

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive
Committee

Faculty Senate

1-21-2014

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda, January 21, 2014

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, January 21, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 526.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/526

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

January 21, 2014

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Champ Hall

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Yanghee Kim
Approval of Minutes December 9, 2013
- 3:05 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Noelle Cockett, Provost
- 3:20 Information Items**
1. Scholarship Advisory Board Report.....Taya Flores
- 3:35 Old Business**
1. Pick date for Spring Brown Bag Lunch w/ President (Mar. 20-21, 24-26).....Yanghee Kim
2. Code change to 402.12.5(1) Referencing Policy 202 (Second Reading)....Stephen Bialkowski
- 3:40 New Business**
1. EPC Items for January.....Larry Smith
2. FS Attendance Issues.....Robert Schmidt
3. FEC Feedback on Faculty Code 405.12 Post Tenure Review Proposal.....Karen Mock
4. AFT Feedback on Faculty Code 405.12 Post Tenure Review Proposal.....Bryce Fifield
- 4:30 Adjournment**



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 9, 2013 3:00 P.M.

Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Yanghee Kim (Chair), Dale Barnard, Amy Brown, Richard Clement, Jennifer Duncan, Lyle Holgram, Mike Jenkins (sub), Steven Mansfield, Bob Miller, Jason Olsen, Terry Peak (sub), Robert Schmidt (excused), Vincent Wickwar, Doug Jackson-Smith (President Elect)(excused), Renee Galliher (Past President), Charles President Stan Albrecht (Ex-Officio), Provost Noelle Cockett (Ex-Officio), Joan Kleinke (Exec. Sec.) (excused), Marilyn Atkinson (Assistant) **Guests:** Francine Johnson, Stephen Bialkowski

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

Approval of Minutes for November 18, 2013

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

University Business - President Albrecht and Provost Cockett.

President Albrecht reviewed the state budget as it affects higher education. The revenue projections for the state indicate that revenues are down from a year ago. The consensus projections for the state budget indicate \$132 million in new one-time funding and \$126 million in new ongoing funds for higher education. There is a recommendation for 1.8% increase in compensation, \$21.5 million in system equity funding, \$2 million for distinctive mission based funding, and the governor recommended funding for only one building which is at Weber State. There is also funding in the budget for a new wing of the Huntsman Cancer Institute at the University of Utah. With such large amounts of the building funds dedicated to these projects, funding for our Regional Campus buildings will be very difficult to obtain. The 2014 Legislative preview shows that there are already nearly 100 bills filed with relevance to higher education. President Albrecht remains hopeful that there will be adjustments made in our favor before the end of the legislative session. He has also spent time talking with our representatives in Washington D.C.

Information Items

Council on Teacher Education Report – Francine Johnson. Francine highlighted items from the report. One new minor/endorsement was approved in literacy teaching, specifically to assist secondary education teachers who have students with low reading ability. Most other changes were made in content or course requirements, in an attempt to help students pass their PRAXIS test which is required for their state licensing. Two psychology teaching majors and a sociology teaching major were discontinued, but a minor in each area was retained. Several graduate programs were also discontinued as a result of the Graduate School Review. Some policy changes included clarifying that student teachers could not be paid during their student teaching experience, and foreign language teaching majors and minors must pass an oral proficiency test. Enrollment is down 3.8%. Reasons for this are partly due to the change in the missionary age, but also a change in the PRAXIS test, especially the Math section, and some of the programs are a cohort program and were not admitting students in the last year. The average ATC score for newly admitted students into the program is 26.77 which is higher than the average incoming freshman. There was a 7.6% increase in the number of graduates recommended for licensing, and they have a placement rate of 89%.

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

Old Business

Word Change in 402.4.3 (second reading) Order of Faculty Business – Stephen Bialkowski.

Renee moved to place this on the agenda as Old Business, Steve Mansfield seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Word Change in 405.6 (second reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

Steve Mansfield moved to place on the agenda as old business, Renee Galliher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Word change from ASUSU to USUSA all 400 sections (second reading) – Stephen Bialkowski.

A motion to place on the agenda was made and seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of code revision to 405.12 Post-Tenure Review Process – Renee Galliher.

Dale Barnard presented several opinions from faculty in the College of Agriculture, the majority of which agreed on these points; that review committees not be organized by upper administration and that there is equity in the process across campus. There was some discussion about which Faculty Senate committees the proposal should be sent to for review. Representatives from AFT and BFW indicated they would like to see it again in their committees. More discussion followed with relatively wide support for sending it to AFT and FEC.

