



FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 29, 2010

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154

Agenda

- 3:00 Call to Order**.....Ed Heath
Approval of Minutes March 1, 2010
- 3:05 Announcements**.....Ed Heath
Roll Call
- 3:10 University Business**.....Stan Albrecht, President
Raymond Coward, Provost
- 3:30 Consent Agenda**.....Ed Heath
1. PRPC Annual Report
2. EPC Items
- 3:35 Information Items**
1. Faculty, Student, and Administrative Data Report (10 Year Trends).....Michael Torrens
2. Honorary Degrees and Awards Report.....Doug Jackson-Smith
3. Committee on Committees Election Results.....Betty Rozum
4. Ad Hoc Committee Report on Pre-Tenure Mentoring & Evaluation.....Mike Parent
- 3:55 Key Issues and Action Items**
1. PRPC Code changes.....John Engler
 • 401.1 – 401.5 Composition and Authority of Faculty (Second Reading)
 • 401.6 – 401.11 Composition and Authority of Faculty (First Reading)
 • 402.1 – 402.3 The Faculty Senate and Its Committees (First Reading)
2. Nominations for Faculty Senate President Elect.....Betty Rozum



**USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
MARCH 1, 2010
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Ed Heath called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Steve Burr moved to approve the minutes of February 1, 2010, Vince Wickwar seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Announcements

1. Roll Call – be sure to sign the roll.
2. Undergraduate Research Program – Celebrating its 35 anniversary this year and is the second oldest in the country.

University Business – President Albrecht.

Following the interim review visit a few weeks ago, USU has received a letter dated February 12, 2010 from NWCCU reaffirming our accreditation. There was one recommendation regarding assessment. The next interim review will be Fall 2012.

The CEU/USU merger vote in the House will be Thursday, March 4 and is expected to be unanimous. A Chancellor Search Committee has been formed; it is a 6-person screening committee with representation from our campus, the Commissioner's Office, CEU/Price campus and CEU/San Juan campus.

There are less than two weeks remaining in the legislative session and the State budget issue remains to be resolved and has been on a "roller coaster ride". It is still expected that the USU budget will be something above the 9% cuts already enacted but below the 17% cut that was proposed.

President Albrecht will be in Washington, DC again this week in meetings regarding the new Ag building for USU.

The review of the Provost is moving forward. It will be conducted by an outside company -- The IDEA Center. It will include a comprehensive electronic survey that will go to all full-time faculty members. A preliminary email will be sent to faculty informing them of the process and asking for their participation. Information will also be collected from Trustees, administrators and others, but that will likely be handled internally. The review is expected to be completed by Spring Break so the report will be ready before Commencement.

Consent Agenda Items

A Motion to approve the consent agenda items was made by Steve Burr, Doug Jackson-Smith seconded, motion carried.

Information Items

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Report. – Tony Peacock. Richard Jenson will be the next chair of the committee effective the end of June. The AFT report addresses several concerns about the AFT committee. In the past year, there were 12 hearings and 6 pre-hearings and it became very time consuming for the 12 members of the committee. The concerns are listed in the Issues section of the report. Most AFT members spent about 80-100 hours on AFT issues in the fall. Two people were involved in three hearings and also chaired panels. All other members served on at least two hearings, which required reading the statements and responses, dealing with procedural matters, attending hearings, and writing and submitting reports. The AFT committee submits a few possible solutions:

- The committee membership be expanded to help reduce the workload.
- Committee members could receive a reduction in course load to offset the time requirements of AFT.
- Assign an administrative assistant to assist with scheduling and coordinating hearings.

There has been a change in the calendar schedule to run continuously thru the summer. Nine of the twelve members of the committee are on nine-month contracts and there is a lot of opposition from the committee to have to spend their summers dealing with these issues.

AFT also questions if membership should be limited to full professors. Decisions have to be made against administration often times, possibly against your own dean, department heads, and faculty members in their own department, which puts associate professors in a difficult position. An alternative may be to not have AFT members sit on grievances that impact their own college.

There is a question about Section 406 of the code as to what constitutes “arbitrary and capricious conduct”.

The AFT committee also questioned whether lawyers should be involved in the process. The upside is that grievants are better prepared and know what the rules are. The downside is that the lawyers tend to transform what is supposed to be an administrative process into a civil action. Would it be better to appoint an advocate instead?

Data suggest that there are very few successes in the grievance process. It is very costly with limited benefits. Should the process be scrapped all together? Perhaps better mentoring would help avoid some of these situations.

Human Resources Policy Changes – BrandE Faupell. BrandE Faupell and Dave Cowley presented a few of the changes that Human Resources is recommending to the Faculty Senate for their information only. The Senate may offer input and opinions but the policy decisions are made by upper administration.

