responding that instructor employed methods "Almost Always" or "Frequently"



**Note:** Teaching Methods and Styles exist only on the IDEA Diagnostic Form. The number of classes evaluated using this form can be found on page 3.




## 7: Student Characteristics

The IDEA Center's research suggests that student characteristics such as motivation, work habits, and academic effort are influences that impact student learning. Graph 7.1 examines these three areas.

Some questions that could be addressed regarding student characteristics can be found in Table 7.1 on the following page.

**Graph 7.1**  
**Student Characteristics**

% responding "Definitely True" or "More True than False"



**Note:** The Instructor motivation and Course effort items exist only on the IDEA Diagnostic Form. The number of classes evaluated using this form can be found on page 3.

<b>Table 7.1</b>	<b>Student Characteristics</b>
<b>Course motivation</b>	<p><b>I really wanted to take this course regardless of who taught it.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How motivated are our students to take the courses in which they are enrolled?</li> <li>• How similar is the motivation of our students compared to our peers or other comparison groups?</li> </ul>
<b>Instructor motivation</b>	<p><b>I really wanted to take a course from this instructor.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is instructor popularity different at our institution than at our peers or other groups?</li> </ul>
<b>Course effort</b>	<p><b>I worked harder on this course than on most courses I have taken.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do our students report their course related effort in comparison to our peers or other groups?</li> </ul>
<b>Work habits</b>	<p><b>As a rule, I put forth more effort than other students on academic work.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do students at our institution report their academic effort in relation to the effort of other students compared to students at our peers or other groups?</li> </ul>


## 8: Summary Ratings of Effectiveness

The IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system contains three global summary evaluation items:

- *As a result of taking this course, I have more positive feelings toward this field of study*
- *Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher.*
- *Overall, I rate this course as excellent.*

The following graph (8.1) summarizes responses to those items for your institution, your peers, and other comparison groups.

**Graph 8.1**  
**Summary Ratings of Effectiveness**  
 % responding "Definitely True" or "More True than False"



## 9: Faculty Ratings of Other Impacts on Learning

The IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system asks faculty to rate the impact (positive, negative, or neutral) that various circumstances had on learning in their class.

Five of those circumstances are summarized in the following graph (9.1). They are:


- Physical facilities and/or equipment (Facility/Equip)
- Technical/instructional support (Tech/Instr spt)
- Adequacy of students' background and preparation for the course (Student prep.)
- Student enthusiasm for the course (Student enth.)
- Student effort to learn (Student effort)

This information is useful in assessing faculty perceptions of instructional support (facilities, equipment, technology) and student characteristics. It allows you to address questions such as:

- Are our facilities and technology viewed to positively support student learning?
- How do our results compare to those of our peers and other comparison groups?

**Note:** Instructors are not required to respond to these items on the IDEA Faculty Information Form; the percent of faculty who opt to complete them may vary substantially across institutions. When you review the following graph please take into consideration that faculty in the "Our Institution" group responded 87% of the time to items in this section of the Faculty Information Form.

**Graph 9.1**  
**Faculty Ratings of Other Impacts on Learning**  
 % responding "Had a positive impact on learning"



Draft version approved by FEC April 2013 and provided to Andi McCabe, Provost's office, 13Sep13.

**UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year**  
**2014**

---

The Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year Award is given each year to recognize and emphasize excellence in teaching. Other scholarly activity such as research and publication records may become consideration in the selection process, but the main emphasis will be on teaching excellence as judged by faculty and students.

The dean is to appoint a committee with students, faculty, and administrative representation to select an outstanding teacher from the college. The Faculty Evaluation Committee then selects the "Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year" from the eight college level nominees. This person is recognized at the annual Robins Award and receives a \$2,000 award.

**Criteria**

The following criteria for selection of the nominees are recommended:

1. Excellence in teaching for over at least three years as supported by standard university course evaluations and letters from peers.
2. The inclusion of other evidence of teaching excellence in addition to course evaluations and letters from peers.
3. Responsibility for a minimum of a six-credit annual assignment including at least one undergraduate course.
4. Evidence of creative teaching innovation.
5. Because so many individuals are potentially deserving of the Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year Award, past recipients will not be considered. [Click here](#) to see list of past recipients.

**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 40 pages total length, approximately 12 pt. font. Materials must be submitted as a single indexed pdf file.

1. A 2-page statement from the candidate summarizing his or her philosophy and objectives as a teacher, and explaining how his or her pedagogy is designed to meet those objectives.
2. A summary of evaluation scores and enrollments for courses taught the last three years. Summary information is most efficiently presented as a table, with course, year, enrollment, raw/adjusted summary scores, and percentile (if using IDEA form) and Department, College, and University comparative values (if available).
3. Letters of support from students (maximum of 10).
4. A letter of nomination from the department head spelling out the candidate's teaching responsibilities and influence on teaching in the department.
5. A short CV that emphasizes teaching roles (including publications that relate to pedagogy).
6. At least one external (peer or supervisor) observation of the teaching.
7. A sample syllabus or excerpts from a syllabus.

**Comment [Karen1]:**  
Update link with list of 2013 recipients, with further links to their websites or directory information.

---

**Please submit materials to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost before 15 February 2013.**

**UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year  
2013**

---

**Comment [Karen2]:**  
update

The Faculty Advisor of the Year Award is given each year to recognize and emphasize excellence in academic advising. Other teaching and scholarly activities may become a consideration in the selection process, but the main emphasis will be on excellence in academic advising as judged by faculty and students.

The dean is to appoint a committee with students, faculty, and administrative representation to select an outstanding advisor from the college. The Faculty Evaluation Committee then selects a "Faculty Advisor of the Year" from the eight college level nominees. This person is recognized at the annual Robins Awards and receives a \$1,000 award.

**Criteria**

The following criteria for selection of nominees are recommended:

1. The nominee should be serving in a full-time faculty position. Staff members who work as full-time advisors should not be nominated.
2. Availability to advisees.
3. Frequency of contact with advisees.
4. Monitoring of student progress toward academic and career goals.
5. Mastery of institutional regulations, policies, and procedures.
6. Number of students assigned for advising purposes.
7. Evidence of involvement in student clubs, organizations, or leadership development.
8. Because so many individuals are potentially deserving of the Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year Award, past recipients will not be considered. [Click here](#) to see list of past recipients.

**Comment [KM3]:** Update link with list of 2013 recipients, with further links to their websites or directory information.

**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 20 pages total length, approximately 12 pt. font. Materials must be submitted as a single indexed pdf file.

1. A 1-2 page statement from the candidate summarizing his or her objectives as an advisor, how these objectives are met, and the number and type of students advised per annum.
2. Letters from former advisees establishing the impact of advising. It would be especially useful if these letters came from alumni as well as current enrollees.
3. Letters from colleagues attesting to the candidate's impact on advisees.
4. Evidence of extracurricular advising (clubs, etc.).
5. A 1-2 page letter from the department head explaining the candidate's role and impact as an advisor.
6. The number of students advised per annum.

