

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

12-9-2013

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, December 9, 2013

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, December 9, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 524.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/524

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





FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
December 9, 2013
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Champ Hall

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Yanghee Kim
Approval of Minutes Nov 18, 2013
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Council on Teacher Education Report.....Francine Johnson
- 3:25 Old Business**
1. Word change in 402.4.3 (Second Reading)..... Stephen Bialkowski
2. Word change in 405.6 (Second Reading)..... Stephen Bialkowski
3. Word change from ASUSU to USUSA all 400 sections (Second Reading).....Stephen Bialkowski
4. Discussion of code revision to 405.12 Post-Tenure Review Process.....Renee Galligher
- 3:50 New Business**
1. EPC Items for December.....Larry Smith
2. Code Revision Process, Policy Manual 202Yanghee Kim
3. Code change to 402.12.5(1) (First Reading)..... Stephen Bialkowski
- 4:30 Adjournment**



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 18, 2013 3:00 P.M.
Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Yanghee Kim (Chair), Dale Barnard, Richard Clement, Jennifer Duncan, Lyle Holgram, Steven Mansfield, Glenn McEvoy, Bob Mueller, Jason Olsen, Robert Schmidt, Vincent Wickwar, Doug Jackson-Smith (President Elect)(excused), Renee Galliher (Past President), President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.), Marilyn Atkinson (Assistant) **Guests:** Doug Fiefia, John Mortensen, Larry Smith, Stephen Bialkowski

Yanghee Kim called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

There were no corrections to the minutes. The minutes were adopted.

Announcements

Bob Mueller will replace Amy Brown on the senate and FSEC.

Please let Yanghee Kim know which of the following dates are preferred for the Spring Semester Brown Bag Lunch with the President: March 20, 21, 24, 25, or 26.

University Business - President Albrecht and Provost Cockett.

The official announcement of the one-time payments to faculty and staff will be coming any day. The administration is trying to get specific items included in the Governor's Budget. There are several public education bills that have been pre-filed, but no higher education bills pre-filed as of now. The findings and recommendations coming out of the NWCCU review have to do more with structure and not USU policy issues.

Charles Waugh told President Albrecht that he had met with the Sustainability Council concerning a carpooling plan for USU. The Council felt that the President could be very helpful in getting the Transportation and Parking departments on board with the idea.

Information Items

ASUSU Report – Doug Fiefia. The name of the student government group has been changed to Utah State University Student Administration (USUSA). An addition to the My USU page is the new My Voice section. Students can now leave concerns and suggestions here. So far about 600 students have left comments and the student government has responded to over 200 of them. The students were recently polled about the Common Hour. Students from the College of Engineering have the most problem with the Common Hour schedule, and have contacted the Provost's Office for an exception to it. The majority of students use the time for study time and group projects. Some colleges use the time for monthly events and seminars. The Common Hour idea was brought forward by the students, but the registrars' office had to implement it. Doug agreed to include the results of the student survey in the ASUSU report when it is presented to the full Faculty Senate. Other concerns that students have raised on the My Voice forum have to do with Parking and Transportation issues; the congestion on 700 North and the limited blue passes in particular. It was suggested that a "Ride Share" board be installed in the TSC to facilitate carpooling for the student body. Renee Galliher commented that the report under-represents all that the ASUSU does for the campus community.

Vince Wickwar moved to place the report on the December consent agenda, Steven Mansfield seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Retention and Student Success Report – John Mortensen. There has been a change in admission standards this year with more emphasis on GPA. The Leave of Absence web site has been revamped. If a student leaves for mission or military service and has completed the Leave of Absence process, they can be excluded from reporting. If the process is not completed, these students count against us in the reported data. A new Leave of Absence Coordinator position has been created to manage the process. The recruiting efforts have really paid off in keeping our enrollment stable this year. The Logan campus is down only 130 freshman compared to last year.

There is an emphasis on getting students to complete the math requirements in a timelier manner. The bottle neck courses are the 0990 and 1010 classes as it can take some students 6 or 7 attempts at them. They are now offering preregistration for students in these classes so they can have the teachers/times that work best for them. Also students on the waiting list for English 1010 and 2010 have priority registration as well. Beginning in fall 2014, if students need to take the math placement exam, they will be steered to one of the regional campus sites to complete this prior to orientation in the fall. The waitlist system is working well and helps the registrar's office and departments to understand the true demand for classes which can result in more sections. They now have the ability to email all of the students on a waitlist when new sections of a course are opened up.

Robert Schmidt moved to place the report on the consent agenda, Renee Galliher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

EPC Items - Larry Smith. The Curriculum Subcommittee approved a request to discontinue the Plan C option in Physic. The General Education Subcommittee handed routine business of mainly course and syllabi approval. The Academic Standards Subcommittee discussed some major issues at their first meeting, most notably changing the General Catalog language for improving English proficiency for international students. The Office of Global Engagement attended the meeting and provided input and the subcommittee sent a recommendation to EPC.

A motion to place the EPC monthly report on the consent agenda was made by Robert Schmidt and seconded by Renee Galliher. The motion passed unanimously.

Word change in 402.4.3 – Stephen Bialkowski. The proposed changes to the policy do not make any change to the current practices of the Faculty Senate, only wording changes to make it easier to understand. Everything under the proposed "Reports" section would still be voted on as a packet, just as the Consent Agenda is voted on now. There was discussion on the procedure to present this item to the senate, and that 400 level items all require a 2/3 vote of the senate. Renee Galliher stated that the PRPC chair should present the item, not the FS President, Yanghee Kim.

Renee Galliher moved to place the proposal to change the structure of the agenda as a New Business item on the Faculty Senate agenda for a first reading by PRPC. Steve Mansfield seconded and the motion passed.

Word change in 405.6 – Noelle Cockett. The proposed change adds the phrase "including the campus or center location" in paragraph 2 and 3. PRPC will circulate the information to the committee prior to the senate meeting.

A motion to place this item on the agenda as New Business from PRPC was made by Steven Mansfield and seconded by Robert Schmidt. The motion passed.

Forum Notes – Yanghee Kim. Yanghee asked for a motion to place the Faculty Forum notes and an update on the agenda as an information item.

Renee Galliher made the motion and Glenn McEvoy seconded. The motion passed.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

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

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

From The

University Council on Teacher Education

(One Page Summary)

Academic Year
September 1, 2012 - August 31, 2013

College of Education and Human Services

Utah State University

Activities of the Council

New Programs

The Council approved the following new programs:

- * Literacy Teaching Minor/Endorsement

Program Changes

The Council approved the following program changes:

- * Secondary Education students who receive the K-12 Art teaching license will be required to complete three additional classes: PSY 1100, PSY 3660, ART 3700
- * Special Education Majors will be required to complete MATH 2020 and ELED 3100. ELED 3000 will no longer be required.
- * The Dual Immersion Endorsement will replace TEAL 4760/6760 with LING 4700/6700 Foundations of Dual Immersion
- * Secondary Teaching Science Minors will be required to take additional upper division classes and both science methods courses
- * Theater Teacher Preparation program has been revised to include: the deletion of Technology and Education for Theater Education for majors and minors; addition of Post Production courses for majors and minors; and addition of Methods of Teaching Drama K-6 for minors.
- * Physical Science Teaching Minor course work has been changed to include the removal of the science courses as electives and to include only upper division physics courses
- * Social Studies Composite Major will require additional upper division courses in History to better align with the Utah Common Core Curriculum. These changes do not increase the total major credit requirement.
- * TEAL 5560: Level 2 Clinical Practicum was approved to be an option in the Teaching Support Minor for the ELED K-6; ELED/SPED K-6; ELED/SPED 1-8 and Deaf/ELED programs. This course is also approved to be an option in the ELED Teaching Major Language Arts Emphasis.

The Council approved the discontinuation of the following programs:

- * Psychology Teaching Major
- * Sociology Teaching Major
- * Designation of Plan C Master of Science (MS) in Psychology with specialization in School Counseling (Now MEd in Psychology with specialization in School Counseling)
- * MS Plan C in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education
- * EdS in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education
- * “Audiology” notation under MA, MS, MEd, and EdS because the doctor of Audiology (AuD) is no the entry level degree nationally

Policy Changes

- * USU student teachers cannot be paid by the district for their student teaching experience
- * Foreign Language Teaching Minors who do not pass the Oral Proficiency Interview will be admitted to the Secondary Education program without a teaching minor until they pass the OPI. If students do not pass the OPI prior to student teaching, another teaching minor will be required.
- * International students who attend USU on a student visa will complete their background check through the Edith Bowen Laboratory School as a school volunteer (no social security number).
- * TEAL 6210: Graduate Route to Licensing Student Teaching will now have a registration block to ensure that a background check is completed prior to student teaching

Student Profile

There was a decrease of 3.8% in total number of students admitted into Teacher Education programs during the 2012-2013 year. The mean ACT scores (26.77) of new admissions is above the University's average for mean ACT scores (23.5) for entering freshmen. There was a 7.6% increase in the number of graduates recommended for educator licensure this year. The pass rate for the Praxis content tests was 74%. The pass rate for the Praxis Principles of Learning and Testing test which is needed for

advancement to the Level II teaching license was 95%. The placement rate for those seeking a teaching position was 89%.