FMLA Policy Revision. Human resources is recommending that parents-in-law not be covered under the FMLA policy. This would bring the policy in line with the minimum federal requirements, which ensures job protection for 12 weeks when FMLA leave is needed. BrandE said that in all the research she had done, they had only been able to find one instance of use of the parents-in-law in policy. Senators questioned if taking it out of policy produces less benefit than the good will of leaving it in the policy, and with no data provided by HR to reflect significant cost savings it would be taking away a benefit for administrative convenience only.

A motion was made by Doug Jackson-Smith that the sense of the Faculty Senate is to retain the designation of parent-in-law in the FMLA policy as a benefit. The motion was seconded by Dorothy Dobson and passed unanimously.

Long-term Disability Health Insurance Coverage Revision. USU’s current long-term disability policy allows for the employee to remain on the USU health insurance policy indefinitely at no cost. The proposed change would allow employees to keep their health insurance for one year at

no cost. For years two and three the employee would pay the entire premium plus a 50% surcharge after which the employee would no longer have access to the University Health Insurance. People who are currently on LTD would be grandfathered in.

Dave Cowley stated that in drafting this proposal they worked with a health benefits consultant and it is highly unusual for an employer to offer this generous of a benefit. The cost of this benefit comes right back to the employees of USU because we are a self funded. Over five years there have consistently been about 70 individuals using this benefit at a cost of \$800,000 to \$1.3 million. The benefit is available to all employees who go on long-term disability regardless of their length of employment. Most of the peer institutions offer 18 months of COBRA coverage. North Carolina allows for transfer of LTD employees to the state insurance plan. Oregon State University employees can remain on the plan as long as they are disabled but they pay the entire premium.

Vance Grange stated that as chairman of the BFW committee he had received twelve communications from faculty members plus the BFW committee and they are uniformly opposed to this change. In the third year people would probably apply for individual coverage, which would be difficult for them to obtain. Therefore, they would have to go to the Utah Insurance Pool which is not medically underwritten, which would be very expensive. This is a very significant benefit for the relatively few who would use it.

A similar number of faculty in the College of Agriculture have contacted Ilka Nemere, again unanimously opposed.

Senators questioned what options people would have if they lost their health care coverage. BrandE said that most would qualify for social security disability, which would provide access to Medicare and Medicaid coverage.

Scott Cannon called for sense of the senate on the issue. Betty Rozum seconded.

More discussion included comments on finding some kind of middle ground rather than forcing people off the policy. Employees have gone without raises in pay for many years at the University in exchange for maintaining benefits. Tami Pyfer asked if there could be some type of vesting period implemented. BFW would like to have this presented to them at their next meeting. Steve Burr reminded senators that Faculty Senate is not involved other than to offer input. The faculty does not have enough information.

A substitute motion was made that more information needs to be shared with the Senate and other faculty so they can provide more feedback, and seconded by Andy Walker.

A vote by raise of hands was taken in support of the substitute motion, For 13, Against 15.

A vote was then taken in support of the original motion. It passed unanimously.

Key Issues and Action Items

Committee on Committee Elections – Betty Rozum. Flora Shrode was self nominated to serve on the Committee on Committees and a second was received. A vote of acclimation was unanimous.

PRPC Code Changes Section 401 – John Engler. Because of the meeting running past its scheduled time and seeing that the Senate lacked a quorum, it was decided that this business will be presented at the next Faculty Senate Meeting.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC)
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
2009-2010 Academic Year

Submitted March 1, 2010

Members:

John Engler, Chair (10), College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences
Susan Turner (10), Jones College of Education and Human Services
Margie Memmott (11), Extension
Robert Parson (11), Library
Jeff Broadbent (12), College of Agriculture
Nancy Messner (12), College of Natural Resources
Randy Simmons (12), Huntsman School of Business
Scott Cannon (12), College of Science
Steven Folkman (12) College of Engineering
Shane Graham, Senate
Ronald Shook, Senate

This report covers the activities of the PRPC committee since the annual report submitted to the Faculty Senate on March 15, 2009.

PRPC committee meetings: Oct 13, Nov 10, Feb 4, Mar 4, Apr 1

Section 401

Addressed Level I and Level II comments from Code Review Committee, including:

- Many line edits such as capitalization, word choice, and grammatical correction in order to improve consistency and clarity
- Eliminated distinction in code between resident and non-resident faculty
- Eliminated the vague phrase “evidence of scholastic promise” in several locations as it referred to qualifications for faculty
- Added the phrase “as determined by appropriate administrator” in several locations to clarify who makes decisions about faculty qualifications and actions
- Eliminated the definition of the faculty position Extension Agents, as it is no longer in use nor recognized by HR
- Confirmed that faculty appointed to the Research Ranks are yet classified as term faculty, and that Federal Cooperator continue to be exempt from limitations of governance otherwise placed on term faculty.
- Recommended that language should be kept limiting adjunct faculty appointment to 50% in order to deter the replacement of benefits-eligible faculty with adjuncts.