**Please submit materials to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost before 15 February 2013.**

Comment [Karen4]:  
update

# **Utah State University**

## **Athletic Council Report**

For Period of  
**July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013**

Submitted to the  
Utah State University  
Faculty Senate

By USU Athletic Council

Kenneth L. White Chair, (2012-2013), Faculty Athletics Representative  
Marie Walsh, Vice Chair (2012-2013)

### **Executive Summary**

The Athletic Council advises the President with respect to the athletics program. The duties of the council are to: (a) help maintain an athletic program compatible with the best academic interests of the university; (b) assure compliance with the rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the university athletic code; (c) review and recommend to the President all intercollegiate athletic budgets; and (d) recommend policies and procedures for all aspects of the intercollegiate programs. The major issue of importance to Athletics at Utah State University (USU) during the 2012-13 academic year were the ongoing changes in the membership of the WAC and the potential impacts on USU. For the fifth year in a row, the Utah State University Athletics department was recognized as one of the most efficient athletic departments in the nation as it placed 20th for the 2013 Excellence in Management Cup, which is recognition for running the most efficient programs in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). The latest (2011-12: *latest published rates*; 2012-13 *not yet released*) Utah State University student athlete federal graduation rate is 62% (2005 cohort; compared to 52% for the general USU student Body), with a four-year average of 61% (54% for all students). A total of 208 student-athletes received academic all-conference (WAC – lead the conference). There were 189 recipients of the Joe E. Whitesides Scholar-Athlete awards (3.2 or better GPA). Utah State University accepted an invitation to join the Mountain West Conference (MWC) beginning July 1, 2013. The Athletics department continued to grow funding through increased ticket sales, Big Blue contributions, sponsorship opportunities, media contracts, and outside donations. Through these efforts there were substantial gifts, which resulted in the completion of the USU Strength & Conditioning Center and the start of construction on the new Wayne Estes Complex (for basketball and volleyball) that is scheduled for completion in spring of 2014. Overall, the Athletics programs at Utah State University are working toward the growth that is necessary to keep the program competitive as a member of the MWC.



## **Faculty Senate Report Athletics Council**

### *Introduction:*

*Committee Members:* Kenneth White, Chair; Marie Walsh, Vice-Chair, Alyssa Everett, Andy Walker, Brian Evans, Christian Thrapp, Craig Petersen, Cree Taylor, Dave Cowley, Dennis Dolny, James Morales, Jana Doggett, Jennifer Duncan, Karson Kalian, Kevin Rice, Todd Crowl, Michael Okonkwo, Raymond Coward, Rob Rusnack, Sandra Weingart, Scott Barnes, Stan Albrecht, Sven Poslusny, Whitney Pugh.

*Mission:* The Athletic Council advises the President with respect to the athletics program. The duties of the council are to: (a) help maintain an athletic program compatible with the best academic interests of the university; (b) assure compliance with the rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the university athletic code; (c) review and recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees all intercollegiate athletic budgets; and (d) recommend policies and procedures for all aspects of the intercollegiate programs. The annual report from the Athletics Council to Faculty Senate includes both future and current issues facing the Athletics Department. Each issue is reviewed by the athletics council to insure the Department of Athletics is operating within the guidelines of the NCAA and Utah State University.

*Meeting Schedule:* The Athletics Council meets from September –April of each academic year, unless conflicts or a lack of agenda items dictates meeting cancelation. During 2012-13 academic terms the Council held five meetings. All agendas and minutes of 2012-13 Athletic Council meetings are available upon request.

### **I. Significant Athletic Council Issues/Actions during 2012-13 academic year (highlights briefly described below):**

#### **1. Athletic Program Compatible with Academic Interests of University.**

- Academic performance of student-athletes for each of the USU teams was reviewed during each semester.
  - APR and GSR rates reviewed for each team (refer to Academic Performance data listed below).

•

#### **2. Assure NCAA Rules Compliance.**

- The Council discussed specific pending NCAA legislation during the 2012-13 legislative cycle and provided input on institutional positions for those with potential academic impact.

#### **3. Review and Recommendation of Athletics Budgets.**

- The Council reviewed and accepted 2012-13 final budget numbers and five-year proposed budget plan for 2013-18.
- The Council received updates on the ongoing Athletics budget and potential impacts of potential move to the Mountain West Conference.

### **II. Miscellaneous Athletics-Related Events/Changes during 2012-13:**

1. Athletics Recognition Management:

- USU received 20<sup>th</sup>-place in the 2013 National Championship for Excellence in Management.
2. Athletics Conference Realignment:
    - USU accepts invitation to move into the Mountain West Conference in all sports.
  3. Athletic Facilities Updates:
    - USU adds permanent bleacher seating in south end zone of Romney Stadium.
    - USU completes Strength & Conditioning Building.
    - USU re-constructing old weight room into office space for softball, soccer and men's and women's tennis, and locker rooms for its women's sports.
    - USU breaks ground and begins construction of new Wayne Estes Center from basketball and volleyball.
  4. Academic Performance of Student Athletes 2011-12 (*latest published rates; 2012-13 not yet released*):

- Graduation rates
  - The 05-06 cohort rate is 62%, with a four year average of 61%;
  - The 04-05 cohort rate is 64%, with a four year average of 62%;
  - The 03-04 cohort rate is 48%, with a four year average of 57%;
  - The 02-03 cohort rate is 73%, with a four year average of 60%;
  - The 01-02 cohort rate is 65%, with a four year average of 58%;
  - The 00-01 cohort rate is 41%, with a four year average of 55%;
  - The 99-00 cohort rate is 61%, with a four year average of 64%;
  - The 98-99 cohort rate is 64%, with a 4-year average of 62%;

The NCAA released the first Graduation Success Rate (GSR) for all teams of all NCAA Division I Member Institutions in December, 2005. This rate, a 4-year Average that can be directly compared to the Federal Rates' 4-year average mentioned above, is a more accurate snapshot of how scholarship student-athletes graduate. Students who transfer to USU that fall into one of the cohorts are counted in this rate (they are *not* counted in the federal rate) when they graduate; students who transfer from USU and are academically eligible at the time of transfer do *not* count against USU graduation rates (as they do with the federal rate). The overall USU GSR for the 4-year cohorts encompassing 2002-2005 is **83% (compared to last year's 84%)**.

5. Academics/Awards
  - Composite 3.157 Student-Athlete GPA
  - 208 Academic All-Conference Selections (***Most in the Western Athletic Conference***) 2012-13.
  - 83% NCAA Graduation Success Rate (***leads the Western Athletic Conference***)

- 189 Whiteside Scholar-Athletes (**3.2 or better GPA**)
- Utah State's Men's and Women's Cross Country teams received the U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA) Academic Award for the fifth-straight year. The men had **3.27** GPA while the Aggie women posted a **3.38**
- USU's soccer team received the NSCAA/Adidas College Women Team Academic Award for the 10<sup>th</sup>-straight year, posting a **3.42** team GPA. Natalie Norris was named a NSCAA first-team Scholar All-American with a 3.95 GPA while double majoring in Nutrition, Dietetics & Food Science and Exercise Science. Three soccer student-athletes, including Norris, earned Scholar All-West Region honors. Senior Ashlyn Mulford and Junior Jennifer Flynn joined Norris.
- Utah State's football team ranked ninth nationally for academic performance of the teams appearing in the final 25 in the BCS standings. McKade Brady earned Capital One First Team Academic All-America Honors, posting a 3.57 GPA majoring in Exercise Science.
- The Utah State golf team earned the Golf Coaches Association of America Academic Award with an overall team GPA of 3.265. Tanner Higham earned Academic All-District VIII honors and was named Cleveland Golf/Srixon All-American Scholar Athlete. Higham has a 3.98 GPA majoring in Nutrition, Dietetics and Food Sciences.
- Track athletes Kyle McKenna and Jodi Williams earned CoSida Academic All-District VIII track & field/cross country honors.
- Women's gymnastics ranked 24<sup>th</sup> by the National Association of Collegiate Gymnastics Coaches/Women with a team GPA of 3.425. Eight gymnasts earned NACGC/W scholastic All-America Honors: Amanda Watamaniuk, Kaitlyn Betts, Kristen Meyers, Susie Miller, Sarah Landes, Stefanie Daley, Hayley Sanzotti, and Michelle Yasugochi.

6. Athletics Accomplishments of Department (2012-13):

- In its eighth and final year as a member of the Western Athletic Conference, Utah State continued its overall athletic success as its 16 varsity sports combined to win three team championships (football, soccer, volleyball), while finishing second in three other sports (men's cross country, women's basketball, men's outdoor track).
- Football finished the 2012 season with a school-record 11 wins and ranked 16th in the final AP Poll, 17th in the final coaches poll and 22nd in the final BCS standings.
- Football player Will Davis was named a CBSSports.com Third-Team All-American, a Phil Steele Fourth-Team All-American and an SI.com Honorable Mention All-American, while Kerwynn Williams was named an SI.com Honorable Mention All-American and Kyler Fackrell was named a Football Writers Association of America Freshman All-American.
- Soccer player Natalie Norris became the first-ever three-time WAC Defensive Player of the Year. Norris was also named the Most Valuable Player of the WAC Tournament, a second-team All-American and a first-

team academic All-American.