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
From The
University Council on Teacher Education

Academic Year
September 1, 2012 - August 31, 2013

Emma Eccles Jones
College of Education and Human Services
Utah State University

INTRODUCTION

During the past year, September 2012 - August 2013, the University Council on Teacher Education has continued to exercise its responsibility for the coordination and regulation of the Teacher Education Program at Utah State University. Operating within the framework of the Utah State University Code of Policies and Procedures, the Council has concerned itself with the:

1. development of teacher education curricula.
2. approval of all teacher education curricula.
3. admission and counseling procedures for students desiring to enter teacher education programs.
4. graduation requirements and the recommendation of graduates for professional licensure.

MEMBERSHIP

The University Council on Teacher Education is composed of 25 voting members consisting of the Dean of the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services, who serves as Chairperson, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Research, representatives from the departments within the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services involved in the preparation of teachers, and representatives of the colleges offering teaching majors and minors. These members are nominated by the respective deans, in consultation with their staffs, and appointed by the Senate. The term of office is for three years with staggered appointments. The faculty member from the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services selected to serve on the University Educational Policies Committee (EPC) is appointed by the Dean of the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services to serve on the Council.

Inasmuch as all curriculum matters relating to any teacher licensure program should receive consideration by the Council prior to submission to the EPC, this appointment provides the necessary correlation and communication between the two bodies. In addition, the State Department of Public Instruction, the Utah Education Association, and the Society of Superintendents are represented on the Council by one voting member from each respective organization. Students at the University are represented by the Senator from the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services who has the privilege of one vote. An alternate student is designated to attend in the absence of the College's Senator. The membership of the Council for the 2012- 2013 academic year is identified on page 12 of the report.

The Council meets regularly on the third Monday of each month. Attendance at the meetings is indicative of the involvement of Council members in the affairs of the Council. During the past year, approximately 65 percent of the membership was in attendance at all meetings.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

Action Items

New Programs:

The Council approved the Literacy Teaching Minor/Endorsement

Program Changes:

1. The Council approved the following program changes:
 - Secondary Education students who receive the K-12 Art teaching license will be required to complete three additional classes: PSY 1100, PSY 3660, ART 3700

- Special Education Majors will be required to complete MATH 2020 and ELED 3100. ELED 3000 will no longer be required. This change is necessary to satisfy the new Utah Common Core Curriculum being implemented into the public schools.
- The Dual Immersion Endorsement will replace TEAL4760/6760 with LING 4700/6700 Foundations of Dual Immersion.
- Secondary Teaching Science Minors will be required to take additional upper division classes and both science methods courses.
- Theater Teacher Preparation program has been revised to include: the deletion of Technology and Education for Theater Education for majors and minors; addition of Post Production courses for majors and minors; and addition of Methods of Teaching Drama K-6 for minors
- Physical Science Teaching Minor course work has been changed to include the removal of the science courses as electives and to include only upper division physics courses
- Social Studies Composite Major will require additional upper division courses in History to better align with the Utah Common Core Curriculum. These changes do not increase the total major credit requirement.
- TEAL 5560: Level 2 Clinical Practicum was approved to be an option in the Teaching Support Minor for the ELED K-6; ELED/SPED K-6; ELED/SPED 1-8 and DeafEd/ELED programs. This course is also approved to be an option in the ELED Teaching Major Language Arts Emphasis.

2. The following programs have been discontinued:

- Psychology Teaching Major
- Sociology Teaching Major
- Designation of Plan C Master of Sciences (MS) in Psychology with specialization in School Counseling. This program has been converted to the Masters of Education (MEd) with specialization in School Counseling
- MS Plan C option in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education
- EdS in Communication Disorders and Deaf Education
- “Audiology” notation under MA, MS, MEd, and EdS because the doctor of Audiology (AuD) is now the entry level degree nationally

Policy Changes

The Council approved the following policy changes:

1. USU student teachers cannot be paid by the district for their student teaching experience
2. Students with a foreign language minor who do not pass the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) at the minimum level of “advance low” will be admitted to the Secondary Education program without a teaching minor until he/she passes the OPI. If the student does not pass the OPI prior to student teaching, another teaching minor will be required.
3. International students who are attending USU on a student visa are not allowed to work; therefore, they do not receive a social security number. Background checks are required of all students admitted into Teacher Education and require a social security number. With the support of the Utah State Office of Education and the BCI, these students will complete a

background check through the Edith Bowen Laboratory School as a school volunteer. The cost is \$35. Edith Bowen will notify the Graduation, Educator Licensing, and Accreditation Office when their background checks have cleared.

4. TEAL 6210: Graduate Routes to Licensing Student Teaching will now have a registration block to ensure that all enrolled students complete a background check prior to enrolling for this class.

Information Items

1. USU's Teacher Preparation programs received national accreditation from the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) July 2012. TEAC and NCATE have since been consolidated under an umbrella organization called the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). New accreditation standards and procedures are being drafted by CAEP and will be available January 2104.
2. Students will no longer be able to use their social security numbers to access the Utah State Office of Education's CACTUS system. Students are now required to use their CACTUS ID numbers. These numbers will be emailed to them when they are accepted into the Teacher Education Program and again when they are licensed.
3. Secondary Education students are required to completed both a teaching major and a teaching minor. The Department of English has agreed that if a student completes a dual degree in two teaching majors, the second degree will waive the teaching minor requirement.

4. The Utah Professional Practices Advisory Council (UPPAC) notified USU that when pre-service teacher education students have been arrested, UPPAC will inform USU and the cooperating school districts. Upon notification of the arrest, students will be removed from any course work requiring involvement in the public schools. These students are required to work with UPPAC to gain clearance to continue in the teacher education program.
5. The Utah State Office of Education currently has no approved Praxis-like content or Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) assessments for the American Sign Language Endorsement. Students cannot be recommended for licensure in American Sign Language until a USOE approved test has been taken and passed. The USOE has asked USU (Jan Kelley-King) to coordinate this effort in identifying appropriate assessments.

STUDENT PROFILE

Students in the Teacher Education Program. Admission into the Teacher Education Program at Utah State University requires formal application to the Office of the Associate Dean for Graduation, Educator Licensing and Accreditation in the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services as well as the department where the major work is being offered. Students are not permitted to enroll in professional courses in education until they have been admitted to the Teacher Education Program. The current admission guidelines require that an applicant have a cumulative 2.75 GPA and a minimum score of 21 in each of three areas (English, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences) and 25 in Mathematics of the American College Test (ACT). In those areas where the ACT score is below the minimum, the applicant must complete the required General Education course work with a pre-established GPA.

A total of 493 undergraduate students were admitted into the Teacher Education Program during the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This total represents a decrease of 3.8 percent from the previous year. Table 1 presents a comparison of the students admitted into the Teacher Education Program by teaching major for the two-year period 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. Tables 2, 3, and 4 provide comparative data related to the criteria upon which students were admitted into the program and ACT scores of the applicants. Table 5 provides data related to the mean ACT scores, USU GPA, and cumulative GPA.

A review of these data indicate that ACT scores and GPAs of students admitted into the Teacher Education Program continue to compare favorably with the ACT scores and GPAs of their counterparts at the University. Three hundred forty-seven (347) students admitted into the Teacher Education Program during the 2012-2013 academic year submitted ACT scores. The mean composite ACT score of these 347 students was 26.77. During the same period of time, the mean composite ACT scores of entering freshmen at Utah State University was 23.5. The 517 students admitted into the Teacher Education Program had a mean USU GPA of 3.44 and a mean cumulative GPA of 3.41. The Registrar's Office at the University reported the following mean GPA's for all sophomores at USU for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Fall Semester 2012:	Mean GPA = 3.17
---------------------	-----------------

In addition, there were 155 students admitted to post-bachelors education licensing programs. These programs include: Administrative Supervisory Certificate (AS/C), Alternative Special Education; Endorsements - Secondary Education Graduate Route to Licensure, and School Counseling.

Graduates Recommended for Certification. There were five hundred seventy-seven (577) students recommended for educator licensing and endorsements. This total is an increase of 7.6 percent in 2013 as compared to 2012 (see Table 6). Four hundred seventy (470) students were recommended for initial licensing in 2013. This total is an increase of 15 percent in the number of initial licenses granted.

Praxis Content Testing. Table 7 shows that there were 1593 tests attempted in the ETS Praxis II Content test in the student's major area. One thousand one hundred and eighty-three (1183) or 74% passed and will receive NCLB "highly qualified status" when they receive their Utah Level I teaching license. Pass rates for each content area ranged from 54% to 100%. The following content areas had a 100% pass rate: Biology, Health, Latin, Physical Education, Physical Science, Physics, Political Science, School Counseling, School Psychology, Special Education, Theatre, and Technology Engineering Education..

Although students are not required to take the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (PLT) until they apply for their Level 2 teaching license, USU strongly encourages students to take the exam prior to graduation to enhance their marketability with school districts. One hundred forty-nine (149) students attempted the PLT and 141 passed the exam, resulting in a 95% pass rate.