- Recognizes that the faculty list, which code specifies be printed each year, is no longer being printed, but perhaps is being addressed, however insufficiently, by the online directory.

For the Mar 1 Senate meeting, changes to Section 401.1-401.5 are up for a second reading, and Section 401.6-401.11 for a first reading.

Recommendation

In its review of Section 401, PRPC noted concern about the definition of and use of term faculty at USU. PRPC has recommended that the senate form an ad hoc committee to review the code regarding term faculty roles in regards to:

- ways to limit the overuse of term faculty as replacements for research faculty
- ways to grant term faculty a greater role in governance and greater protection of academic freedom
- ways to protect lower-division and Gen Ed courses from a disproportionate hit during financial cutbacks
- ways to verify that appropriate use of term faculty is accommodated by code, and that academic units are abiding by code specifications
- ways to accommodate the inclusion of faculty from CEU into code

Section 402

Have received Section 402 with comments from Code Review committee, which PRPC will address in Mar and Apr meetings.

**Report from the Educational Policies Committee
March 4, 2010**

The Educational Policies Committee met on March 4, 2010. The agenda and minutes of the meeting are posted on the Educational Policies Committee web page and are available for review by the members of the Faculty Senate and other interested parties.

During the March 4th meeting of the Educational Policies Committee, the following discussions were held and key actions were taken.

1. Approval of the report from the Curriculum Subcommittee meeting of March 4th which included the following notable actions:
 - The Curriculum Subcommittee approved 57 requests for course actions. In addition, the committee approved course prefix changes from “NFS” to “NDFS” for all courses offered by the Department of Nutrition, Dietetics, and Food Science and a course prefix change from “BIE” to “CEE” for courses once offered by the Department of Biological and Irrigation Engineering but which will now be offered by the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.
 - A request from the Biological and Irrigation Department to move the M.S. and Ph.D. Irrigation Engineering degrees to the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Department was approved.
 - A request from the Plants, Soils and Climate Department to consolidate the Crop Science and Horticulture majors within the department into one Plant Science major was approved.
 - A request from the Department of Computer Science to offer a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science in China with an emphasis in Information Technology was moved to the EPC agenda
 - A request to implement a Graduate Route to Licensure in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership was approved.
2. There was no report of a February meeting of the Academics Standards Subcommittee.
3. Approval of the report from the General Education Subcommittee meeting of February 16, 2010. Of note:
 - The following General Education courses were approved:

SSWA/ENVS 5640 (CI)
GEO/PHYS 3150 (QI)

GEO/PHYS 3150 (DSC)
USU 1320 (BHU)

- For information only:
 - There was agreement in committee that the CIL test should remain as a prerequisite for ENGL 2010 and that ENGL 1010 students should be reminded of that requirement by the Registrar. The CIL committee should make recommendations about possible revisions of the CIL exam at the March meeting of the General Education Subcommittee.
 - Registrar John Mortensen informed the committee that USU must now accept all Gen Ed requirements from transfer students with regional associate degrees (with the exception of math, English and American institutions -- everyone must meet Utah's standard for these).
 - Deborah Humphries, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities will visit the campus in April.

4. Other EPC Business

- A request from the Department of Computer Science to offer a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science in China with an emphasis in Information Technology was approved.

Appendix A

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY BENEFIT ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES by EEO6 CATEGORY Fall 1999 to Fall 2009

Banner HR Implemented

Category	FALL SEMESTER											Pre-VSIP 1999-2008	Post-VSIP 1999-2009
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		
Faculty	848	837	833	879	873	909	915	908	931	977	907	15.2%	7.0%
Tenured & Tenure-Track Instructional	613	600	608	626	631	653	656	607	631	651	622	6.2%	1.5%
Non-Tenured Instructional	119	117	108	137	136	142	144	167	158	174	166	46.2%	39.5%
Research & Public Service Faculty	116	120	117	116	106	114	115	134	142	152	119	31.0%	2.6%
Exec./Admin. & Mgr.	184	177	158	149	156	155	147	111	164	119	121	-35.3%	-34.2%
Other Professionals	690	730	824	835	859	889	914	942	882	979	950	41.9%	37.7%
Technical & Paraprof.	134	131	132	123	126	136	144	132	106	112	108	-16.4%	-19.4%
Clerical & Secretarial	554	541	557	525	513	513	507	494	501	528	461	-4.7%	-16.8%
Skilled Crafts	119	119	121	116	112	114	111	107	108	111	96	-6.7%	-19.3%
Service/Maintenance	236	241	246	215	216	221	212	202	176	169	153	-28.4%	-35.2%
Total Staff (excluding Faculty)	1,917	1,939	2,038	1,963	1,982	2,028	2,035	1,988	1,937	2,018	1,889	5.3%	-1.5%
Total Faculty and Staff	2,765	2,776	2,871	2,842	2,855	2,937	2,950	2,896	2,868	2,995	2,796	8.3%	1.1%