- Track and field athletes Chari Hawkins (heptathlon) and Will Henry (100m) both earned second-team All-American honors at the 2013 NCAA Outdoor Finals. Hawkins was named the Mountain Region's Women's Field Athlete of the Year.
- Track and field athlete Briton Page was named the WAC's Men Indoor Freshman of the Year, while Tylee Newman was named the WAC's Female Outdoor Freshman of the Year and volleyball player Elle Brainard was named the WAC Freshman of the Year.
- Football coach Gary Andersen and volleyball coach Grayson DuBose were both named WAC Coach of the Year in their respective sports.
- Men's & Women's Cross Country - Utah State's men finished second at the WAC Championship, while the Aggie women finished third. Both teams also advanced to NCAA Regionals as the women finished 10th and the men placed 14th. Tylee Newman was named the WAC's Female Freshman of the Year and joined senior Alex Litzsinger on the WAC's first-team list. First-team all-WAC honorees on the men's side include junior Kyle McKenna and sophomore Eric Shellhorn, while three other Aggies earned second-team all-WAC honors. Litzsinger also earned all-region honors, while USU had 21 student-athletes receive academic all-WAC recognition.
- Football - Utah State had its most successful season in school history in 2012 as it went 11-2 and set school records for wins (11) and home wins (6), while recording just its second bowl win in school history with a 41-15 victory against Toledo in the Famous Idaho Potato Bowl. USU also won its first outright conference championship since 1936 and just its third in school history joining the 1921 and 1936 teams that both won Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference titles. USU ended the 2012 season nationally ranked for just the third time in school history as it finished the year ranked 16th in the Associated Press poll, 17th in the ESPN/USA Today Coaches' poll and 22nd in the Bowl Championship Series standings. USU also finished the 2012 season winning its final seven games, which is tied for the fourth-longest active winning streak in the nation and tied for the third-longest winning streak in school history. Overall, USU had two All-Americans in seniors Will Davis and Kerwynn Williams, while senior McKade Brady earned first-team academic All-American honors. USU also had 17 players earn various all-WAC accolades (8-first team, 6-second team, 3-honorable mention), while Gary Andersen was named the WAC's Coach of the Year. USU also had 21 student-athletes receive academic all-WAC honors.
- Volleyball - Utah State won its first-ever regular season WAC Championship as it went 21-9 overall, including a 15-3 league mark, before

ending its season in the semifinals of the WAC Tournament. USU had four players earn first-team all-WAC honors and two others named to the second team, while Grayson DuBose was named the WAC's Coach of the Year for the second time in his career and Elle Brainard was named the league's Freshman of the Year. USU also had eight players earn academic all-WAC honors.

- Women's Soccer - Utah State advanced to the NCAA Tournament for the second time in as many years after winning its second-straight WAC Tournament title. USU, who had a 13-3-6 record in 2012, tied for first in the WAC during the regular season with a 6-0-2 mark for its third regular season conference championship in the last four years. Utah State had five players earn various all-conference honors, including senior Natalie Norris being named the WAC's Defensive Player of the Year. Norris was also named the Most Valuable Player of the WAC Tournament, while four other Aggies were named to the all-tournament team. Norris was also named a second-team All-American and a first-team academic All-American. Norris, along with senior Ashlyn Mulford and junior Jennifer Flynn, were all named first-team scholar all-West Region and USU also had 17 players earn academic all-WAC honors.
- Men's Basketball - Utah State recorded its 14th-straight 20-win season in 2013 as it finished the year with a 21-10 record, including an 11-7 WAC mark to place tied for fourth. USU ended its season with a loss in the quarterfinals of the WAC Tournament. Junior center Jarred Shaw and junior guard/forward Spencer Butterfield were both named to the WAC's second-team and all-newcomer team, while four players earned academic all-WAC honors.
- Women's Basketball - Utah State advanced to postseason play for the third time in as many years as it participated in the Women's Basketball Invitational (WBI). Utah State, who went 18-14 on the season, record its best-ever conference finish for the second-straight year as it was second in the WAC with a 14-4 record, marking the most single-season league wins in school history. For the fourth time in the last five years, USU advanced to the semifinals of the WAC Tournament. Senior guard Devyn Christensen was named first-team all-WAC for the second-straight year, while junior guard Jennifer Schlott was named to the second-team and senior guard Jenna Johnson earned third-team honors along with being named to the league's all-defensive team. USU also had five student-athletes receive academic all-WAC recognition.
- Gymnastics - Utah State placed fourth at the WAC Championships and finished the year with three individual competitors advancing to the NCAA Regional Championships. USU finished the year with a 5-14 record, including an 0-5 WAC mark. USU also had nine student-athletes receive

academic all-WAC recognition.

- Track & Field - Utah State's track and field teams had an outstanding year as the Aggie men finished second at the WAC Outdoor Championships and third at the WAC Indoor Championships, while the Aggie women placed seventh at both championships. Overall, USU had six individual WAC champions and 38 student-athletes earn various all-WAC honors. USU also had 99 academic all-WAC honorees, while 17 student-athletes advanced to compete in the first round of the NCAA Championships. USU also had two second-team All-Americans during the outdoor season in Chari Hawkins (heptathlon) and Will Henry (100m).
- Men's & Women's Tennis - Utah State's men's tennis had a 7-15 record, including a 2-4 WAC mark, while the Aggie women went 5-13 on the season including a 1-7 WAC record. USU had one player earn all-WAC honors as senior Sven Poslusny was named to the singles second-team. Overall, the two programs had 12 academic all-WAC honorees.
- Men's Golf - Utah State's golf team competed in 11 events during the year and finished in sixth-place at the WAC Championships as junior Tanner Higham tied for 11th with a 9-over 225. USU also had five academic all-WAC honorees.
- Softball - Utah State's softball team finished the year with an 11-43 record, including a 5-16 WAC mark to finish eighth in the league standings. Senior Christine Thomsen earned first-team all-WAC honors, while sophomore Hailey Froton was named to the second-team. USU also had eight student-athletes receive academic all-WAC honors.

### III. **Budget (FY13):**

<b><u>Unrestricted Revenues</u></b>	<b><u>Original Budget</u></b>	<b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>Variance</u></b>	
			<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>%</u></b>
Education & General Funds (State Funds)	4,495,069	4,495,069	0	0%
Institutional Support	2,269,142	3,100,447	831,305	28%
Student Fees	4,085,580	4,105,832	20,251	0%
Football Income	2,495,492	3,884,454	1,388,962	39%
Men's Basketball Income	918,500	804,447	-114,053	-15%
Big Blue Scholarship Fund	1,522,900	1,376,858	-146,042	-10%
Television Rights	159,438	25,000	-134,438	-110%
Sponsorships	1,045,000	889,289	-155,711	-18%
WAC Revenues	381,244	500,000	118,756	19%
NCAA Revenues	922,339	1,025,442	103,103	
Athletic Fund	489,380	1,825,523	1,336,143	258%
Indirect Facilities & Admin	1,700,000	1,700,000	0	0%
Endowment Earnings	<u>111,405</u>	<u>124,220</u>	<u>12,815</u>	<u>11%</u>
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>20,595,490</b>	<b>23,856,580</b>	<b>3,261,090</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b><u>Unrestricted Expenses</u></b>				
Salary Expenses				
Base Salary	4,504,307	4,966,395	462,088	10%
Extra Service Compensation		78,687	78,687	
Other Salary Costs	170,000	356,438	186,438	52%
<b>TOTAL SALARIES</b>	<b>4,674,307</b>	<b>5,401,520</b>	<b>727,213</b>	<b>14%</b>
Fringe Benefits	2,056,695	2,053,364	-3,331	0%
<b>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; FRINGE</b>	<b>6,731,002</b>	<b>7,454,884</b>	<b>723,882</b>	<b>10%</b>
Operating Budget Expenses				
Men's Varsity Sports Programs	5,353,630	5,997,907	644,277	11%
Women's Varsity Sports Programs	3,255,900	3,611,118	355,218	10%
<b>Total Varsity Sports Programs</b>	<b>8,609,530</b>	<b>9,609,025</b>	<b>999,495</b>	<b>11%</b>
Administrative Units	5,117,939	7,358,856	2,240,918	41%
<b>Total Unrestricted Expenses</b>	<b>20,458,471</b>	<b>24,422,765</b>	<b>3,964,294</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>\$137,019</b>	<b>(\$566,185)</b>	<b>(\$703,204)</b>	<b>-420%</b>
Available Operating Balance		<b>(\$300,367)</b>		
Capital Repair & Replacement Fund Balance		<b>\$186,530</b>		

**UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Department of Intercollegiate Athletics**  
**5-Year Financial Report**  
**Mountain West Projections**

Revenues	Actual	Actual	BUDGET	*** 5-YEAR PROJECTION ***			
	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
E&G	4,480,93	4,495,069	4,629,921	4,768,819	4,911,883	5,059,240	5,211,017
Inst. Support	2,188,916	2,600,447	2,677,848	2,758,183	2,840,929	2,926,157	3,013,942
Inst. Support (MW Fees)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000			
Student Fees	3,958,837	4,105,832	4,122,331	4,328,448	4,415,017	4,635,767	4,728,483
Football Home Gate	703,375	1,232,775	1,156,582	1,473,819	1,694,892	1,949,126	2,241,495
Football Bowl Revenues	460,726	460,000					
Football Guarantees	951,900	1,525,000	850,000	1,700,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,200,000
Merlin Olsen Fund	363,742	666,679	550,000	500,000	510,000	520,200	530,604
Men's Basketball	1,029,759	804,447	897,668	868,180	830,113	871,619	915,200
BBSF Donations	1,174,012	1,186,850	1,471,250	1,691,938	1,810,373	1,937,099	2,072,696
BBSF Events & Auction	179,191	190,008	123,600	127,308	131,127	135,061	139,113
TV Rights	104,873	25,000	300,000				
ASP - Sponsorship	672,656	486,705	870,000	895,000	920,000	945,000	970,000
Marketing - Trade		102,976	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Nike - Sponsorship		299,608	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
WAC Revenues	656,499	500,000	See MWC				
MWC Revenues			1,250,000	1,500,000	1,750,000	3,000,000	3,090,000
NCAA Revenues	965,335	1,025,442	982,527	1,012,003	1,042,363	1,073,634	1,105,843
Endowment Earnings	105,049	124,220	123,600	127,308	131,127	135,061	139,113
Athletic Fund	701,564	838,032	533,895	549,912	566,409	583,401	600,904
Indirect Facilities & Admin	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
One Time Revenues	144,601	987,490					
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>21,041,966</b>	<b>23,856,580</b>	<b>23,339,222</b>	<b>25,100,917</b>	<b>24,854,233</b>	<b>27,171,365</b>	<b>28,258,408</b>
<b>Unrestricted Expenses</b>							
<b><u>Salary Expenses</u></b>							
Salaries & Wages	4,573,093	5,401,520	5,651,248	5,881,054	6,236,364	6,695,228	6,758,680
Fringe Benefits	1,829,026	2,053,364	2,299,681	2,278,794	2,436,955	2,639,615	2,678,828
<b>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; FRINGE</b>	<b>6,402,119</b>	<b>7,454,884</b>	<b>7,950,929</b>	<b>8,159,848</b>	<b>8,673,319</b>	<b>9,334,843</b>	<b>9,437,509</b>
<b><u>Operating Budget Expenses</u></b>							
Men's Varsity Sports Programs	5,956,131	5,997,907	5,809,297	6,295,175	6,162,235	6,334,623	6,512,527
Women's Varsity Sports Programs	3,606,198	3,611,118	3,807,332	3,989,181	4,102,408	4,219,332	4,340,082
<b>Total Varsity Sports Programs</b>	<b>9,562,329</b>	<b>9,609,025</b>	<b>9,616,629</b>		<b>10,264,643</b>	<b>10,553,955</b>	<b>10,852,609</b>
Administrative Units	5,581,262	7,358,856	6,254,790	6,552,242	6,140,029	6,765,571	6,861,083
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>21,545,710</b>	<b>24,422,765</b>	<b>23,822,348</b>	<b>24,996,446</b>	<b>25,077,991</b>	<b>26,654,369</b>	<b>27,151,201</b>
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>(503,744)</b>	<b>(566,185)</b>	<b>(483,126)</b>	<b>104,471</b>	<b>(223,758)</b>	<b>516,996</b>	<b>1,107,207</b>
<b>Available Balance</b>		<b>(300,367)</b>	<b>(783,493)</b>	<b>(679,022)</b>	<b>(902,780)</b>	<b>(385,785)</b>	<b>721,422</b>

\*\*\* ALL FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS ARE PRELIMINARY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE \*\*\*



All FY13 Athletic Council Meeting Materials are Archived and Available Upon Request.

## Report from the Educational Policies Committee October 14, 2013

The Educational Policies Committee met on October 3, 2013. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page<sup>1</sup> and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the September meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of October 3, 2013 which included the following notable actions:
  - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 80 requests for course actions.
  - A request from the Department of Psychology to discontinue the Psychology Teaching BS and BA was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Psychology to reduce the minimum number of credits required for the PhD program in Psychology was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology to discontinue the Teaching Emphasis within the Sociology BS and BA was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences to solely house the MS and PhD Toxicology program **AND** a request from the Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences; Biology; Chemistry and Biochemistry; Civil and Environmental Engineering; and Plants, Soils, and Climate to discontinue the Interdepartmental Program in the MS and PhD in Toxicology was approved.
2. There was no September report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of September 17, 2013. Of note:
  - The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:  
  
GEO 3250 (DSC)  
USU HONR 1320 (BHU)

1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/archives/index.html>

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

#### **12.4 Academic Process**

Evaluations, conducted pursuant to Policy 407, may reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that call into question the faculty member's ability to function in his or her position. If such problems have not been rectified by efforts at improvement as prescribed in a professional development plan, the outcomes of which have been judged (405.12.3.(3)) by the review committee (405.12.2), then other nonpunitive measures, should be considered in lieu of a sanction as per policy 407.1.1. The standard for sanction (policy 407.2) remains that of adequate cause, namely conduct contrary to the standards set forth in policy 403. Successive negative reviews do not in any way diminish the obligations of the university to show such adequate cause pursuant to policy 407.4.

#### **402.12.7 Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Award Name Chages**

##### **(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 Professor and Advisor of the Year.

##### **(2) Membership.**

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

The text in yellow needs to be changed to:

"(c) decide university awards for Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year and Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year."

The change is needed because the "Professor of the Year" is not the correct term for this award, and it also needs to be clear that these are two separate awards.