Placement of Program Graduates. The job placement rate of program graduates continues to be of interest to the Council. In 2013 a total of 581 graduates were recommended to the Utah State Office of Education for initial licensing in new concentration areas. Three hundred fifty-five (61%) responded to our placement survey. Of these, 287 (81%) were employed in Utah

and 20 (5.6%) accepted teaching contracts out-of-state. These percentages represent an 89 percent placement rate for those seeking teaching positions (see Table 8). The 2013 placement rate is higher than the rate achieved in 2012, which was 83 percent. Some teaching majors have a much higher placement rate than others, and students seeking admission into the pre-service teacher preparation program are informed that the probability for employment in some majors may not be as favorable as in other teaching areas. Placement rates for each major ranged from 48% to 100%. The following majors had placement rates less than 75% : Administrative/Supervisory, Elementary Education, Music, Physical Science, School Counseling and Social Studies.

Additional statistics are as follows: fourteen (3.9%) were still seeking a teaching position; twenty-seven (7.6%) were not seeking a teaching position; nine (2.5%) had secured other employment, and four (1.1%) were continuing their education.

SUMMARY

This report provides the Faculty Senate with an account of the activities of the University Council on Teacher Education and the status of the Teacher Education Program for the 2012-2013 academic year. The Council's primary activities during this period have been directed at maintaining a quality program.

The membership of the Council is cognizant of the need for improving the quality of education offered by our public, private, and charter schools. This need, as a minimum, requires the preparation of highly motivated, well-trained professionally competent teachers. In response to this challenge, the University Council on Teacher Education will continue with its efforts to provide leadership, service, and control for the Teacher Education Program at Utah State University. The

intent is to maintain a high quality pre-service teacher preparation program that will attract the "best and brightest" potential teachers. The information in this report provides evidence that the academic performance of students in the pre-service teacher education program compares favorably with and, in some instances, exceeds the performance of their peers in other academic programs.

**UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
COUNCIL ON TEACHER EDUCATION MEMBERSHIP
2012-2013 through 2014-2015**

College and Number	Department or Area	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Dean, CEHS (1)	Chairman			Beth Foley
Associate Dean, CEHS (1)				Francine Johnson
Administration (1)	Vice Provost			<i>PENDING</i>
Agriculture (2)	Ag. Education, Family, Consumer Sci			Brian Warnick
	Engineering (TEE)	Gary Stewardson*		
Education (6)	Teacher Education and Leadership			Martha Dever
	Inst Tech	Sheri Haderlie*		
	Com Dis & Deaf Education			Debbie Golos Schmidt
	Special Education & Rehabilitation			Ben Lignugaris/Kraft
	HPER			Dennis Dolny
	Psychology		Carrie Madden	
Humanities and Social Sciences (2)	English	Steve Shively*		
	History			Daniel McInerney
Caine College of Arts (2)	Fine Arts	Gregory Wheeler*		
	Theater Arts	Matt Omasta*		
Natural Resources (1)	Geography			<i>PENDING</i>
Science (2)	Mathematics		Jim Cangelosi	
	Biology		Richard Mueller	
State Department of Public Instruction (1)	Teacher Personnel			Linda Alder
University (1)	Educ. Policy Com.	Scott Hunsaker*		
UEA (1)	Public Schools		Tom Nedreberg	
Society of Supts. (1)	Superintendents	Ron Wolff*		
ASUSU (1)	ASUSU	Mike Rees*		

* Terms expire May 30

TABLE 1

**A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS ACCEPTED INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION
PROGRAM, 2011-10 AND 2012-2013, BY TEACHING MAJOR**

MAJOR	2011-12	2012-13	DIFFERENCE
Early Childhood	43	32	-11
Elementary Education (1-8)	138	149	11
Elementary Education (K-6)	33	21	-12
Composite, Elem Educ & Deaf	20	7	-13
Composite, Elem Educ & Spec Educ	26	30	4
Composite, Spec Educ & Early Child	3	9	6
Special Education	47	90	43
Secondary Education Majors			
Chemistry	1	1	0
English	31	21	-10
Geography	2	0	-2
Health Education	8	4	-4
History	18	11	-7
Languages	5	4	-1
Mathematics	6	8	2
P.E.	14	7	-7
Physics	3	1	-2
Political Science	0	0	0
Psychology *	1	n/a	-1
Sociology *	1	n/a	-1

TABLE 1 (cont.)

MAJOR	2011-12	2012-13	DIFFERENCE
Composite Majors			
Agricultural Education	8	11	3
Art Education	15	6	-9
Biological Science	7	6	-1
Earth Science	0	0	0
Family & Consumer Sciences Education	16	21	5
Mathematics/Statistics	26	10	-16
Music	18	15	-3
Physical Science	2	3	1
Social Studies	13	20	7
Engineering Technology Educ (TEE-ETE-TIED)	6	5	-1
Theatre Arts	2	1	-1
Teacher Education TOTAL	513	493	-36
Post Bachelors Licensing Program			
Administrative Supervisory Certificate	52	56	4
Communicative Disorders (SLP)	13	24	11
Alternative Special Education	34	25	-9
Graduate Route Licensing SCED	4	4	0
School Counseling	52	26	-22
Post BS TOTAL	155	135	-18
Grand TOTAL	668	628	-54

NOTE Psychology and Sociology are no longer offered as a major

TABLE 2**STUDENTS ADMITTED INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM CATEGORIZED BY ADMISSION CRITERIA
2013-2013**

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED			
	2011-2012	% of Total	2012-2013	% of Total
ACT Scores \geq 21 in <u>ALL</u> four areas	256	50%	226	46%
ACT Scores \geq 21 in at least one area	112	22%	114	23%
ACT Scores < 21 in <u>ALL</u> four areas	11	2.1%	7	1.4%
2 nd BS Degree (GPA of \geq 2.75 on last 45 credits)	11	2.1%	13	2.6%
No ACT Score available	130	25%	133	27%
TOTAL	513		493	

TABLE 3

**ACT SCORES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO TEACHER EDUCATION
BY TEST AREA
2011- 2012 AND 2012-2013**

ACT TEST AREA	NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED			
	2011-2012		2012-2013	
	ACT \geq 21	ACT <21	ACT \geq 21	ACT <21
English	366 (97%)	13 (3.4%)	306 (88%)	36 (10%)
Mathematics	313 (83%)	66 (17%)	274 (79%)	70 (20%)
Social Sciences	331 (87%)	48 (13%)	309 (89%)	31 (9%)
Natural Sciences	324 (85%)	55 (15%)	296 (85%)	44 (13%)
	N=379		N=347	

TABLE 4

**STUDENTS ADMITTED INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM CATEGORIZED BY ADMISSION CRITERIA,
BY MAJOR
SEPTEMBER 1, 2012 - AUGUST 31, 2013**

Teaching Major	Total # of Students Admitted	# students with ACT scores \geq 21 in at least one area	# of students with ACT scores < 21 in all areas	# students with B.S. degree	# of students with no ACT scores
Agricultural Education	11	6	0	0	5
Art Education	6	4	0	0	2
Biological Science	6	4	0	0	2
Chemistry	1	1	0	0	0
Early Childhood	32	15	0	0	17
Earth Science	0	0	0	0	0
Elem Education (1-8)	149	137	3	4	9
Elem Education (K-6)	21	18	1	0	2
English	21	15	1	0	5
Composite, El Ed & Deaf Educ	7	7	0	0	0
Composite, El Ed & Spec Educ	30	30	0	0	0
Composite, Spec Ed & Early Child	9	8	0	0	1
FCSE	21	9	1	0	11
Geography	0	0	0	0	0
Health Education	4	2	0	0	2
History	11	6	0	2	5
Languages	4	4	0	0	0
Math	8	7	0	0	1
Math/Stat	10	8	0	1	2
Music	15	14	0	0	1

Teaching Major	Total # of Students Admitted	# students with ACT scores \geq 21 in at least one area	# of students with ACT scores < 21 in all areas	# students with B.S. degree	# of students with no ACT scores
Physical Education	7	1	1	0	5
Physical Science	3	2	0	1	1
Physics	1	0	0	0	1
Political Science	0	0	0	0	0
Psychology *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social Studies	20	10	7	5	3
Sociology *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Special Education	90	29	3	0	58
Technology Engineering Educ	5	1	0	0	4
Theatre Arts	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	493	338	17	13	138

*NOTE: Psychology and Sociology are no longer offered as a major

TABLE 5

**STUDENTS' MEAN COMPOSITE ACT SCORES, USU GPA,
CUMULATIVE GPA BY MAJOR, AT THE TIME OF ADMISSION INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM
SEPTEMBER 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 2013**