Renee Galliher made a motion to send the current proposal to AFT and FEC, Rhonda Callister seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

EPC Items - Larry Smith. The Curriculum Sub-committee approved 7 R401 proposals, one of them was the long form for a Bachelor of Science in Horticulture and will be RCDE specific. Two of the short form requests are from the Caine College of the Arts; one BFA degree in film producing in a cooperative partnership with Salt Lake Community College. The Music Department offers an emphasis in organ performance. Special Education and Rehabilitation offer a specialization in audiology. A short form proposal from the Physics Ph.D. to reduce the required credits from 60 to 42 for students who already have a Master's degree was also approved.

The Academic Standards Subcommittee approved 8 items, most of a general housekeeping nature.

The General Education Subcommittee heard a proposal from Noelle Cockett to eliminate the requirement that undergrads have 2 USU courses in their Breadth studies to graduate. This met with unanimous support among the General Education Committee. Bob Miller questioned if this move means that the USU courses will be phased out and Larry assured him that was never part of the discussion. The USU courses were originally conceived as being small courses with many sections, but in reality what has happened is many of them have very few sections with very large enrollments and this can create issues for students approaching graduation if they cannot get into a section when they register. Often times they are being granted waivers, and because it happens with such frequency (up to 1/3 of the seniors), it has prompted the Provost to recommend that the requirement be dropped.

A motion to place the EPC monthly report on the consent agenda was made by Rhonda Callister and seconded by Steve Mansfield. The motion passed unanimously.

Code Revision Process, Policy Manual 202 – Yanghee Kim. The PRPC chair, Stephen Bialkowski questioned the code revision process at the last Faculty Senate Meeting. Yanghee would like to spend time reviewing the policy 202 to build understanding of the process to eliminate questions and confusion on code change process in the future. Section 202 defines procedures for amending section 400 of the code. Section 202.1 outlines the proposal process and how a proposal is forwarded to PRPC. Section 202.2 defines PRPCs possible actions on proposals. Section 202.4 covers the ratification of proposed amendments. See attachments for the specific language of the policy.

A discussion about current past procedures and code changes ensued and whether or not ad-hoc task-force committees were in line with code procedures, when the full senate should vote on proposals, and when proposals should be sent to PRPC. Yanghee commented that the code is our guideline, but if there is a better option in certain circumstances it should be flexible enough to allow changes, like forming a task force or sending issues to appropriate senate subcommittees. The senate voted to create them when they were formed. Noelle reminded the committee that section 202 could be changed by the senate if clarification was necessary. No vote or formal action was taken on this issue.

Code change to 402.12.5 (1) First Reading – Stephen Bialkowski.

A motion was made by Terry Peak and seconded by Dale Barnard. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Yanghee Kim asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

SCHOLARSHIP YEAR END REPORT FOR 2012-13

Undergraduate scholarships reported by college. Waivers are awarded by the Admissions Office according to legislative mandates and university policy. College and departmental awards are determined at the college/department level from endowments or cash accounts.

Scholarship Type	# of Recipients	\$AMOUNT	Change from 2011/12, Recipients	Change from 2011/12, Amount
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	157	\$ 478,255	18%	29%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	66	\$ 606,172	5%	31%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	74	\$ 695,838	118%	147%
Other Admissions Scholarships	117	\$ 234,231	-23%	-38%
Departmental Scholarships	246	\$ 493,317	48%	113%
Other USU Scholarships	79	\$ 425,872	34%	65%
Cash from Outside Sources	116	\$ 261,945	-7%	15%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	627	\$ 3,195,628	21%	45%

CAINE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	138	\$ 392,945	3%	7%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	37	\$ 376,907	-49%	-42%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	49	\$ 440,848	40%	46%
Other Admissions Scholarships	95	\$ 164,215	-38%	-47%
Departmental Scholarships	273	\$ 615,101	28%	124%
Other USU Scholarships	71	\$ 280,945	-55%	26%
Cash from Outside Sources	69	\$ 137,834	-27%	-41%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	493	\$ 2,408,795	-7.50%	2%

EMMA ECCLES JONES COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	383	\$ 1,175,107	0%	23%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	113	\$ 1,016,414	-23%	-10%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	171	\$ 1,715,568	55%	80%
Other Admissions Scholarships	260	\$ 448,234	-33%	-48%
Departmental Scholarships	290	\$ 723,527	56%	65%
Other USU Scholarships	143	\$ 369,712	10%	51%
Cash from Outside Sources	257	\$ 596,240	-22%	-12%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	1,202	\$ 6,044,801	-2%	15%