## Report from the Educational Policies Committee October 14, 2013

The Educational Policies Committee met on October 3, 2013. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page<sup>1</sup> and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the September meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of October 3, 2013 which included the following notable actions:
  - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 80 requests for course actions.
  - A request from the Department of Psychology to discontinue the Psychology Teaching BS and BA was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Psychology to reduce the minimum number of credits required for the PhD program in Psychology was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology to discontinue the Teaching Emphasis within the Sociology BS and BA was approved.
  - A request from the Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences to solely house the MS and PhD Toxicology program **AND** a request from the Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences; Biology; Chemistry and Biochemistry; Civil and Environmental Engineering; and Plants, Soils, and Climate to discontinue the Interdepartmental Program in the MS and PhD in Toxicology was approved.
2. There was no September report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of September 17, 2013. Of note:
  - The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:  
  
GEO 3250 (DSC)  
USU HONR 1320 (BHU)

1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/archives/index.html>

## **Report from the Educational Policies Committee November 13, 2013**

The Educational Policies Committee met on November 7, 2013. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page<sup>1</sup> and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the November meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of November 7, 2013 which included the following notable actions:
  - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 79 requests for course actions.
  - The request from the Department of Physics to discontinue the Plan C in the M.S. Degree in Physics was approved.
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of October 14, 2013. Action items were:
  - Approval of revisions to the General Catalog Language regarding English Language Proficiency Requirement for Undergraduate International Students

### **Rationale for amending the requirement:**

The current policy is restrictive and does not allow an exemption for native English speakers. The SAT, ACT, and U.S. high school attendance and enrollment in mainstream English classes as proof of English proficiency are currently used by a wide variety of state supported institutions of higher education, including the University of Utah. Currently, domestic applicants to USU are required to achieve a total ACT score of 18 or a total SAT score of 860, which theoretically allows a domestic applicant to achieve significantly less than 18 or 500 on the English portion of the ACT or critical reading portion of the SAT and still be admitted to USU.

USU allows credit toward the Communications Literacy 1 (CL1) general education requirement for any student that provides Advanced Placement scores of 3 through 5 on the English Language Composition exam or the English Literature and Composition exam. Similarly, credit is granted toward the CL1 requirement for students who provide score results of 4 through 7 on either the Standard Level or Higher Level International Baccalaureate English A1 exam. Additionally, completion of the International Baccalaureate Diploma allows an international student to receive up to 30 credit hours and a waiver of many general education requirements including the

1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/archives/index.html>

CL1 requirement. Allowing an international student to receive a waiver of the rigorous CL1 requirement while simultaneously requiring “proof” of English proficiency in the form of the TOEFL, the IELTS, or the IELI placement exam creates a contradictory policy.

Applicants to the School of Graduate Studies at Utah State University are currently allowed to submit the Pearson Test of English as proof of English proficiency. Additionally, though the Eiken is administered almost exclusively in Japan, it is accepted as proof of English proficiency at approximately 350 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. Accepting the Eiken as an option to prove English proficiency would enable International Admissions to recruit Japanese students more effectively and potentially increase enrollment.

Allowing the proposed revisions to the English language proficiency requirement would regularize the current undergraduate international application process with the processes in place at other state-supported institutions of higher education in the United States. The amendment would also create a more equitable set of standards between international, domestic and graduate admissions at USU and eliminate contradictory practices currently in place.

**Present Catalog Language:**

*International students must be proficient in the use of English. Proficiency is determined for undergraduates by a minimum TOEFL score of 525 on the manual (paper/pencil) test, 71 on the iBT (Internet-based TOEFL), a minimum IELTS score of 6.0 (with a minimum of 5.0 on each subscale) or by passing level 4 (advanced level) of the Intensive English program at Utah State University. Qualified students in level 4 (advanced level) of Intensive English may take one or more academic courses if approved by the Intensive English faculty and their academic advisor.*

**Approved Revised Catalog Language:**

*All undergraduate international applicants whose native language is not English must prove University level English proficiency. The English language proficiency requirement may be satisfied in a variety of ways:*

- *TOEFL internet-based exam score of 71 or paper-based exam score of 525*
- *IELTS score of 6.0 overall band score with a minimum of 5.0 on each subscale*
- *SAT Critical Reading score of 500*
- *ACT English score of 18*
- *Pearson Test of English overall score of 53*
- *Eiken Test in Practical English Proficiency Grade Pre-1*
- *English Language and Composition Advanced Placement exam or English Literature and Composition Advanced Placement exam score of 3, 4, or 5*
  - *Standard Level or Higher Level International Baccalaureate English A1 exam score of 4, 5, 6, or 7*

- *Completion of the International Baccalaureate Diploma at an accredited high school or secondary school*
- *USU's Intensive English Language Institute's placement exam score of 146\**
- *Attendance at an accredited U.S. high school for 3 or more years and enrollment in mainstream non-ESL English/Language Arts classes all three years*
- *Receive a grade of "C" or better in a college-level English Composition course (equivalent to USU's English 1010 – Introduction to Writing: Academic Prose or English 2010 – Intermediate Writing: Research Writing in a Persuasive Mode) at a regionally-accredited U.S. college or university. Equivalency will be determined by the Registrar's Office at Utah State University.*

*Any equivalency determination made by the Registrar's Office will be final.*

*If you are not sure if you qualify for an exemption as a native English speaker, please contact International Admissions to request a review of your circumstances. Utah State University reserves the right to require proof of English proficiency from any applicant, if deemed necessary by a university official. \*IELI's placement exam may be taken upon arrival at USU. For further information, please review the conditional admission parameters below. Applicants who are unable to provide proof of English proficiency as outlined above, may request conditional admission to the university pending the completion of Utah State University's Intensive English Language program. Conditionally admitted students will be eligible to enroll in their chosen academic program at USU after they have passed level 4 (advanced level) of the Intensive English program at Utah State University or achieved a 146 on the Intensive English Language Institute's placement exam. Qualified students in level 4 (advanced level) of Intensive English may take one or more academic courses concurrent with their Intensive English courses, if approved by the Intensive English Language Institute faculty and their academic advisor.*

- **Semester Credit Limit.** Approved revision to General Catalog language as follows:

**Present Catalog Language:**

*"Credit Limit: Students registering for more than 18 credits must present their advisor's signed authorization to the Registrar's Office."*

**Approved Revised Catalog Language:**

*"Semester Credit Limit: Students must have authorization from their academic major advisor to enroll in more than 18 credits in a semester."*

3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of October 22, 2013. Of note:

1. <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/epc/archives/index.html>



- The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:

CHEM 5720 (CI)  
HIST 3560 (DHA)  
PHIL 3820 (DHA)  
RELS 3820(CI)  
WGS 3010(CI)  
THEA 2110 (Remove DHA Designation)  
USU 1320(BHU) Ravi Gupta  
USU 1320(BHU) Robert McPherson  
USU 6900 Russ Price



**Office of the Student Body  
President**

Douglas Fiefia | (435) 797-1723  
douglas.fiefia@usu.edu

December 2, 2013

**USU/SA Report – Faculty Senate**

**ASUSU Name Change**

-The ASUSU Executive Council voted to change the name of Associated Students of Utah State University to the Utah State University Student Association. The change passed Executive Council and a special election was called for October 22 and 23 for the student body. Students approved the changes. Reasoning behind the change includes: having “Utah State University” in the beginning of the organization name, explaining to students that they are a member of the student association, and following a state/national trend.

**myVoice Project**

-An online platform now exists for students to voice their concerns or suggestions about any aspect of the University as part of the new myUSU web portal at my.usu.edu. Responses will be filtered and sorted by USU/SA and sent to the appropriate University entity for review. The goal of the project, spearheaded by Doug Fiefia, is to give students an easy avenue to provide input on how to improve the University. A media campaign took place on November 4-8 to introduce the project to students.

**President’s Award**

-Doug Fiefia has implemented a new student recognition program called President’s Award to recognize students who go above and beyond in the areas of involvement, leadership, and service at USU and in the community. Students who receive the award will be recognized throughout the year at USU/SA Executive Council meetings and will be invited to a banquet with other recipients near the end of the school year and have the opportunity to apply for a scholarship.

**HURD Campout**

-An unprecedented 2,200 students attended a campout on the Quad the night before the USU v. BYU football game. Students who attended the campout were given a wristband to get in to the game early.