Teaching Major	No. of Students Admitted	Students with ACT Scores	Students w/o ACT Scores	No. of Students with BS	Mean ACT Score	Mean USU GPA	Mean Cum GPA
Agricultural Education	11	6	5	0	25.50	3.34	3.36
Art Education	6	4	2	0	24	3.39	3.33
Biological Science	6	4	2	0	26.75	3.34	3.42
Chemistry	1	1	0	0	24.75	3.34	3.34
Early Childhood Education	32	15	17	0	29.25	3.43	3.44
Earth Science	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Elem Education (1-8)	149	140	9	4	23.50	3.55	3.50
Elem Education (K-6)	21	19	2	0	25	3.52	3.54
English	21	16	5	0	25.75	3.48	3.48
Composite, EI Ed & Deaf Ed	7	7	0	0	29.50	3.52	3.52
Composite, EI Ed & Spec Ed	30	30	0	0	25	3.64	3.62
Composite, Spec Educ & EC	9	8	1	0	24.85	3.59	3.47
FCSE	21	10	11	0	33.25	3.58	3.00
Geography	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Health Education	4	2	2	0	25.75	3.70	3.69
History	11	6	5	2	21.5	3.29	3.26
Languages	4	4	0	0	31.75	3.79	3.80
Math	8	7	1	0	34	3.54	3.38
Math/Stat	10	8	2	1	29.75	3.32	3.50

Teaching Major	No. of Students Admitted	Students with ACT Scores	Students w/o ACT Scores	No. of Students with BS	Mean ACT Score	Mean USU GPA	Mean Cum GPA
Music	15	13	1	0	27	3.59	3.56
Physical Education	7	2	5	0	19.25	3.25	3.09
Physical Science	3	2	1	1	26.75	3.06	3.05
Physics	1	0	1	0	n/a	3.31	3.31
Political Science	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Psychology *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social Studies	20	17	3	5	26.25	3.42	3.41
Sociology *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Special Education	90	32	58	0	24.85	3.36	3.53
Tech Engineering Ed (TEE)	5	1	4	0	31.5	3.16	3.23
Theatre Arts	1	0	1	0	n/a	3.55	3.55
TOTAL	493	354	138	13	26.77	3.44	3.41

*NOTE: Psychology and Sociology are no longer offered as majors

TABLE 6
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM GRADUATES
RECOMMENDED FOR TEACHER LICENSING
2006-2013

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Composite	34	34	44	44	31	29	8	8
Early Childhood	3	5	6	0	4	4	17	17
Elementary	151	172	156	149	112	123	109	139
Elementary K-6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	7	17	15
Secondary	92	111	143	113	105	167	113	117
Endorsements	143	127	131	57	46	79	85	107
Art	3	6	3	3	2	8	5	7
ComD	11	16	26	23	13	20	13	28
HPER	24	8	22	16	20	17	27	16
Lib Media	13	6	22	11	15	1	4	4
Music	4	11	9	9	10	10	8	9
School Counseling	32	19	53	18	34	19	52	26
School Psychology	3	4	5	2	1	2	3	5
Special Education	92	123	113	120	94	89	75	79
TOTAL	605 (468)	642 (475)	733 (548)	565 (466)	495 (425)	558 (416)	536 (407)	577 (470)

*Numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of **initial** certificates for that year.

Table 7

**PRAXIS RESULTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM GRADUATES
RECOMMENDED FOR LICENSING
2009-2013**

Program	Praxis Test Number and Name	Passing Score	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
			Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed
Administrative/ Supervisory Certificate	0411/5011-Educational Leadership & Supervision	151	19	18 (95%)	25	25 (96%)	44	43 (98%)	60	55 (91%)	43	39 (91%)
Ag Education	0700-Agriculture	520	3	3	22	20 (91%)	8	8 (100%)	7	6 (88%)	12	10 (83%)
Art Education	0134/5134- Art: Content Knowledge	158 #	3	0 (100%)	18	17 (94%)	7	7 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	4	3 (75%)
Biology	0235/5235- Biology: Content Knowledge	149	8	8 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	17	17 (100%)	8	8 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Chemistry	0245/5245-Chemistry: Content Knowledge	151	7	6	0	0	9	7 (78%)	3	2 (67%)	5	3 (60%)
Earth Science	0571/5571- Earth Sci: Content Knowledge	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elementary Education	0014/5014–Elementary Educ: Content Knowledge	150	149	140 (94%)	130	125 (96%)	78	74 (95%)	89	79 (89%)	19	17 (89%)
Elementary Education Early Childhood Early Childhood/Deaf Ed Early Childhood/Elem Ed Elem/Deaf Education Elem/Special Education Special Education	5032-Elementary Ed Reading/Language	165	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	275	227 (83%)
	5033-Elementary Ed Mathematics	165	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	308	180 (58%)
	5034-Elementary Ed Social Studies	155	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	289	196 (68%)
	5035-Elementary Ed Science	159	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	290	218 (75%)
English	0041/5041-English Lang: Literature & Composition: Content Knowledge	168	22	16 (73%)	44	22 (50%)	32	22 (69%)	25	19 (76%)	19	17 (89%)
Family & Consumer Science	0120/5121-Family & Consumer Sciences	159	11	11 (100%)	26	24 (92%)	19	19 (100%)	13	12 (92%)	13	12 (92%)
French	5174-French: Content Knowledge	160 #	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2 (67%)	5	4 (80%)
Geography	0920-: Geography	630	2	2 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0

Program	Praxis Test Number and Name	Passing Score	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
			Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed
German	5183-German: Content Knowledge	160 #	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	0	0	1	1 (100%)	0	0
Health Education	0550/5550-Health Educ	670	8	8 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	11	7 (66%)	5	5 (100%)
History	0941/5941- World & US History: Content Knowledge	156	19	12 (63%)	45	23 (51%)	48	29 (60%)	39	20 (51%)	32	20 (63%)
Integrated Science	0435/5435-General Sci: Content Knowledge	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	11 (58%)	7	4 (57%)
Latin	0600-Latin	610	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2 (100%)	2	2 (100%)
Math Level II Endorsement	0069/5061-Middle School Mathematics	145	15	15 (100%)	14	13 (93%)	51	50 (98%)	59	55 (93%)	99	85 (86%)
Mathematics/ Math/Stats	0061/5061-Mathematics: Content Knowledge	138	21	20 (95%)	59	48 (81%)	34	26 (76%)	53	43 (81%)	42	38 (90%)
Music	0113/5113-Music Content Knowledge	156	9	9 (100%)	11	11 (100%)	20	19 (95%)	8	6 (75%)	22	18 (82%)
Physical Education/ PE/Coaching	0091/5091- Physical Ed: Content Knowledge	152	9	9 (100%)	7	6 (86%)	7	5 (71%)	0	0	7	7 (100%)
Physical Science	0070-Chemistry, Physics, General Sci	570	0	0	4	2 (50%)	0	0	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)
Physical Science	0481-Physical Sci: Content Knowledge	150	1	1 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	0	0
Physics	0265/5265- Physics: Content Knowledge	136	4	3 (75%)	1	0	4	2 (50%)	9	6 (69%)	4	4 (10%)
Political Science	0930-Government/ Political Sci	660 #	2	1 (50%)	4	3 (75%)	9	7 (78%)	0	0	2	2 (100%)
Psychology	0390- Psychology	620	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	4	3 (75%)	3	3 (100%)	0	0
Reading Endorsement	0204/5204-Teaching Reading	154	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13	12 (92%)	5	4 (80%)
Sch Counseling	0421/5421-Sch Guidance & Counseling	156 #	18	18 (100%)	39	38 (97%)	19	18 (95%)	63	58 (92%)	18	18 (100%)
Sch Psychology	0401/5401- School Psychologist	165	2	2 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	7	7 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	4	4 (100%)

Program	Praxis Test Number and Name	Passing Score	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
			Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed
Social Studies	0081/5081-Social Studies: Content Knowledge	159	6	5 (83%)	11	6 (55%)	22	17 (77%)	2	2 (100%)	24	13 (54%)
Sociology	0950-Sociology	550 #	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech	0220/5221-Speech Communication	144 #	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spanish	0191-Spanish: Content Knowledge	165 #	13	13 (100%)	21	17 (81%)	3	3 (100%)	0	0	9	7 (78%)
Special Education	0351/5354-Educ of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge	151 #	22	22 (100%)	17	17 (100%)	0	0	1	1 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Special Education	0049-Middle School English/Language Arts	155	1	1 (100%)	13	10 (77%)	2	2 (100%)	7	4 (57%)	7	4 (57%)
Engineering & Technology Education	0050/5051-Technology Education	159 #	7	7 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	8	8 (100%)
Theatre	0640-Theatre	630	3	3 (100%)	1	1 (100%)	2	2 (100%)	0	0	1	1 (100%)
		TOTAL	520	482 (93%)	633	530 (84%)	527	443 (84%)	621	526 (85%)	1593	1183 (74%)