Tenured & Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty as % of Total Instructional Faculty	84%	84%	85%	82%	82%	82%	82%	78%	80%	79%	79%
Tenured & Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty as % of Total USU Employees	22%	22%	21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	21%	22%	22%	22%
Non-Tenured Instructional Faculty as % of Total USU Employees	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Exec./Admin & Mgr. as % of Total USU Employees	7%	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	6%	4%	4%

Notes

- * These are the categories used to report employees to the Dept. of Education in USU's IPEDS Reports.
- * USU's 43 Department Heads were moved from Exec./Admin. & Mgr. to Faculty in Fall 2002. To provide an *apples-to-apples* comparison, they have been taken from Exec./Admin and placed in Faculty for 1999, 2000, and 2001 in this comparison
- * Only a very small percentage (less than 3%) of all faculty at USU are part-time employees, therefore, they are not broken out in this comparison
- * Librarians were re-classified from Faculty to Other Professionals in Fall 2006, they are counted in Faculty throughout for this comparison .
- * Note: fluctuations in job classifications since 2006 due to implementation of the Banner System account for some portion of observed changes
- * Research & Public Service Faculty include both Tenured and Non-Tenured personnel; in 1999 65 were tenured; in 2009 82 were tenured

Trends & Comments

- * Service/Maintenance staff has been reduced by more than 35% over 10 years
- * Technical & Paraprofessional staff and staff in Skilled Crafts have both declined by 20% over 10 years
- * Clerical and Secretarial personnel have been cut by 17% over 10 years
- * Exec./Admin. & Mgr personnel has been significantly reduced over 10 years
- * Faculty grew by more than 15% through 2008, but that growth had been cut to 7% by 2009
- * USU lost a total of 199 employees between 2008 and 2009, the largest reduction in the school's history

Appendix B

Utah State University Percent of SCH's Taught by Faculty and Employees

	2006	2007	2008	2009
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Employees	46.0%	45.6%	45.1%	44.4%
% of SCH's taught by Faculty	66.1%	64.3%	66.8%	67.5%
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	43.8%	43.5%	42.9%	42.6%
% of SCH's taught by Benefit Eligible Employees	75.4%	73.2%	76.3%	74.4%
% of SCH's taught by Non Benefit Eligible Employees	24.6%	26.8%	23.7%	25.6%
% of SCH's taught by Graduate Assistants	Analysis Not Available	6.2%	7.0%	6.5%
% of SCH's taught by Others	Analysis Not Available	20.6%	16.7%	19.1%

Appendix C

Utah State University Percent of SCH's Taught by Faculty and Employees Fall 2009

	Total USU	Logan Campus	RCDE
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Employees	44%	51%	25%
% of SCH's taught by Faculty	67%	74%	50%
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	43%	50%	22%
% of SCH's taught by Benefit Eligible Employees	74%	80%	59%
% of SCH's taught by Non Benefit Eligible Employees	26%	20%	41%
% of SCH's taught by Graduate Assistants	7%	8%	1%
% of SCH's taught by Others	19%	11%	40%

Utah State University Percent of SCH's Taught by Faculty and Employees Fall 2008

	Total USU	Main Campus	RCDE
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Employees	45%	51%	28%
% of SCH's taught by Faculty	67%	72%	52%
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	43%	49%	24%
% of SCH's taught by Benefit Eligible Employees	76%	80%	65%
% of SCH's taught by Non Benefit Eligible Employees	24%	20%	35%
% of SCH's taught by Graduate Assistants	7%	9%	1%
% of SCH's taught by Others	17%	11%	35%

Utah State University Percent of SCH's Taught by Faculty and Employees Fall 2007

	Total USU	Main Campus	RCDE
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Employees	46%	52%	27%
% of SCH's taught by Faculty	64%	71%	46%
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	43%	50%	25%
% of SCH's taught by Benefit Eligible Employees	73%	79%	57%
% of SCH's taught by Non Benefit Eligible Employees	27%	21%	43%
% of SCH's taught by Graduate Assistants	6%	8%	1%
% of SCH's taught by Others	21%	13%	42%