**The HOWL**

-USU/SA’s largest event, the HOWL, was held on October 26 in the Taggart Student Center and drew a sell-out crowd of 6,000 people. The event drew thousands of USU students and many non-USU students from around the state. Shiny Toy Guns was the featured band.

## COMMON HOUR SURVEY MEMO

**To: Faculty Senate**

**From:** Douglass Fiebia and Daryn Frischkencht

**Date:** October 14, 2013

**Subject:** Findings from the Common Hour survey and ASUSU's recommendation

---

### Executive Summary

The Common Hour survey was collected September 30, 2014 through October 3, 2014. It received 1,004 responses, and each college was represented:

- Caine College of the Arts- 22
- College of Agriculture and Applied Science- 41
- College of Engineering- 527
- College of Humanities and Social Sciences- 100
- College of Science- 71
- Emma Eccles Jones College of Education & Human Services- 98
- Jon M. Huntsman School of Business- 123
- S.J. & Jessie E. Quinney College of Natural Resources-7

Based on the results of our primary data described below, we recommend that Common Hour remain implemented through Utah State University. Due to the copious amount of engineering student responses and the lack of knowledge of convocational speakers, we reached this conclusion.

### Survey Findings

The key findings from this research were:

- 62.81% of students surveyed agreed that Common Hour is a benefit whereas, 37.19% of students surveyed believes it is not a benefit
- 59% of students surveyed want to continue Common Hour and 40% of students surveyed would like to have classes scheduled
- Students use Common Hour to:
  - Attend convocational speakers- 17.78%
  - Study- 65.96%
  - Attend meetings- 17.98%
  - Eat lunch- 51.21%
  - Free time- 37.37%
  - Go home- 27.07%

## University Retention Report to Faculty Senate, November 2013

Prepared by the Division of Student Services

### Abstract

This report is prepared on an annual basis for the Faculty Senate at Utah State University (USU) to provide basic student cohort and retention data, and to explain processes, initiatives, and programs central to student retention efforts at Utah State. Following a summary depiction of current and recent available cohort and retention data, this report will annotate previous, on-going, and future initiatives representing a broad collaboration amongst faculty, administrators, and Student Services' staff. The report concludes with a statement emphasizing the critical nature of campus collaboration in efforts to meaningfully engage students in their Utah State University experience.

### Administrative Oversight for Retention and Student Success

John Mortensen serves as Assistant Vice President for Student Services over Enrollment Services and Retention. Donna Crow serves as Executive Director for Student Success. Matt Sanders, faculty member in Communication Studies, chairs the Faculty Engagement in Student Retention Subcommittee. Jason Thomas, Assistant Director of Student-Athlete Services, chairs the Provisional Admission Subcommittee, and Whitney Milligan, Director of Residence Life, chairs the Student Engagement Subcommittee. The Retention Leadership Team has been charged with the mission of comprehensively approaching the processes of student transition, integration, and persistence through programs, initiatives, and research. In addition, the following units report to the Assistant Vice President:

- Academic Resource Center
- Admissions
- Career Services
- Financial Aid
- Registration
- Student Orientation and Transition Services
- Student Support Services
- University Advising

Beyond the scope of these programs, the Retention Leadership Team collaborates extensively with departments, offices, and individuals from across the University to identify and implement programs and initiatives designed to contribute to student success and mitigate student attrition.

### Cohort Enrollment Numbers

(provided by Office of Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation)

<b>All Degree-Seeking (1-year, 2-year, and 4-year)</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Logan Campus (Initial Cohort)	2,639	2,914	2,937	2,846	2,743
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Total USU	2,796	3,069	3,455 <sup>I</sup>	3,384	3,564

<b>4-Year Degree-Seeking Only</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Logan Campus (Initial Cohort)	2,931	2,845	2,634 <sup>II</sup>
First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students, Total USU	3,081	3,023	2,935

## Program Participation Figures

(provided by Student Orientation and Transition Services)

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of Students Enrolled in Traditional, Pre-Semester Connections	1,557	1,694	1,672	1,596	1,739
Number of Students Enrolled in All Sections of Connections	1,710	1,811	1,781	1,690	1,865
Number of Students Participating in SOAR	3,084	3,318	3,334	3,295	3,214
Number of Parents Attending Orientation on Campus	1,345	1,607	1,655	1,581	1,796

## Student Retention Performance and Future Goals

### First-to-Second-Year Retention for Initial First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students

Cohort Year	Logan Campus Plus Regional Campuses	Official Retention Rate (one year later)
2007	2,744	72.8%
2008	2,665	73.6%
2009	2,796	71.5%
2010	3,069	71.6%
2011	3,081 <sup>III</sup>	71.9%
2012	3,023	Not yet available <sup>IV</sup>

The Retention Leadership Team and the Vice President for Student Services have established the following first-to-second-year retention goals for Utah State University:

### First-to-Second-Year Retention Goals

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Students in 4-Year Programs	71.0%	75.0%	75.5%	76.0%	76.5%

*The year 2013 represents the first-year retention for 2012 cohort students.*

## Six-Year Graduation Performance and Future Goals

### Six-Year Graduation Performance for Initial First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students at Logan Campus and RCDE who completed a bachelor's degree.

Cohort Year	Logan Campus Plus Regional Campuses	Official Six-Year Graduation Rate
2002	2,308	49.5%
2003	2,466	54.0%
2004	2,158	52.1%
2005	1,984	53.0%
2006	2,508	50.3%
2007	2,744	Not yet available <sup>V</sup>

The Official four-year graduation rate average (2003-2006) was 52.4%. The Retention Leadership Team and the Vice President for Student Services have established the following six-year graduation goals for Utah State University:

### Graduation Goals – Six-Year Graduation Performance for Initial First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking Students at Logan Campus and RCDE who completed a bachelor's degree.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Students in 4-Year Programs	52.0%	53.0%	54.0%	55.0%	55.5%

*The year 2013 represents the sixth-year graduation for 2007 cohort students.*

Retention and graduation goals will be met through the following initiatives.

## **New and Ongoing Retention and Graduation Initiatives**

### **1. Enrollment Confirmation and Early Registration Requests**

A website is available for incoming freshmen to request a cluster of courses, based on their major, interests, previous academic background, and advisor recommendations. The process allows the students to be preregistered into a set of courses prior to participating in SOAR.

### **2. Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR)**

All incoming freshmen are required to participate in this program. Additional SOAR options have been created, including an evening session for nontraditional students and veterans, as well as a session for students who earned a New Century Scholarship prior to attendance. Online SOAR has been revised and improved and alternative versions of it are being used by the regional campuses.

### **3. University Connections Course (USU 1010)**

Connections is an optional first-year experience course for incoming freshmen. Over 50 percent of the incoming freshman class take this course. University Advising uses the grades reported from this course as an early alert tool in identifying and following up with students who may be struggling academically.

### **4. Strategies for Academic Success (PSY 1730)**

This course is designed to assist students who may be struggling and covers important skills to help students be successful, including study/reading skills, note-taking, time-management, and other strategies that have helped other students succeed in college.

### **5. Career Exploration (PSY 1220)**

This course assists students in identifying their interests, strengths, and weaknesses and is especially helpful to students in assisting them in deciding on a major.

### **6. Weekly E-mail to Students**

Students may sign up to have an e-mail sent to them weekly. The e-mail includes important campus dates and deadlines, highlights one of the campus resources available, highlights a campus club or organization, shares a variety of tips from the A-Team, and provides a calendar of events on campus and in the community.

### **7. Retention Committee and Subcommittees**

The Retention Committee and its subcommittees meet regularly to plan and discuss initiatives that may have a positive impact on student retention.