Praxis Test Test Number	Praxis Test Number and Name	Passing Score	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
			Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed	Attempt	Passed
Principles of Teaching & Learning: Early Childhood	0621/5621	160	0	0	8	8 (100%)	10	10 (100%)	5	5 (100%)	6	5 (83%)
Principles of Teaching & Learning: Grades K-6	0622/5622	160	33	32 (97%)	130	117 (90%)	75	72 (96%)	70	66 (94%)	81	80 (99%)
Principles of Teaching & Learning: Grades 5-9	0623/5623	160	3	3 (100%)	4	4 (100%)	3	2 (67%)	3	3 (100%)	5	4 (80%)
Principles of Teaching & Learning: Grades 7-12	0624/5624	160	48	48 (100%)	156	144 (92%)	118	113 (96%)	90	84 (93%)	57	52 (91%)
		TOTAL:	84	83 (99%)	298	273 (92%)	206	198 (96%)	168	158 (94%)	149	141 (95%)

TABLE 8

**PLACEMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM GRADUATES
RECOMMENDED FOR INITIAL LICENSING FOR THE PERIOD
SEPTEMBER 1, 2012 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2013**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Teaching Major	Total No. Certified	Total No. Responded	In State	Outside State	Other Employment	Seeking Teaching Position	Not Seeking Teaching Position	Continuing Formal Education	% Placement in Teaching of Total Responded	% Placement in Teaching of Total Seeking Employment
Ad/Supervisory	56	25	11	1	0	4	9	0	48%	75%
Ag Ed	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Art Ed	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Biological Science	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Chemistry	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	n/a	n/a
Com Dis	28	9	4	0	4	0	1	0	44%	50%
Earth Science	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Composite Majors	8	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Early Childhood	17	13	9	0	0	1	3	0	69%	90%
Elem Educ (1-8)	139	102	95	2	1	1	3	0	95%	98%
Elem Edu (K-6)	15	11	8	0	1	0	2	0	73%	89%
English	27	19	13	1	0	0	0	0	74%	74%
TEE/ETE/ITE/TIED	8	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	75%	100%
FCSE	13	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Geography	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Health Education	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
History	19	9	8	0	0	1	0	0	89%	89%
Mod Languages	12	8	6	0	0	0	1	1	75%	100%
Math	31	22	14	7	0	0	0	1	95%	91%
Music Ed	9	6	3	0	0	2	0	1	50%	60%

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Teaching Major	Total No. Certified	Total No. Responded	In State	Outside State	Other Employment	Seeking Teaching Position	Not Seeking Teaching Position	Continuing Formal Education	% Placement in Teaching of Total Responded	% Placement in Teaching of Total Seeking Employment
PE	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Physical Science	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	50%	100%
Physics	7	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	80%	100%
Political Science	7	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Psychology	9	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	80%	100%
School Psychology	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Social Studies	17	11	4	1	1	4	1	0	45%	50%
Special Education	54	40	34	2	1	0	3	0	90%	97%
Special Education Alternative	25	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Speech/Theater	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
Library Media	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
School Counselor	26	10	8	0	1	1	0	0	80%	80%
TOTALS	581	355	287	20	9	14	27	4	86%	95%

NOTES: Percent (Column 10) = $\frac{\text{Column 4} + \text{Column 5}}{\text{Column 3}}$

Column 3

Percent (Column 11) = $\frac{\text{Column 4} + \text{Column 5}}{\text{Column 3} - \text{Column 8} - \text{Column 9}}$

Column 3 - Column 8 - Column 9

- No data available

*graduate may be teaching in major or minor content area

Word Change to 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.

Recommended changes with track changes (Oct 12, 2013)

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

In addition to the reviews that are mandatory for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion, the performance of all faculty members will be reviewed annually. These annual reviews will be used as the basis for recommendations for salary adjustments and for term appointment renewal. They also serve as the basis for the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.

Tenure (see Section 405.1) is a means to certain ends, specifically; freedom of teaching, research and other academic endeavors, and a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Academic freedom and economic security for faculty are indispensable to the success of a university in fulfilling its obligation to its students and to society.

With tenure comes a professional responsibility to conscientiously and competently to devote one's energies and skills to the teaching, research or creative endeavors, extension, librarianship, and service missions of the university. A central dimension of academic freedom is the exercise of professional judgment in such matters. The intent of the review process is to support the principles of academic freedom and tenure through the provision of effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention, and timely and affirmative assistance to ensure that every faculty member continues to experience professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career. Useful feedback should include tangible recognition to those faculty members who have demonstrated high or improved performance. It is also the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Each department, in collaboration with the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, shall establish procedures by which all faculty members shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. Recognizing that faculty accomplishments do not always occur in a linear fashion, this review should take into account performance over the past 5 years (or since the individual's appointment to USU if less than 5 years). The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

12.2 Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty

For tenured faculty, the annual review specified above constitutes the post-tenure review. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:19 PM

Comment [1]: Minor wordsmithing to make it clear that the annual review is the basis for post tenure review, and to make the text more accurate (e.g., adding librarianship).

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:24 PM

Deleted: There are two additional reviews of faculty performance other than those

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:25 PM

Deleted: are

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:26 PM

Deleted: for faculty

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:26 PM

Deleted:

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:26 PM

Deleted: , and quinquennial reviews of tenured faculty

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:28 PM

Deleted: , the obligation

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:29 PM

Deleted: post-tenure

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [2]: Minor changes to acknowledge that college and campus administration are part of the process of developing assessment procedures. The ultimate responsibility for establishing procedures lies with the department.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [3]:
Also introduces 5 year window for annual review.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:32 PM

Deleted: for tenure-eligible faculty (405.7.1 (3))

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:37 PM

Deleted: Quinquennial

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [4]: Removed initial paragraph about quinquennial review.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:38 PM

Deleted: Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years by a post-tenure quinquennial review committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member being reviewed. The committee shall be appointed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and must include at least one member from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee w... [1]

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:38 PM

Deleted: or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with polic... [2]

careers. This evaluation of tenured faculty shall include the current curriculum vita and other professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member, and any professional development plan in place. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate: (1) teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment; (2) the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and (3) service to the profession, the university, and the community. In order to promote and support academic freedom and the expression of scholarship and creative talents, the criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.

If a tenured faculty member is deemed to not be meeting the standard described above, a professional development plan will be implemented to address the specific area(s) of concern (see section 405.12.3). The department head or supervisor has the latitude to consider other options, including re-negotiation with the faculty member of his/her role statement. In addition, options, such as leave of absence, voluntary resignation, early retirement, phased retirement, medical leave, or career counseling may be available to the faculty member upon consultation with the USU Office of Human Resources. The faculty member may request a comprehensive peer-review (as outlined in 405.12.2(1)) after any annual review in which he/she disagrees with the department head's evaluation of his/her performance.

If the next annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is meeting expectations, taking into account progress on the professional development plan, the faculty member will be considered eligible for merit pay increases if available. However, if the department head concludes that the faculty member is not meeting expectations for a second consecutive year then a comprehensive post-tenure peer review will occur, as outlined below.

(1) Comprehensive Peer Review

College peer review committees (see section 405.12.4) will receive copies of the annual reviews from the previous two years (with each review covering a 5-year period as stated in 405.12.1), the material upon which the annual reviews were based, the most recent professional development plan, and any additional material the faculty member or department head wishes the committee to consider. The committee may also elect to invite the faculty member and/or department head to provide additional input.

Upon completion of its review, the college peer review committee shall submit a written report providing an assessment of the faculty member's performance. Copies of the written report will be provided to the faculty member, department head or supervisor, who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of a comprehensive peer review committee. Ombudspersons must receive adequate advance notice of a committee meeting from the chairperson (see policy 405.6.5).

If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is not meeting the standards for appraisal outlined in 405.12.1 a Professional Development Plan will be implemented as described in 405.12.3.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:40 PM

Deleted: the review of the annual evaluation (405.12.1), and shall include

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:22 PM

Deleted: T

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:40 PM

Deleted: In the event that a faculty member is promoted to the most senior rank, the review made by his or her promotion committee shall constitute the quinquennial review. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [5]: New text adding detail about the outcome of the annual review, and the comprehensive review.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:54 PM

Deleted: the review committee for tenured faculty

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:54 PM

Deleted: to the

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:56 PM

Deleted: A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty member.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 8:56 PM

Deleted: In the event that the outcomes of a professional development plan are contested (405.12.3(3)), the review committee for tenured faculty may be called upon by the faculty member to conduct its quinquennial review ahead of schedule. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. The review committee may also, at times, between its quinquennial reviews, review the professional development plan as described in sections (405.12.3(1-2)).

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [6]: Provides additional detail about the work of the comprehensive peer review committee, in order to facilitate consistency across campus.

If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is meeting the standard for appraisal as outlined in 405.12.1 no sanctions will be pursued against the faculty member relative to non-performance (see 403.3.2) and the faculty member will be eligible for merit increases as available.

Following a comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, if the subsequent annual review indicates that the faculty member is meeting the standards for appraisal as outlined in 405.12.1, the Professional Development Plan will be considered complete and the faculty member will be eligible for merit pay increase as available.

If, following an initial comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, the subsequent (third consecutive) annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is continuing to not meet expectations and is not meeting benchmarks set in the professional development plan, a second comprehensive peer review will occur. The procedures for this peer review will be the same as those outlined in 405.12.2 (2).