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	392	\$ 1,233,512	48%	62%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	88	\$ 929,756	-32%	-14%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	102	\$ 990,290	104%	134%
Other Admissions Scholarships	305	\$ 647,761	-21%	-25%
Departmental Scholarships	334	\$ 658,499	38%	71.65%
Other USU Scholarships	142	\$ 872,537	1%	-27%
Cash from Outside Sources	217	\$ 536,035	20%	23%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	985	\$ 5,868,391	16%	14%

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	264	\$ 892,820	-6%	16%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	55	\$ 546,424	-41%	-25%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	106	\$ 1,006,587	45%	67%
Other Admissions Scholarships	215	\$ 417,365	-36%	-46%
Departmental Scholarships	213	\$ 469,147	35%	56%
Other USU Scholarships	174	\$ 675,202	32%	58%
Cash from Outside Sources	140	\$ 334,914	-38%	-23%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	834	\$ 4,342,459	-10%	7.47%

JON M. HUNTSMAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	288	\$ 1,035,220	30%	53%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	56	\$ 565,107	-31%	-14%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	70	\$ 685,868	119%	136%
Other Admissions Scholarships	250	\$ 468,259	-14%	-37%
Departmental Scholarships	271	\$ 709,162	7%	-3%
Other USU Scholarships	282	\$ 1,495,074	18%	28%
Cash from Outside Sources	117	\$ 261,507	7%	-1%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	814	\$ 5,220,197	3%	15%

Scholarship Type	# of Recipients	\$AMOUNT	Change from 2011/12, Recipients	Change from 2011/12, Amount
S.J. & JESSIE E. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	37	\$ 122,596	19%	59%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	17	\$ 168,362	-11%	17%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	27	\$ 286,344	238%	411%
Other Admissions Scholarships	24	\$ 53,482	-27%	-42%
Departmental Scholarships	64	\$ 140,960	-7%	-13%
Other USU Scholarships	35	\$ 107,928	84%	462%
Cash from Outside Sources	35	\$ 96,415	-10%	-17%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	175	\$ 976,088	15.89%	47%

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	241	\$ 783,499	-6%	4%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	62	\$ 554,933	-25%	-20%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	72	\$ 712,764	14%	31%
Other Admissions Scholarships	190	\$ 350,053	-41%	-49%
Departmental Scholarships	110	\$ 284,499	16%	66%
Other USU Scholarships	86	\$ 257,166	-5%	-45%
Cash from Outside Sources	111	\$ 266,624	-33%	-29%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	548	\$ 3,209,538	-23%	-13%

TRANSITION MAJORS**				
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers)	174	\$ 273,909	-30.12%	-52%
WAIVERS: ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75	69	\$ 597,424	-60%	-52%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship	141	\$ 1,235,689	53%	83%
Other Admissions Scholarships	130	\$ 251,670	-43%	-30%
Departmental Scholarships	22	\$ 45,655	-27%	70%
Other USU Scholarships	134	\$ 240,436	6%	-42%
Cash from Outside Sources	199	\$ 413,290	-17%	-23%
Total Unduplicated Recipients*	692	\$ 3,058,073	-15%	-20%

* Indicates the total unique number of students in each college that received an award.

**Transition Majors include Continuing Education and Undeclared Students.

TOTAL FOR EACH ACCOUNT PLUS GRADUATES AND ATHLETES				
Scholarship Type	# of Recipients ⁸	\$AMOUNT	Change from 2011/12, Recipients	Change from 2011/12, Amount
WAIVERS: University In-State Tuition (10% Waivers) ²	2,074	\$ 6,387,864	6.20%	20.46%
WAIVERS: NR Waivers (ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, WUE, SB170 , & HB75) ³	563	\$ 5,361,500	-34.61%	-21.25%
WAIVERS: Alumni Legacy Scholarship ⁴	812	\$ 7,769,795	63.38%	88.21%
WAIVERS: Graduate Students	838	\$ 5,190,994	0.72%	4.90%
WAIVERS: Athletics	116	\$ 1,532,200	-7.20%	2.15%
SUBTOTAL WAIVERS		\$ 26,242,352		
Other Admissions Scholarships ⁵	1,586	\$ 3,035,270	-30.80%	-40.25%
Departmental Scholarships ⁶	1,823	\$ 4,139,865	28.93%	52.19%
Other USU Scholarships ⁷	1,146	\$ 4,724,872	4.47%	6.76%
Cash from Outside Sources	1,261	\$ 2,904,806	-16.49%	-11.79%
Other Graduate Student Scholarships	465	\$ 1,255,841	36.36%	51.04%
Other Athletics Scholarships	349	\$ 1,767,840	2.35%	13.24%
SUBTOTAL NONWAIVERS		\$ 17,828,493		
Grand Total¹	7,592	\$ 44,070,845	-1.70%	8.55%

LEGEND FOR 2011-12 SCHOLARSHIP REPORT

¹Indicates the total unduplicated amount of students, total scholarship funding, and the overall changes from the 2011/12 year.