- The **Provisional Admission Subcommittee** uses representatives from across campus that are engaged in developing and implementing high-touch programming, to encourage the retention and success of provisionally admitted students. This programming begins with a mandatory and customized SOAR orientation, early alert, timely communication/services from advisors and academic support program offices, mid-term progress reports, and peer advising.
- The **Student Engagement Subcommittee** focuses on programs and issues that help students become more socially engaged while at USU.
- The **Faculty Engagement in Student Retention Subcommittee**, formerly known as the Academic Experience Subcommittee, was reconfigured and given a new charge. A faculty member from each college serves on the subcommittee, as well as a representative from RCDE and Student Services. This subcommittee is focusing on best practices for which faculty are engaged in student retention efforts and is exploring the implementation of some campus-wide initiatives.

### **8. Registration Reminders and Assistance**

E-mails are sent to currently enrolled students to inform them of priority registration for an upcoming semester. In addition, a follow-up e-mail is sent to students and offers assistance to those who did not take advantage of preregistration.

### **9. Access to Student Progress and Retention Data**

A range of reports have now been created and are both available and customizable through the USU Reporting Warehouse. Departments can now access specific report templates and track aggregate and individual student data longitudinally using varied sets of criteria. Access to this information gives these offices and departments the capability to better monitor the students they serve and determine appropriate courses of action on the basis of this analysis.

### **10. Leave of Absence Program**

USU has a significant number of students who take a leave of absence for a variety of reasons. A website was created to assist students in their transition away from and back to USU. The processes that are in place have led to a high return rate of those who have left. Students who leave for church or military service may be excluded when retention or graduation rates are calculated. Students who return and graduate within six years of their initial start date may be included in the calculation of graduation rates.

### **11. Readmission of Students Who Left USU on Warning, Probation, or Suspension**

A new readmission process was initiated in 2004. Of the students who were readmitted and enrolled, a high percentage of students have attained good standing and many have graduated, or are on track to graduate.

### **12. DegreeWorks**

The University has had DegreeWorks for a few years, and it has just recently been implemented for every undergraduate program. DegreeWorks automates a lot of the course planning and “what-if” scenarios, giving students instant access to this information without the assistance of an advisor.

### **13. Passport Program**

In an effort to help students become more engaged in their experience at USU, this program was created. New freshmen students receive a passport and there are many activities on campus designated as “passport” activities, where students get their passport stamped. In addition to the benefit of becoming more engaged, students receive other tangible awards for participation. Students who receive ten stamps are invited to dinner with President and Mrs. Albrecht in their home.

### **14. Summer School Calendar, Offerings, and Bell Times**

In Summer 2012, the summer school calendar, offerings, and bell times were modified to better meet students' needs. The calendar is more attractive to students and faculty, the offerings are more closely based on student demand, and the bell times are more conducive to assembling a full-time schedule. It is anticipated that summer school will help alleviate some of the current bottlenecks associated with fall and spring semesters.

### **15. Student Tracker**

Student Tracker is a free service available to USU through the National Student Clearinghouse. This service is beneficial in identifying and students who transfer and/or graduate from other colleges or universities.

### **16. University Participation in Utah College Completion Academy**

Representatives from USU participated in the first ever Utah College Completion Academy. Participation in this group will be ongoing. Preliminary discussions focused on measures that could be taken to help students be more successful in mathematics and gateway courses.

### **17. Retention Reports by Subpopulations**

Retention reports are being prepared that will provide comparison data between key student demographics. Comparison data will look at academic indicators (e.g., ACT math scores, admission index, etc.) and student engagement indicators (e.g., students who live on-campus, students who belong to a fraternity or sorority, students who participate in Connections, etc.). Many of these reports are available and many more will be developed within the next year.

### **18. Preregistration for Students Enrolled in MATH 0990 and MATH 1010**

In an effort to keep the momentum going for students who struggle with math, a new website was created that will allow students currently enrolled in MATH 0990 or MATH 1010 to request preregistration into the next math class in their sequence leading to completion of the Quantitative Literacy Requirement.

### **19. D, F, W, I Grade Reports**

A report has been created that identifies courses for which a high percentage of students receive a grade of D+, D, F, W (withdraw), or I (incomplete). The Retention Committee will discuss strategies that may help students be more successful in these classes. An example in one course was the implementation of a prerequisite that would ensure students would be at a certain skill level before registering for the course.

### **20. New Leave of Absence Coordinator Position**

A new full-time employee position was created and was filled beginning October 2013. This individual is responsible for working directly with students, and parents of students, who take a leave of absence for missionary or other reasons. The main goal of this position is to assist students in their transition to and from the University, and to try to retain as many students as possible.

### **21. Preregistration for Students Remaining on Waiting lists for ENGL 1010 and ENGL 2010**

Beginning Fall 2013, students who remained on waiting lists for ENGL 1010 and ENGL 2010 were invited to request preregistration into those classes for the next term.

### **22. Intentional Follow-up Campaign with Students Who Do Not Register for the Next Semester**

Students who do not take advantage of preregistration for the next semester will be contacted by email, and later by personal phone calls. The purpose of the communication is to assess the circumstances of each student and, where possible, encourage them to register. Students who have other plans will be encouraged to visit the Leave of Absence website.

### **23. Retention Workshops**

Retention workshops are being presented to various University constituencies, including the New Faculty Academy. Faculty and staff are becoming more familiar with the issues that lead to student retention or attrition and best practices are shared to help them recognize the little things they can do that make a difference.

### **24. Student Portal**

The new student portal will provide a better way for students to navigate the University's system of support offerings and engagement activities.

## **Future Retention and Graduation Initiatives**

The first five initiatives below are a result of meetings of the Complete College Utah Academy.

### **1. 15-to-Finish Campaign**

A publicity campaign is in the works to educate students that to finish in four years they need to average at least 15 credits each semester.

### **2. Plateau Tuition Starting at 12 Credits**

USU currently has a plateau tuition that begins with 13 credits. The Vice President for Business and Finance is reviewing this proposal.



### **3. Graduation Maps for Each Major**

USU already has DegreeWorks to help students plan out the completion of their degree requirements. Research is being done to look at Acalog, the current online catalog software, to better utilize its functionality to make four-year plans more prominent.

### **4. Implement Strategies to Improve Success in Developmental Math**

A committee is already meeting regularly to develop strategies for this gateway course. The strategies include creating a new hybrid class that covers intermediate algebra and introduction to statistics in a combined class. In addition, greater efforts are being made to encourage students to take the math placement exam prior to their attendance at new student orientation.

### **5. Reverse Transfer/Stackable Credential Policy**

Students who leave a two-year institution shy of completing an associate's degree may have credits completed at a four-year institution transferred back so that an associate's degree may be awarded. A policy is nearly finalized with Salt Lake Community College, which will be followed up with a proposed agreement with Snow College.

### **6. Retention Scholarships**

Approximately \$30,000 per year is currently devoted to scholarships for student retention. Efforts are in the works to solicit additional resources.

### **7. Advisor Assignments in Banner**

Approximately 35 percent of students currently do not have an advisor assigned in Banner. An initiative is being explored that would automatically assign advisors in Banner. Advisor assignments would include academic advisors, financial aid counselors, and career coaches. The goal is to make these assignments very visible to students so they know who to go to when questions arise.

### **8. Improved Early Alert System**

Automated early alert systems from various vendors are being evaluated. The goal is to implement an automated early alert system by Fall 2014.

### **9. Best Practices**

It is proposed that the Retention website become a clearinghouse for listing all retention-related activities. It is intended that the website will serve as a resource for campus units to replicate successful retention efforts.

### **10. Collaboration with Regional Campuses and Distance Education (RCDE)**

Collaboration efforts with RCDE are already underway to determine how to best provide services and meet the needs of RCDE students.

### **11. Awarding of Associate Degrees**

An associate's degree was not previously available on the Logan Campus. Efforts are underway to identify students who left USU without a bachelor's degree who may qualify for an associate's degree. In addition, students who left USU and were within one semester of completing an associate's degree will be recruited to come back and finish.