12.3 Professional Development Plan

(1) As noted above, the department head or supervisor will, as a consequence of the annual review finding that the faculty member is not meeting expectations, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet expectations. The plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit subsequent alteration. The professional development plan shall be mutually agreed to and signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If agreement cannot be reached the appropriate college peer review committee will be used to resolve disagreements.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (1) identify the faculty member's specific strengths and weaknesses; (2) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified performance deficiencies; (3) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (4) set appropriate time lines for achieving the outcomes; (5) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (6) identify any institutional commitments.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the goals or outcomes included in the plan. At the next scheduled annual evaluation, the department head or supervisor will evaluate the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes described in the plan, in terms of the criteria established by the plan. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the 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.

12.4 College Comprehensive Peer Review Committee

Comprehensive peer review committees consisting of five standing members and three alternates, all of whom are full Professors, shall be formed by every college, Libraries, and Extension. Standing committee members will include four individuals elected by the college faculty and one individual appointed by the college dean. Alternates will include two elected individuals and one individual

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [7]: Minor changes to reference college peer review committee as arbiter of disagreement between department head and faculty member.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:02 PM

Deleted: T

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:02 PM

Deleted: may

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:03 PM

Deleted: process

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:03 PM

Deleted: role

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:04 PM

Deleted: individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:04 PM

Deleted: before transmitting revised role statements to promotion advisory committee and tenure committees. Such appeal and hearing procedures can, upon request, include a review of the professional development plan by the Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:06 PM

Deleted: (if any) and relate these to the allocation of effort assigned in the role statement

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:06 PM

Deleted: implementing and monitoring the activities and

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:06 PM

Deleted: in the plan

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:07 PM

Deleted: The department head or supervisor shall, at the conclusion of the professional development plan,

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:09 PM

Deleted: 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.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [8]: Deleted because the peer review committee will review the progress on the PDP automatically if a second annual review indicates the faculty member is not meeting expectations.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:09 PM

Deleted: At the request of the faculty member, department head, or supervisor, this report must be reviewed by the committee. (3)

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:09 PM

Deleted: the committee for tenured faculty, who shall conduct an in-depth evaluation as described in policy 405.12.2 (4)

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [9]: A whole new section on the structure and function of the college peer review committee (5)

appointed by the dean. While only full Professors can serve on the peer review committee, nominations for the elected positions will be sought from all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members within the college. All tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members will vote for the appropriate number of candidates to ensure there are four elected standing members and two elected alternate members. With the exception of Libraries and Extension, no more than two members can be from any one department. Department heads, deans, associate deans, and others with central administration appointments are not eligible to serve on these committees. If a committee member takes on such an administrative position during his/her period of committee service, he/she will be replaced.

Each comprehensive peer review committee member will serve a three-year term. However, terms will be staggered to ensure some continuity and to avoid, if possible, no more than half of the members being replaced in any given year. Vacancies will be filled through college elections for the four elected members and two elected alternates and dean appointment for the one appointed member and one appointed alternate. Each year the committee will elect an individual from within the committee who will serve as the committee chairperson for that year.

When a tenured faculty member undergoes a comprehensive peer review, the faculty member and/or department head or supervisor may each request that one committee member recuse him/herself and be replaced by an alternate member. Supervisors of faculty members under review must recuse themselves from the discussion of that particular faculty member. Such requests should be made only when there is a clear conflict of interest (e.g., faculty member or department head has a close personal or professional relationship with a committee member). The alternate selected will be an elected alternate if an elected standing member is replaced and the appointed alternate if the dean-appointed member is replaced.

12.4 Academic Due Process

Evaluations, conducted pursuant to this policy, 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 over a reasonable period of time as prescribed in a professional development plan, the outcomes of which have been judged 3 by the comprehensive college peer review committee, then nonpunitive measures or sanctions may be considered as per policy 407. Successive negative reviews do not in any way diminish the obligations of the university to show adequate cause pursuant to policy 407.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:16 PM

Comment [10]: Edits to increase clarify and eliminate redundancy.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:20 PM

Deleted: 5

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:13 PM

Deleted: Policy 407

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:13 PM

Deleted: (405.12.

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:13 PM

Deleted: (3))

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:14 PM

Deleted: (405.12.2)

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:14 PM

Deleted: other

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:14 PM

Deleted: , should be considered in lieu of a sanction as

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:15 PM

Deleted: .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

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:15 PM

Deleted: such

Renee Galliher 10/12/13 9:15 PM

Deleted: .4

Recommended changes clean (Oct 12, 2013)

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

In addition to the reviews that are mandatory for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion, the performance of all faculty members will be reviewed annually. These annual reviews will be used as the basis for recommendations for salary adjustments and for term appointment renewal. They also serve as the basis for the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.

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

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Each department, in collaboration with the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, shall establish procedures by which all faculty members shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. Recognizing that faculty accomplishments do not always occur in a linear fashion, this review should take into account performance over the past 5 years (or since the individual's appointment to USU if less than 5 years). The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

12.2 Post-Tenure Review of Tenured Faculty

For tenured faculty, the annual review specified above constitutes the post-tenure review. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. This evaluation of tenured faculty shall include the current curriculum vita and other

professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member, and any professional development plan in place. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate: (1) teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment; (2) the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and (3) service to the profession, the university, and the community. In order to promote and support academic freedom and the expression of scholarship and creative talents, the criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty.

If a tenured faculty member is deemed to not be meeting the standard described above, a professional development plan will be implemented to address the specific area(s) of concern (see section 405.12.3). The department head or supervisor has the latitude to consider other options, including re-negotiation with the faculty member of his/her role statement. In addition, options, such as leave of absence, voluntary resignation, early retirement, phased retirement, medical leave, or career counseling may be available to the faculty member upon consultation with the USU Office of Human Resources. The faculty member may request a comprehensive peer-review (as outlined in 405.12.2(1)) after any annual review in which he/she disagrees with the department head's evaluation of his/her performance.

If the next annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is meeting expectations, taking into account progress on the professional development plan, the faculty member will be considered eligible for merit pay increases if available. However, if the department head concludes that the faculty member is not meeting expectations for a second consecutive year then a comprehensive post-tenure peer review will occur, as outlined below.

(1) Comprehensive Peer Review

College peer review committees (see section 405.12.4) will receive copies of the annual reviews from the previous two years (with each review covering a 5-year period as stated in 405.12.1), the material upon which the annual reviews were based, the most recent professional development plan, and any additional material the faculty member or department head wishes the committee to consider. The committee may also elect to invite the faculty member and/or department head to provide additional input.

Upon completion of its review, college peer review committee shall submit a written report providing an assessment of the faculty member's performance. Copies of the written report will be provided to the faculty member, department head or supervisor, who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. An ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of a comprehensive peer review committee. Ombudspersons must receive adequate advance notice of a committee meeting from the chairperson (see policy 405.6.5).

If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is not meeting the standards for appraisal outlined in 405.12.1 a Professional Development Plan will be implemented as described in 405.12.3.

If the peer review committee concludes that the faculty member is meeting the standard for appraisal as outlined in 405.12.1 no sanctions will be pursued against the faculty member relative to non-performance (see 403.3.2) and the faculty member will be eligible for merit increases as available.

Following a comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, if the subsequent annual review indicates that the faculty member is meeting the standards for appraisal as outlined in 405.12.1, the Professional Development Plan will be considered complete and the faculty member will be eligible for merit pay increase as available.

If, following an initial comprehensive peer review and the initiation of a Professional Development Plan, the subsequent (third consecutive) annual review indicates that the tenured faculty member is continuing to not meet expectations and is not meeting benchmarks set in the professional development plan, a second comprehensive peer review will occur. The procedures for this peer review will be the same as those outlined in 405.12.2 (2).

12.3 Professional Development Plan

(1) As noted above, the department head or supervisor will, as a consequence of the annual review finding that the faculty member is not meeting expectations, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet expectations. The plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit subsequent alteration. The professional development plan shall be mutually agreed to and signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension and agriculture, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If agreement cannot be reached the appropriate college peer review committee will be used to resolve disagreements.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (1) identify the faculty member's specific strengths and weaknesses; (2) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified performance deficiencies; (3) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (4) set appropriate time lines for achieving the outcomes; (5) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (6) identify any institutional commitments.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the goals or outcomes included in the plan. At the next scheduled annual evaluation, the department head or supervisor will evaluate the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes described in the plan, in terms of the criteria established by the plan. For meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the 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.

12.4 College Comprehensive Peer Review Committee

Comprehensive peer review committees consisting of five standing members and three alternates, all of whom are full Professors, shall be formed by every college, Libraries, and Extension. Standing committee members will include four individuals elected by the college faculty and one individual appointed by the college dean. Alternates will include two elected individuals and one individual appointed by the dean. While only full Professors can serve on the peer review committee, nominations for the elected positions will be sought from all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members within the college. All tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members will vote for the appropriate number of candidates to ensure there are four elected standing members and two elected alternate members. With the exception of Libraries and Extension, no more than two members can be from any one department. Department heads, deans, associate deans, and others with central administration appointments are not eligible to serve on these committees. If a committee member

takes on such an administrative position during his/her period of committee service, he/she will be replaced.