Utah State University Percent of SCH's Taught by Faculty and Employees Fall 2006

	Total USU	Main Campus	RCDE
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Employees	46%	53%	25%
% of SCH's taught by Faculty	66%	72%	49%
% of SCH's taught by Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty	44%	50%	24%
% of SCH's taught by Benefit Eligible Employees	75%	80%	62%
% of SCH's taught by Non Benefit Eligible Employees	25%	20%	38%
% of SCH's taught by Graduate Assistants			
% of SCH's taught by Others			

Analysis Not Available

Election Results

*last updated
3/9/2010*

red = newly elected
(2) = second term

College or Unit	Senators	Term Ends
Agriculture	Bernard, Dale	2011
Agriculture	Nemere, Ilka	2012
Agriculture	Worthen, Eric	2013
Agriculture	Whitesides, Ralph	2012
Agriculture	Feuz, Dillon	2011

Alternates	Term Ends
Deer, Howard	2012
White, Ken (2)	2013

Committees	Member	Term Ends
Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Ralph Whitesides	2012
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Rhonda Miller	2011
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Jeff Broadbent	2012
Educational Policies Committee	David Hole (2)	2013
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Reza Oladi	2011
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Paul Jakus	2011
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Paul Johnson	2012

Business	H. Craig Peterson	2013
Business	McEvoy, Glenn	2011
Business	Paper, David	2011
Business	Parent, Michael (2)	2012

Olsen, David	2013
Mills, Robert (replaced Pete Ellis who is retiring)	2013

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Richard Jensen	2012
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Alan Stephens	2013
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Randy Simmons	2011
Educational Policies Committee	Stacey Hills	2013
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Alison Cook	2013
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Konrad Lee	2012
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Frank Caliendo	2014

College or Unit	Senators	Term Ends	Alternates	Term Ends	Committees	Member	Term Ends
Education	Bates, Scott	2012	Camicia, Steve	2012	Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Nick Eastmond	2013
Education	Delgadillo, Lucy (2)	2013	Roggman, Lori	2012	Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Chuck Salzberg (2)	2011
Education	Dobson, Dorothy	2011	Walker, Andy (2)	2012	Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Susan Turner (2)	2011
Education	Galliher, Renee (2)	2013			Educational Policies Committee	Scott Bates	2013
Education	Gillam, Sandi (2)	2013			Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Sherry Marx	2011
Education	Yanghee Kim	2013			Faculty Evaluation Committee	Yanghee Kim	2011
Education	Pyfer, Tami	2011			Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Scott Deberand	2014
Education	Shelton, Brett (2)	2012					
Education	Sheri Haderlie	2013					

Engineering	Bob Pack	2013	Fang, Ning	2012	Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Scott Budge (2)	2012
Engineering	Folkman, Steve	2012	Stewardson, Gary	2013	Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Ed Reeve	2012
Engineering	Sorensen, Darwin	2011			Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Paul Wheeler	2013
Engineering	Tullis, Blake	2012			Educational Policies Committee	Ed Reeve (2)	2011
Engineering	YangQuan Chen	2013			Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Christopher Neale	2011
Engineering	Chris Winstead	2013			Faculty Evaluation Committee	Doran Baker (2)	2011
					Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Barton Smith	2012

College or Unit	Senators	Term Ends	Alternates	Term Ends	Committees	Member	Term Ends
HASS	new	2013	Bame, Jim	2012	Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	need to elect (3 yr term)	2013
ART	Fisher, Shawn	2011	Culver, Lawrence	2011	Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Tim Wolters	2013
SSH	Graham, Shane	2012	new	2013	Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	need to elect (3 yr term)	2013
SSH	Grieve, Victoria	2011	Schroeder, Tom	2012	Educational Policies Committee	Ed Glatfelter	2011
SSH	Jackson-Smith, Doug	2012	Weil, Nolan	2012	Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Maria Cordero	2011
SSH	McNamara, Peter	2012			Faculty Evaluation Committee	Michael Lyons (2)	2011
ART	Morrison, Nick	2012			Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Keith Grant-Davies	2012
SSH	Petrzelka, Peggy	2012					
HASS	new	2013					
SSH	Sanders, James (James Bame)	2012					
HASS	new	2013					
SSH	Smitten, Jeff	2012					

Natural Res.	Burr, Steve	2011	Dueser, Ray	2011	Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Helga Van Miegroet	2012
Natural Res.	Mesner, Nancy	2012	new	2013	Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Robert Schmidt	2011
Natural Res.	Messmer, Terry	2011			Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Nancy Mesner (interim)	2012
					Educational Policies Committee	Nancy Mesner (2)	2011
					Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Karen Mock	2011
					Faculty Evaluation Committee	Nancy Mesner	2011
					Graduate Council (4-year terms)	need to elect (4 yr term)	2014