²10%: Legislative approval for 10% of in-state tuition to be awarded as waivers to students.

³ISU/USU, 100 Mile Radius, Western Undergraduate Exchange, SB170 & HB75: \$5258 (ISU), \$2629 (100) and \$4074 (WUES) per semester respectively.

⁴Alumni Legacy Scholarship: Legislative approval for nonresident students with parents whom are Alumni to pay resident tuition (nonresident portion waived).

⁵Other Admissions Scholarships: Waivers not included in 10% or NR, and cash scholarships.

⁶Departmental Scholarship: Funded by endowments, cash or contracts set up by departments.

⁷Other USU Scholarships: Includes Student Support Services, Auxiliaries, Special Programs and Categories and other scholarships that are not categorized as Admissions or Departmental.

⁸# of Recipients: A student may be listed in more than one category due to multiple awards.

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).

Report from the Educational Policies Committee
January 15, 2014

The Educational Policies Committee met on January 9, 2014. 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 January meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following actions were taken:

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of January 9, 2014 which included the following actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 43 requests for course actions.
 - A request from the Department of Political Science to establish a Center for the Study of American Constitutionalism was approved.
2. There was no December report from the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of December 10, 2013. Of note:
 - The following General Education courses and syllabi were approved:
 - ANTH 4990 (CI)
 - ENGR 3080 (CI)
 - RELS 3050 (DHA/CI; DHA Approved)
 - USU 1330 (BCA, Laura Gelfand)

Committee on Committees FS attendance report
13 January 2014

Robert Schmidt, Chair
Sheri Haderlie
Dan Davis

1. According to Faculty Code 402.3.4, "The Executive Secretary of the Senate reports all vacancies to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees will then contact the affected academic dean, vice president, or, where applicable, the chancellor or regional campus dean, who will appoint an alternate elected senator to fill the seat within 30 days." Additionally, "A senate seat shall be declared vacant if a senator (1) resigns from Faculty Senate, (2) is no longer a member of the faculty of the academic unit from which he or she was elected, or (3) *misses two regularly scheduled senate meetings during an academic year without making a documented effort to arrange for an alternate and keeping the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate informed in writing* (email is acceptable)."

Correspondingly, "Senators must notify the Executive Secretary of the Senate in writing (email is acceptable) whenever alternates will replace them. If a senator fails twice to make a documented effort to arrange for an alternate during an academic year, then that senator's position will be considered vacant" (402.3.2).

According to attendance records, for the past 4 FS meetings:

Senators with one undocumented absence: 14

Senators with two or more undocumented absences: 6

Presidential appointments with one undocumented absence: 3

Presidential appointments with two or more undocumented absences: 1

Ex Officio FS members with one undocumented absence: 2

Ex Officio FS members with two or more undocumented absences: 1

AS-USU members with one undocumented absence: 0

AS-USU members with two or more undocumented absences: 3

CoC concerns:

- Up to 6 positions could be declared vacant (although it is unclear who does the "declaring"), and more may occur as the academic year continues. It is important to clarify the legitimacy of all Senators, particularly for contentious issues resulting in close votes.

- There is no process for replacing absent Presidential appointments or AS-USU members, nor is there any requirement for them to attend FS meetings. The same seems to be true for ex-officio members of the FS.

2. The Faculty Code (402.3.2) also notes: "Senate members are expected to attend its meetings regularly. In cases of unavoidable absence, including sabbatical leave, professional development leave, and unpaid leaves of absence, senators will arrange for an elected alternate senator to attend in their place."

CoC concerns:

- It seems appropriate that teaching conflicts be added to the list of reasons for unavoidable absences.

3. It is difficult for the Executive Secretary to keep track of attendance for a number of reasons, including:

- a. failure of Senators to sign the roll sheet
- b. failure of Alternates to designate who they are representing
- c. failure of Senators and Alternates to inform the Executive Secretary of replacements (via email)

CoC concerns:

- It would be helpful to remind all Senators to sign the roll at the beginning and end of the FS meeting, and remind Alternates to sign two places (their name, and the name of the Senator being replaced for that meeting).

Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)
16 January 14, 3:00-4:00pm NR204

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Roosevelt)
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)
Thomas Lachmar (Science)
Kit Mohr (Education)
Emily Esplin (ASUSU VP)
Brittney Garbrick (ASUSU Grad Studies)

Absent:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)
Raymond Veon (Arts)
Daryn Frischknecht (ASUSU student advocate)

- 1) **Approved minutes from November 14, 2013 meeting**
- 2) **Reviewed Spring 2014 calendar**
- 3) **Discussed proposed revisions to Policy section 405.12, per request by Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

There was much discussion of the revised Policy section 405.12 Review of Faculty section of the Policy Manual, which was provided to us for comment by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. A.S. provided a history of the revision and the Task Force. There was recognition that tenure is a foundation of shared governance, and also acknowledgement that faculty review processes should be rigorous, clearly described in policy, and evenly applied across colleges. There was particularly extensive discussion about proposed linkage between annual reviews and more comprehensive reviews and also about the composition of the faculty committee conducting comprehensive reviews.

The committee recommended retention of the current language in the Code rather than adoption of the proposed changes. The committee recognized that minor changes to the language in this section of the Policy Manual were probably necessary, and could be addressed by appropriate Faculty Senate committees, but that wholesale process changes were not warranted. The committee felt that the current policy of annual reviews by department heads and a separate 5-year review process was a **sound process** but that it was **unevenly applied** across colleges and departments. The current policy allows annual reviews to be used as information by the review committee, but does not create a “trigger” for a comprehensive review. This appropriately limits the influence of department heads in decisions about sanctions, but should allow department head authority in decisions about merit pay. The committee felt that if annual reviews were triggers for more comprehensive reviews, then the comprehensive reviews could become both punitive and rare. The committee also felt that the existing requirements for the membership of the faculty

review committee (with respect to both departmental representation and rank) were appropriate. There was concern that if only full professors could serve on these committees (as proposed), then there would be a paucity of eligible members within departments.

The committee did suggest a change to the current language of the committee composition; namely that this committee should be primarily made up of faculty from the same department as the faculty member under review (e.g. 2/3). The committee felt that faculty within the same department would be best able to judge the performance of the faculty member under review, although minority representation outside the academic unit was also valuable.

Recommended changes with track changes (Oct 12, 2013)

405.12 REVIEW OF FACULTY

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

Comment [RG1]: 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).

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, ~~the obligation 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 post-tenure 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.

— minor edit

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).~~

Comment [RG2]: 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.

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 ~~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.

Comment [RG3]: Also Introduces 5 year window for annual review.

12.2 Quinquennial Post-Tenure 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.

Comment [RG4]: Removed initial paragraph about quinquennial review.

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 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. 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. 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.

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.

Comment [RG5]: New text adding detail about the outcome of the annual review, and the comprehensive review.

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.

(I) 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 review committee for tenured faculty 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, to the 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. A copy of the committee's report shall be sent to the faculty member. 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).

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)).

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 may will, as a consequence of the annual review finding that the faculty member is not meeting expectations process, initiate the negotiation of a professional development plan to help the tenured faculty member more fully meet role

Comment - there is a confused process as to what happens if a PDP is created in first year. It implies a need for a second different PDP in year 2.

or updated

Comment [RG6]: Provides additional detail about the work of the comprehensive peer review committee, in order to facilitate consistency across campus.

In addition, that year's annual review by the department head will be considered null and be replaced by the college peer review committee's written assessment.

Comment - This abbreviates the timelines, thus punishing a faculty member who elects to use the college committee in the first year.

Comment [RG7]: Minor changes to reference college peer review committee as arbiter of disagreement between department head and faculty member.

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, 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 faculty member's 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 performance 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, 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. 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 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.

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.

Comment [RG8]: 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.

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

Comment [RG9]: A whole new section on the structure and function of the college peer review committee.

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.

12.45 Academic Due Process

Evaluations, conducted pursuant to Policy 407, ~~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 (405.12.3.(3)) by ~~the~~ comprehensive college peer review committees (405.12.2), then other nonpunitive measures or sanctions may be considered as ~~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.

Comment [RG10]: Edits to increase clarity and eliminate redundancy.

comment - The timelines and dates for remedial actions are not provided. Annual reviews and comprehensive reviews may end up overlapping each other. To protect faculty from arbitrary implementation, deadlines for review processes, development of professional plans, and implementation need to be specified

at least two