Each comprehensive peer review committee member will serve a three-year term. However, terms will be staggered to ensure some continuity and to avoid, if possible, no more than half of the members being replaced in any given year. Vacancies will be filled through college elections for the four elected members and two elected alternates and dean appointment for the one appointed member and one appointed alternate. Each year the committee will elect an individual from within the committee who will serve as the committee chairperson for that year.

When a tenured faculty member undergoes a comprehensive peer review, the faculty member and/or department head or supervisor may each request that one committee member recuse him/herself and be replaced by an alternate member. Supervisors of faculty members under review must recuse themselves from the discussion of that particular faculty member. Such requests should be made only when there is a clear conflict of interest (e.g., faculty member or department head has a close personal or professional relationship with a committee member). The alternate selected will be an elected alternate if an elected standing member is replaced and the appointed alternate if the dean-appointed member is replaced.

12.4 Academic Due Process

Evaluations, conducted pursuant to this policy, 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 over a reasonable period of time as prescribed in a professional development plan, the outcomes of which have been judged 3 by the comprehensive college peer review committee, then nonpunitive measures or sanctions may be considered as per policy 407. Successive negative reviews do not in any way diminish the obligations of the university to show adequate cause pursuant to policy 407.

Current Code

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

There are two additional reviews of faculty performance other than those for tenure-eligible faculty and for promotion. These are annual reviews for faculty for salary adjustments and for term appointment renewal, and quinquennial reviews of tenured faculty.

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

12.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Each department shall establish procedures by which all faculty shall be reviewed annually. Such reviews shall, at a minimum, incorporate an analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member annually to review this analysis of the fulfillment of the role statement and, subsequently, provide a written report of this review to the faculty member. A copy of this report shall be sent to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. The annual evaluation and recommendation by the department head or supervisor for tenure-eligible faculty (405.7.1 (3)) may constitute this review for salary adjustment. For faculty with term appointments, the annual review shall also include a recommendation regarding renewal of the term appointment.

12.2 Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years by a post-tenure quinquennial review committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members who hold rank equal to or greater than the faculty member being reviewed. The committee shall be appointed by the department head or supervisor in consultation with the faculty member and academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, and must include at least one member from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than two faculty members in the academic unit with equal to or higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall not serve on this committee, and no committee member may be a department head or supervisor of any other member of the committee. An administrator may only be appointed to the quinquennial

review committee with the approval of the faculty member under consideration. For post-tenure quinquennial review meetings and for meetings held between either the department head or supervisor and the candidate to review the committee's evaluation and recommendation, the candidate or department head or supervisor may request the presence of an ombudsperson in accordance with policy 405.6.5. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with his or her position as specified in the role statement. It is the intent of this policy to acknowledge that there will be different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. This evaluation of tenured faculty shall include the review of the annual evaluation (405.12.1), and shall include the current curriculum vita and other professional materials deemed necessary by the faculty member, and any professional development plan in place. The review will be discipline and role specific, as appropriate to evaluate: (1) teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment; (2) the quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and (3) service to the profession, the university, and the community. The criteria for the award of tenure or promotion to the most senior ranks shall not be employed for the review of the tenured faculty. In the event that a faculty member is promoted to the most senior rank, the review made by his or her promotion committee shall constitute the quinquennial review. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. Upon completion of its review, the review committee for tenured faculty shall submit a written report to the department head or supervisor, who shall forward a copy to the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, chancellor or regional campus dean. A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty member. In the event that the outcomes of a professional development plan are contested (405.12.3(3)), the review committee for tenured faculty may be called upon by the faculty member to conduct its quinquennial review ahead of schedule. In such cases, another review need not be scheduled for five years. The review committee may also, at times, between its quinquennial reviews, review the professional development plan as described in sections (405.12.3(1-2)).

12.3 Professional Development Plan

(1) The department head or supervisor may, as a consequence of the annual review process, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role expectations. The plan shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall permit subsequent alteration. The professional development plan shall be mutually agreed to and signed by the faculty member and the department head or supervisor and approved by the academic dean or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean. If 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. Such appeal and hearing procedures can, upon request, include a review of the professional development plan by the Review Committee described in policy 405.12.2.

(2) The professional development plan should include elements which: (1) identify the specific strengths and weaknesses (if any) and relate these to the allocation of effort assigned in the role statement; (2) define specific goals or outcomes needed to remedy the identified deficiencies; (3) outline the activities that are necessary to achieve the needed outcomes; (4) set appropriate time lines for implementing and monitoring the activities and achieving the outcomes; (5) indicate appropriate criteria for progress reviews and the evaluation of outcomes; and (6) identify any institutional commitments in the plan.

(3) The faculty member shall meet with the department head or supervisor, at times indicated as appropriate in the professional development plan, to monitor progress toward accomplishment of the

goals or outcomes included in the plan. The department head or supervisor shall, at the conclusion of the professional development plan, evaluate the fulfillment of the goals or outcomes described in the plan, in terms of the criteria established by the plan. The department head or supervisor shall meet with the faculty member to review this analysis and subsequently, the department head or supervisor shall provide a written report of this review to the faculty member 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.

**Report from the Educational Policies Committee
December 6, 2013**

The Educational Policies Committee met on December 5, 2013. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page¹ and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties. During the December meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following actions were taken:

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of December 5, 2013 which included the following actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 77 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the Department of Plants, Soils, and Climate to offer a BS degree in Horticulture was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Theatre Arts to add an emphasis in Film Production within the BFA in Theatre was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Music to offer an Organ Performance Emphasis within the existing Bachelor of Music degree was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Applied Economics to create an Environmental and Natural Resource Economics Minor was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Applied Economics to change the name of the Agribusiness Management Minor to Agribusiness Minor was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation to offer a specialization in Audiology within the PhD in Disability Disciplines was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Physics to restructure its PhD degree by reducing the credits from 60 to 42 was approved.
2. Approval of the report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee meeting of November 11, 2013. Action items were:
 - Proposed changes to the USU General Catalogue language of the following (changes in red):
 1. **Credit transfer policy vote**
*Utah State University awards transfer credit for academic work completed at other academic institutions. Transfer and articulation is not based solely on the accreditation status of the transfer institution. **Evaluations for the specific acceptance of credit being equivalent to a Utah State University course are at the discretion of each department's faculty or faculty designee.***

Acceptance of credit should not be confused with its application. Transfer credit may or may not apply to the graduation requirements of Utah State University, regardless of the number of credits transferred.

2. Associate of Science and Associate of Arts

The Associate of Science (AS) *or Associate of Arts* degree in general studies is offered. ~~Some degrees are offered online and are delivered to several international locations. These degrees are offered through USU's Logan Main Campus, Regional Campuses and Distance Education, and USU Eastern.~~ Requirements include: (1) completion of current USU General Education requirements; (2) USU cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher *and a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher*; (3) completion of at least 60 credits; and (4) at least 20 credits in residency (USU credits) at USU's Logan Campus, USU Eastern, or through courses offered by USU Regional Campuses and Distance Education.

The Associate of Science *and Associate of Arts* degrees ~~is are~~ available without a concentration. USU-Eastern also offers an Associate of Science in Business (AB) and an Associate of Science in Criminal Justice (AC).

3. Transcript evaluation

Once the Admissions Office has completed your admissions application, your transcript will be sent to the Registrar's Office to be posted by the Articulation Staff. Transfer courses that are not *currently articulated* will be sent to an Articulation Representative *designated by the department* for evaluation, which will then determine how the course will transfer.

4. College Level Examination Program (CLEP)

The CLEP examinations were designed for *undergraduate* students who wish to utilize previous knowledge and experience in lieu of required coursework. CLEP is a national program of credit-by-examination, allowing students to obtain recognition for college-level achievement. This privilege is intended to measure information and training gained from practical experience that may be considered the equivalent of the experience and training received by students in an organized course given at the University.

Undergraduate credits may be acquired through the CLEP examinations. These credits may be used to fill General Education Requirements and may also be accepted as equivalent to specific courses. Students interested in taking a CLEP exam should contact the University Testing Services Office, University Inn 115.

5. Credit by department examination

Undergraduate, matriculated students may challenge a course for credit by taking a departmental examination. Departments will determine if a course is appropriate for challenge; students should contact the instructor and/or department. If a challenge exam is available, the instructor should advise the student as to whether he or she has a reasonable chance of passing.

The examination will survey knowledge of the course content and may include papers, projects, portfolios, etc.

Students challenging a course for which they are registered must do so within the first two weeks of the course. Students not registered will be required to pay a course-specific examination fee. Students who take a departmental examination will receive the exam grade posted to their transcript for that course. Credits earned through departmental examination can be used to meet the minimum ~~USU~~ course requirement.

6. Dual majors

Students ~~can earn receive a single multiple~~ degrees and ~~majors diploma~~, but have two different ~~majors~~, either within the same college or from two different colleges. They will then receive a diploma for each major.