College or Unit	Senators	Term Ends
Science	Chang, Tom	2011
Science	Davidson, Brad	2013
Science	Flann, Nick (2)	2011
Science	Bialkowski, Stephen	2013
Science	Ted Evans (replaced Sue Morgan)	2011
Science	Corcoran, Chris (2)	2013
Science	Wallace, Dave	2011
Science	Wickwar, Vince	2012

Alternates	Term Ends
Cannon, Scott	2011
Wilczynski, Dariusz	2012

Committees	Member	Term Ends
Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	David Peak (2)	2011
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Stephen Bialkowski	2013
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Ian Anderson	2013
Educational Policies Committee	Richard Mueller (2)	2011
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Susanne Janecke	2013
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Greg Podgorski (2)	2011
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	Richard Cutler	2011

Library	Shrode, Flora (2)	2012
---------	-------------------	------

Holliday, Wendy	2011
-----------------	------

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Britt Fagerheim	2013
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Steve Sturgeon	2011
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Bob Parson	2011
Educational Policies Committee	Wendy Holliday	2013
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Jennifer Duncan	2011
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Pamela Martin (2)	2011
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	John Elswailer	appointed, 1

College or Unit	Senators	Term Ends
RCDE	Blackstock, Alan	2012
RCDE	Straight, Nathan	2011

Alternates	Term Ends
Tollefson, Derrik	2013

Committees	Member	Term Ends
Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	Aaron Roggia	2013
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Dave Woolstenhulme	2013
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Karen Woolstenhulme	2013
Educational Policies Committee	Ronda Menlove	2012
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Virginia Exton	2013
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Robert Mueller	2012
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	RCDE not represented, per code	N/A

Extension	Goodspeed, Jerry	2011
Extension	Holmgren, Lyle	2011
Extension	Pace, Michael	2013
Extension	Nelson, Mark	2011
Extension	Beddes, Taun	2013

Albertson, Marilyn (2)	2011
Barnhill, James	2011
Olsen, Shawn	2013

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee	James Barnhill	2012
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee	Joanne Rouché	2013
Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee	Margie Memmott	2011
Educational Policies Committee	not represented	N/A
Faculty Diversity, Development, and Equity Committee	Donna Carter	2011
Faculty Evaluation Committee	Ronda Olsen	2011
Graduate Council (4-year terms)	not represented	N/A



**Report of the ad hoc Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring and
Evaluation Committee**
In Response to Evaluation Committee Report, October 2007
by the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Recommendation Number 8: The committee recommends that the University review for possible revision and for consistent implementation the **pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies** and procedures for post-tenure faculty evaluation policies and procedures, including institutional involvement in implementing plans for improvement (Standard 4.A.5 and Policy 4.1.a-d).

Introduction and Background

During a campus accreditation visit in 2007, members of a site visitation team from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) met with faculty representing each academic college at Utah State University (USU) as well as selected other academic units (such as the library). One area of concern expressed by faculty in several of these sessions was about the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation process at USU. Specifically, faculty identified a possible conflict of interest between the mentoring and evaluation roles expected of faculty who serve on Tenure Advisory Committees (TAC). While the Commission, in their report, noted positive comments from faculty with respect to the mentoring role of the senior faculty on Tenure Advisory Committees, they also shared negative comments concerning their objectivity as evaluators given their mentoring role. Specifically, the visitation team said the following in their report:

“The conflicting responsibilities frequently, if not universally, result in recommendations favoring the award of tenure with too little regard to actual performance. Faculty members have strong feelings regarding the dual roles of the committee – first as advisory and later as evaluative – because of the potential for conflict as the relationships become adversarial. Positive comments reference the committee as a source of mentorship and direct guidance. Negative comments reference the fact that faculty serving as mentors have difficulty in becoming objective when the candidates apply for tenure. Clearly this procedure merits review for clarification or possible revision, given the disparity of opinions and the extent of confusion regarding the authority and role of the promotion advisory committees.” (Page 48).

Based upon these observations, the NWCCU Commission recommended “that the University review for possible revision and consistent implementation the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies...”

During the 2008-2009 academic year, several discussions occurred about this issue among members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Provost Coward, and President Albrecht. These discussions culminated in a consensus that a “blue ribbon” committee should be formed to explore the Commission’s recommendation (the committee was referred to as the “Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee”).

It was further agreed that the committee should be co-chaired and members selected by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Vice-President and Provost. The committee was formed in April 2009 and first met in May 2009. At that time, the committee reviewed the accreditation report from NWCCU and relevant parts of Section 400 of the University Policy Manual (commonly referred to as the “Faculty Code”). The committee also discussed issues raised in recent grievances suggesting that there might be confusion over the dual roles of faculty on Tenure Advisory Committees. Finally, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Committee discussed their own experiences, observations, and concerns associated with the USU codified process and considered various data and appropriate comparisons that would provide context and scope for understanding the issues.