## **A Concluding Note on Faculty and Collaboration**

According to Kinzie and Kuh (2004), "Sharing responsibility for educational quality and student success is woven into the tapestry of educationally effective institutions." A review of the student success and retention-focused accomplishments noted in this report reveals the significance of effective and efficient collaboration among faculty, staff, and administrators in developing effectual initiatives and engendering positive outcomes for students and the institution. While each of the aforementioned initiatives certainly demand the contributions of multiple constituents, it is important to note the central role played by faculty members not only in these initiatives taken individually, but perhaps most critically, in the comprehensive

effort to provide for student success and retain students at this institution. The proximity between faculty members and students on a daily basis in teaching, research, and advising capacities allows for members of the faculty to have unparalleled influence on the lives of students, an influence that Richard Light (2001) claims many faculty members often underestimate. Faculty members' efforts, both in their individual work with students on a daily basis, and their participation in centrally-sponsored programs and initiatives such as those outlined in this report, are fundamentally critical to the Utah State University's student retention endeavors and accomplishments, and should be emphatically noted as the basis for the accomplishments listed in this report, and the foundation for the successes to be achieved in the future.

## References

Kinzie, J., & Kuh, G.D. (2004). Going DEEP: Learning from Campuses that Share Responsibility for Student Success. *About Campus*, 9(5), 2-8.

Light, R. (2001). *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 104.

---

<sup>i</sup> Beginning in 2011, numbers include students from USU Eastern.

<sup>ii</sup> Beginning in 2013, provisional students were admitted into a two-year general studies program.

<sup>iii</sup> Cohorts 2007 through 2010 include all degree-seeking first-time, full-time students from the Logan Campus and RCDE. Starting with 2011, the cohort includes all bachelor level degree-seeking first-time, full-time students from the Logan Campus, RCDE, and USU Eastern.

<sup>iv</sup> All adjusted cohort totals and corresponding first- to second- year retention figures are prepared each spring by Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation for the previous academic year's cohort of entering students. Correspondingly, the retention rate for the official 2012 entering cohort will be available from AAA in spring 2014.

<sup>v</sup> All adjusted cohort totals and corresponding six-year graduation figures are prepared each spring by Analysis, Assessment, and Accreditation. Correspondingly, the six-year graduation rate for the official 2007 entering cohort will be available from AAA in spring 2014.

# **Faculty Forum, Nov 4, 2013. TSC Auditorium**

## **Participation:**

Slightly over 50 people attended.

## **Focused Discussion:**

### **1. Revision Proposal to Faculty Code Section 405.12 Post Tenure Review Process.**

- The dominant majority of the attendants agreed that the current code could be improved. Some mentioned the external pressure from the legislature and NW evaluation and also the procedure itself that could be easier and clearer to follow.
- Concern about putting too much power in the hands of the department head. The collective wisdom is greater than that of individuals. A countering argument was made that the proposed revision would provide greater protection. Straw-poll hand votes indicated more attendants in favor of the proposed code in this regard.
- Concern about the college-wide committee. Judgments should be the responsibility of the colleagues in the same field (Code 401.8.3). From the hand vote, more attendants were in favor of the dept-level committee.

Additional individual comments:

- From a person in a college where something like this proposal has already been implemented: There are already examples of dept. heads trying to get rid of faculty. The college committee backed up the department head. This person also suggested creating a whole new code to state the faculty power explicitly.
- Another person countered that the committee apparently failed to do its job. The faculty at USU seems to not take advantage of the power they have. If the faculty is not willing to stand up and exercise their rights, that is a problem. Do not need to rewrite the whole code.
- Some comments about the importance of tenure. Tenure is a right we have achieved.
- A question was asked if we want to get onto salary adjustments in the 5-year reviews. Wanted to have a place (situation), where faculty can talk about salaries.
- Discussion about disseminating best practices of the post-tenure review process across campus, e.g., making the review more participatory and points-based self-evaluations for each activity.
- In favor of efficiency: not having to go through the review every five years.

### **2. & 3. Re-establishing a strong sense of shared governance &**

**The diminished emphasis on the service components in the faculty role statements**

Referring to 401.8.1 (4), the FS leadership expressed concerns about senior faculty not taking an active role in shared governance. To have shared governance established, service is vital: people have to volunteer to serve. Currently, the FS has vacancies to fill on the committees.

- In general, people have very little sense that there is shared governance at USU. There is a very limited mechanism for faculty to provide any feedback on new and existing policies. The FS does not appear to function independently from administration. People are dispirited and do not see any point in participating in the FS.
- In some colleges, administrators seem selective in their support of service activities, seemingly not valuing FS service. The faculty is evaluated, based on research productivity in their role statements. Junior faculty are explicitly discouraged from FS service.
- More frequent evaluations of administrators (regarding productivity and performance) could facilitate a sense of shared governance. Every 3 or 5 years, as it is now, is too far apart. Need to evaluate the administrators on an annual or semiannual basis.

### **Open Discussion:**

- The Faculty Senate could encourage more open discussions (rather than handing down the agenda) in the meetings; the faculty should be encouraged to bring up new issues.
- A suggestion: the faculty plays an active role in car-pooling and air quality. A countering recommendation was made that the Sustainability Council might be a better place. The council drafts policies that go to the president; there is a representative from each college on the council. It has been very active and gotten a lot done.
- Need to facilitate easy communications between the faculty body and the FS leadership. An electronic forum on the FS web site could be an option.

#### **402.12.7 Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Award Name Chages**

##### **(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 Professor and Advisor of the Year.

##### **(2) Membership.**

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

The text in yellow needs to be changed to:

"(c) decide university awards for Eldon J. Gardner Teacher of the Year and Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year."

The change is needed because the "Professor of the Year" is not the correct term for this award, and it also needs to be clear that these are two separate awards.

## **Word Change in Faculty Code Section 402.4.3.**

### *Impetus:*

1. FS meeting or not easily understandable to new comers.
2. Inconsistency between the current 402.4.3 and 402.5:

#### 402.4.3 Order of Business

Except as otherwise provided by the Senate, its order of business shall be: call to order (quorum), approval of minutes, announcements, university business, information items, consent agenda, key issues and action items, new business, and old business.

#### 402.5 PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

All actions of the Senate shall be in accordance with the most recent edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

### *Goals:*

1. To make the meeting order easily understandable to all.
2. To resolve the inconsistency.
3. To clarify the order of business and better reflect what we actually do.

### *Proposed word change:*

Except as otherwise provided by the Senate, its order of business shall be: **approval of minutes, university business, information items, reports, special orders (only if needed), unfinished business, and new business.**

## **405. 6 TENURE, PROMOTION AND REVIEW: GENERAL PROCEDURES**

### **6.1 Role Statement and Role Assignment**

A role statement will be prepared by the department head or supervisor, agreed upon between the department head or supervisor and the faculty member at the time he or she accepts an appointment, and approved by the academic dean and the provost and where applicable, the chancellor, vice president for extension or regional campus dean. The role statement shall include percentages for each area of professional domains (404.1.2). These percentages will define the relative evaluation weight to be given to performance in each of the different areas of professional domains. Role statements serve two primary functions.

First, the faculty member can gauge his or her expenditure of time and energy relative to the various roles the faculty member is asked to perform in the university. Second, role statements provide the medium by which the assigned duties of the faculty member are described, **including the campus or center location**, and by which administrators and evaluation committees can judge and counsel a faculty member with regard to his or her allocation of effort. During the search process, the department head or supervisor will discuss with each candidate his or her prospective role in the academic unit as defined by the role statement.

The role statement shall be reviewed, signed and dated annually by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and academic dean, or, where appropriate, the vice president for extension, chancellor, or regional campus dean and revised as needed. Any subsequent revision may be initiated by either the faculty member or the department head or supervisor. Any revision of the role statement, **including the campus or center location**, should be mutually agreed to by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If agreement cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements before transmitting revised role statements to promotion advisory committee and tenure committees. At the time of the appointment a copy of the role statement, and any later revisions, will be provided to the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, the academic dean or vice president for extension and the provost, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and the members of the tenure and/or promotion advisory committee.