7. Second Bachelors Degree

Applicants for a second bachelor's degree must file an application with the Admissions Office and obtain the recommendation of their academic dean prior to being admitted. A second bachelor's degree is available only to those on whom a first bachelor's degree has been conferred by a regionally-accredited institution. Students must complete a minimum of 30 USU credits beyond those applied toward the first bachelor's degree, 18 of which must be earned in department-approved upper-division courses related to the major. USU credits may be earned in courses completed at USU's Logan campus or ~~at designated centers, or through classes offered by~~ Regional Campuses and Distance Education ~~through USU~~.

Students may apply for a second bachelor's degree only if the major is different from the major in the first bachelor's degree.

Candidates for a second bachelor's degree who did not satisfy the ~~Communications Literacy, Quantitative Literacy, and~~ American Institutions requirements in the first bachelor's degree, must satisfy ~~any deficiencies in these~~ this requirements before receiving the second bachelor's degree.

Note: *The first bachelor's degree must have been awarded by a regionally-accredited college or university. Students who earn a degree from an international college or university may be considered for a second bachelor's degree if the first degree was earned from an institution listed in a database approved by the ~~Office of International Students and Scholars~~ Office of Global Engagement.*

8. Letter of Completion

On occasion, there may be circumstances in which a student has completed most of the General Education requirements at Utah State University, transferred to another institution where he or she has completed the last of the courses needed to complete the USU General Education requirements, and then requested a Letter of Completion from USU. Since the coursework was

*not completed at USU, USU may not submit a Letter of Completion, unless the coursework is posted to a USU transcript. To have this coursework posted to a USU transcript, a student should submit his or her transcript ~~and a \$15 posting fee~~ to the Registrar's Office, 1600 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-1600. The Registrar's Office will then *evaluate and post* the credit. If all requirements have been satisfied, the Letter of Completion will be generated.*

3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of November 19, 2013. Of note:

- The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:

ENGL 3630 (DHA/CI)

PHIL 3820 (DHA)

RELS 3050 (DHA)

- A proposal from Executive Vice President and Provost Noelle Cockett to eliminate the two USU course requirement for undergraduate graduation was approved.

Changes to Section 402.12.5 (1)

This section is important in that it specifies the role of PRPC in code changes and addresses how code changes are initiated. I would like to modify the description for PRPC in Section 402 to reference this section of code so that future PRPC members could be aware of the process. The amendment to the PRPC description is in red.

12.5 Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC)

(1) Duties.

The Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee shall advise the Faculty Senate regarding composition, interpretation, and revision of Section 400 in University Policies and Procedures. Recommended revisions shall be submitted to the Senate for its consideration. **The procedure for code amendments are specified in Section 202 of the USU Policy Manual.**

(2) Membership.

The membership, election, and appointment of members; term of members; officers; and meetings and quorum of the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee shall be parallel to those of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, as stated in policy 402.12.3(2) through 12.3(5).



POLICY MANUAL

AUTHORITY AND AMENDMENTS

Number 202

Subject: Authority and Amendments: Faculty Policies (Section 400)

Covered Employees: Faculty

Effective Date: January 24, 1997

Date of Last Revision: April 10, 2009

202.1 AUTHORITY AND VIOLATION

1.1 Authority of the Policy

This policy is subordinate to the Code of Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents' of the Utah System of Higher Education (hereafter Regents' Code) and the authority of the Board of Trustees and the President. This policy supersedes all previous University codes or policies and procedures affecting faculty and staff of the University, and takes precedence over previous executive memoranda and other policy directives affecting the provisions of this policy. If new executive memoranda or policy directives are issued which conflict with existing policy, the memoranda or policy directives will take precedence until action is taken to reconcile them with policy.

1.2 Violation of Policies

Any faculty or staff employee or any group of faculty or staff employees shall have the right to grieve any alleged violation of the policies. A faculty or staff employee may be sanctioned for violations of these policies as provided herein. (Section 407)

202.2 PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING SECTION 400

2.1 Proposal Process

Proposals for amendments to this section may only be made by faculty members who hold tenured, tenure-eligible, or term appointments and members of the Faculty Senate.

(1) Proposals for amendments by individual faculty members.

Proposals for amendments to this code by individual faculty members shall be submitted in writing to any faculty senator(s). The faculty senator(s) may submit the proposal for amendment to the Executive Committee of the Senate for consideration of inclusion on the agenda of the

next regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate. Individual faculty members may also communicate their interest in general or specific changes to the policies directly to the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC) which will take such communications under advisement and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

(2) Proposals for amendments by members of the Faculty Senate.

Proposals for amendments to these policies by members of the Faculty Senate shall be presented to any regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate. The PRPC shall consider proposals for policy amendments upon the formal action of the Senate. Members of the Faculty Senate may also communicate their interest in general or specific changes to the policies directly to the PRPC which will take such communications under advisement and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

(3) Proposals for amendments by petition of the faculty.

Any 25 or more faculty members who hold tenured, tenure-eligible, or term appointments may directly petition the Senate for consideration of a proposal for amendment to the policies at any time. Such a petition shall be presented in writing to the secretary of the Senate who shall then give notice of the proposal to the Executive Committee of the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting. In turn, the Executive Committee of the Senate shall schedule the proposal for amendment as an action item to be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

(4) Forwarding of proposals to the PRPC.

Upon favorable formal action by the Senate on any proposal to amend the code, the proposal to amend shall be forwarded to the PRPC for drafting of the proposed amendment.

2.2 Proposed Amendments to Section 400

(1) Drafting of proposed amendments to the section.

The drafting of all proposed amendments to Section 400 shall be performed by the PRPC. The draft of the proposed amendment shall be forwarded to the Senate no later than the second regular meeting of the Senate after receipt of the proposal for amendment by the PRPC. This time limit may be extended by majority vote of the Senate.

(2) Proposed amendments originated by the PRPC.

As one of its two principal functions, the PRPC will monitor the language of the policies for congruence of policy language with actual University practices, internal consistency of policy language, and clarity of the meaning of policy language. Where actual practice and the policies differ, the PRPC shall seek resolution either in changed practice, proposed amendments to the policies, or both. The PRPC shall also propose amendments to the policies to increase their clarity and internal consistency. Amendments to the policies proposed by the PRPC shall be presented in writing to the Senate initially as information items. Revision of the policies will be undertaken by the PRPC only under the formal instruction of the Senate.

(3) Proposed amendments by the Regents.

While the Regents may amend this code to be congruent with their own Code of Policies and Procedures (202.2.4.4), such amendments shall ordinarily occur as a result of collaborative interactions among the Regents, the University, and the PRPC acting on behalf of the Senate.

2.3 Publication of Proposed Amendments

The language of any proposed amendments to the policies shall be published in the minutes of the Senate meeting in which they are brought forward by the PRPC as information items.

2.4 Ratification of Proposed Amendments

Ratification of proposed amendments to the policies is a four-step process:

(1) Ratification by the Senate.

Approval of a proposed amendment to these policies shall be by a two-thirds majority of a quorum of faculty senators at any regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate where the proposed amendment is on the agenda as an action item, provided that the proposed amendment has been presented for information at a previous regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate, and provided further that the proposed amendment remains unchanged except for editorial clarifications. Changes in the proposed amendment approved by a simple majority of the Senate during its meeting will result in the postponement of action on the proposed amendment, the re-initiation of the publication process (202.2.3), and the rescheduling of action on the proposed amendment for the following regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

Upon approval of the proposed amendment by the Senate, proposed amendments will be forwarded to the President.

(2) Ratification by the President.

Within 30 calendar days of receipt of the proposed amendment, the President will either forward the proposed amendment to the Board of Trustees with a recommendation for its approval, forward the proposed amendment to the Board of Trustees with no recommendation, remand the proposed amendment to the Senate, or inform the Senate of his/her disapproval.

(3) Ratification by the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees will either approve the proposed amendment to the policies and forward the proposed amendment to the Regents, if required, or disapprove the proposed amendment and remand it to the President who will report such action to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting. On specific matters, identified by Regents' policy or request, and pursuant to procedures provided by the Commissioner of Higher Education, the Board of Trustees, in exercising its approval authority, is responsible to review and report to the Regents any policies

herein or any proposed policies that are not in compliance with state law and the Regents' rules relating to such matters.

(4) Ratification by the Regents.

Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, a proposed amendment to the policies shall be submitted to the Regents for approval (if required). These policies shall be consistent with the Regents' Code. Substantive differences or exceptions of these policies from the Regents' code must be reviewed and approved by the Regents. Once approved, the policies herein will apply. In cases where a new amendment is silent on issues addressed by the Regents' Code, the Regents' Code applies.

Subsequent proposed amendments to already approved policies herein, determined by the Commissioner of Higher Education to represent a substantive change, must be reviewed and approved by the Regents. If the Regents disapprove of the proposed amendment, they may remand the proposed amendment to the University, and the PRPC acting on behalf of the Senate. At this time the Regents may also propose their own language and negotiate with the University and the PRPC whatever changes they determine are necessary in the proposed amendment to these policies.

Substantive changes to the proposed amendment negotiated by the Regents are brought back to the Senate by the PRPC for appropriate Senate action.