The committee held twice monthly meetings through the fall 2009 semester with the co-chairs meeting separately several times to set meeting agendas. Initially, the committee focused on what could be found in the literature and by way of data that would shed light on issues associated with the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation. Relatively few studies have been published which address the perceived conflict of interest between mentoring and evaluation. Most are descriptive of a narrow set of work place practices in a single work environment. If there is any consensus in these studies, findings are that mentors and mentees should understand the importance of this process and their respective roles, which should be clearly communicated in some form of education or training.

The committee examined data from the past eight years of promotion and tenure decisions at USU (2002 to 2009) and discovered that virtually all candidates during that time received a positive recommendation from their Tenure Advisory Committee or their Promotion Advisory Committee (328 of 333 or 98.5%). One possible explanation for this high rate of support at the final stage of the probationary period is that USU weeds out weak candidates before they get to the final stage. Specifically, tenure achievement rates at USU were compared to ten peer universities, and those comparisons indicated that USU was within the range of tenure achievement rates of peer institutions, albeit towards the high end. Considerable discussion over several meetings about possible reasons for differences between USU and the ten-university study concluded with an agreement on two points: (1) the tenure achievement rates at USU are similar to those of national peers, and (2) there may be evidence of a possible misunderstanding between the Tenure Advisory Committee’s perceived mentoring responsibility and their codified evaluation responsibility. Such differences of interpretation may be especially apparent when the TAC votes favorably and subsequent votes are negative (at the department head, dean, Central Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Presidential levels – or some combination thereof).

The committee then turned its attention to identifying the strengths and weaknesses of our current system where the TAC is expected both to mentor and evaluate a candidate for promotion and tenure. As the strengths and weaknesses of our current system were discussed, it

became apparent that one possible weakness was related to a common problem – i.e., variability in the interpretation of the words (and their nuances) that appear in the code. The committee concluded that a possible mitigation of the perceived conflict between the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation could be achieved through the education and training of all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.

The Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee also concluded that small changes to the code might be adopted to preserve those positive aspects of our current system while clearly reinforcing the evaluative responsibilities of the TAC. We discovered, for example, that the word “mentoring” does not appear in the code where the responsibilities of the TAC are described. Other words that do appear include “assist,” “counsel and advise”, and phrases like “assist the faculty member in the achievement of tenure.” While each of these words might be construed as some dimension or form of mentoring, the interpretation of these words and their nuances might also lead some colleagues to move beyond mentoring and embrace a role of advocacy.

Thus, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee adopted two recommendations in response to the NWCCU report:

1. To create a rigorous, systematic and structured training program for all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.
2. To recommend minor changes to the text of the “Faculty Code” that would improve the understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and actions to be taken by the Tenure Advisory Committee.

These two recommendations are described in more detail in the rest of this report.

Improved Training and Communication

The Office of the Provost routinely reviews the responsibilities, procedures, and deadlines for the promotion and tenure (P&T) review process with deans and department heads. However, there is currently no training for faculty members who sit as evaluators on Tenure Advisory Committees (TAC). One of the actions of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee was to propose a plan for training the senior scholars who chair the TACs. This section of the report outlines the proposed plan of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee that includes a description of the target audience for the training, the development of the curriculum, and the instructors and presentation format for the training.

Target Audience

The Provost annually reviews the P&T process with deans and department heads. Building upon that tradition, the purpose of the proposed training is to extend these instructions to a larger audience. Specifically the training is intended for faculty who chair or are members of Tenure Advisory Committees. During a candidate's probationary period, these committees meet formally once each year for the purpose of evaluating a candidate's progress toward tenure. At the end of the probationary period, the TAC evaluates the candidate's record of accomplishments

and makes a recommendation to the department head. The TAC is the first level of evaluation. Tenure Advisory Committee chairpersons would be required to attend the training, and members of the TAC would also be invited to attend but their attendance would not be required.

Curriculum Development

The curriculum to be developed is focused on informing TAC chairs and members about their roles and responsibilities. The foundation for the curriculum will be Section 400 of the USU Policy Manual (commonly referred to as the “Faculty Code”). The training is intended to clarify the roles of TAC members as evaluators. By the means of this training, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee aims to address the conflict expressed by some TAC members over the dual roles of mentoring and evaluation. The curriculum will be developed by a committee, appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, whose members have experience serving on and/or chairing TACs. This committee will work in cooperation with the Office of the Provost, who will be responsible for creating and assembling the training materials.

Instructors and Presentation Format

The instructors for the proposed training would be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Executive Vice President and Provost. The instruction will be given in person and will be reinforced with on-line supplementary materials. A successful precedent for on-line delivery of such training is the ombudsperson course that is provided entirely on-line, under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, using the Blackboard course management system. The Office of the Provost will provide logistical and staff support for the production of the materials needed for the training and the coordination of meeting times and locations.

Code Revision

The second recommendation of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee is to examine carefully the section of the “Faculty Code” (Section 405.6.2(1)) that describes the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) and propose changes to the Faculty Senate. All of the paragraphs in this section seemed clear with the exception of the third paragraph, which reads,

“The role of the tenure advisory committee is to assist the faculty member in the achievement of tenure through appropriate counsel and advisement and to render judgment that the faculty member has or has not attained the criteria for tenure. Concurrently, the tenure advisory committee has a responsibility to recommend the nonrenewal of the appointment of a faculty member who is not, in the judgment of the committee, progressing satisfactorily toward tenure. To these ends, the tenure advisory committee shall counsel and advise and thereafter make an annual recommendation with respect to the continuation of the appointment of the faculty member. Such a recommendation will be: 1) to renew the appointment; 2) nonrenewal of the appointment (407.2.1(5)) prior to the end of the probationary period; 3) to award tenure; or 4) to deny tenure, that is, nonrenewal of the appointment (407.2.1(5)) at the end of the probationary period.”

Several potential problems and uncertainties were identified in the preceding paragraph extracted from the Faculty Code. For example, in the first sentence, what does it mean to “assist the faculty member”? What does “appropriate counsel and advisement” mean? In the same manner, it is not clear that the statement - “to render judgment that the faculty member has or has not attained the criteria for tenure” only applies to the final year of the probationary period. Indeed, members of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee agree that judgments about progress towards tenure need to be rendered each year. This responsibility is reinforced in the final two sentences of the paragraph (see above). In the third sentence, the meanings of the following phrases are unclear: “to these ends” and, again, “counsel and advise.” In the fourth sentence, it appeared that an attempt was made to include two distinct actions that might be stated more clearly with two distinct sentences. Further, based on the text and on the experience of several committee members, it appeared that this sentence was trying to include references to the consideration of early tenure. The possibility of early tenure, more properly described as the consideration of administrative nomination for tenure, is discussed later in the Code (In Section 405.7.3 (1) under the phrase “Exceptional Procedures”). Indeed, this later section refers back to the paragraph above. The Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee concluded that this paragraph might be easier to interpret if a reference to early tenure was specifically included in the text.

Taken as a whole, the committee concluded that the intention of the above paragraph could be clarified by focusing on three items: (1) the role of the TAC; (2) the responsibilities of the TAC; and (3) the actions it needed to take. In that context, however, some of the current text became almost duplicative. To avoid that situation, the statements on role and responsibility were combined. Moreover, to clarify further the role of the TAC, a sentence was added for the exceptional consideration of administrative nomination for tenure (commonly referred to as “early tenure” – a phrase, however, that never appears in the “Faculty Code”). Combining these considerations, the committee believes that the following revised version better captures what the TAC should do:

“The role and responsibility of the Tenure Advisory Committee is to provide an annual evaluation of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. The TAC is responsible for providing feedback to the faculty member with regard to progress toward tenure and promotion, and shall recommend (a) to renew the appointment or (b) not to renew the appointment (407.2.1 (5)). In the final year of the probationary period, the committee shall recommend (a) awarding promotion and tenure or (b) denying promotion and tenure (407.2.1 (5)). At any time during the probationary period, the committee can be asked to render judgment on an administrative proposal to grant promotion and tenure in accordance with Section 405.7.3 (1) of the Faculty Code. Under those circumstances, the TAC shall recommend (a) to award promotion and tenure or (b) to continue the probationary period.”

The intent of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee is for this recommended code revision to be shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee where it will be discussed in the presence of the chair of the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee (PRPC). The intent, then, is to encourage the Executive Committee to charge the

PRPC with reviewing the proposed code change, to make revisions consistent with those recommended above and to present the code change to the Faculty Senate as an action item.

Summary

Feedback from USU faculty led our accreditation agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, to recommend that we review for possible revision the pre-tenure faculty mentoring and evaluation policies employed on our campus. The USU Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, created a committee of faculty to explore this issue. After exhaustive review and discussion, the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee concluded that two actions would improve our current policies and procedures. Specifically, the committee proposed two recommendations in response to the NWCCU report:

1. To create a rigorous, systematic and structured training program for all faculty who chair Tenure Advisory Committees.
2. To recommend minor changes to the text of the “Faculty Code” that would improve the understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and actions to be taken by the Tenure Advisory Committee.

The members of the Pre-Tenure Faculty Mentoring Review Committee request the USU Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, to implement the two recommendations adopted by our committee.

Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Pre-Tenure Mentoring Process

Chairs: **Michael Parent**, Professor, Department of Management, Faculty Senate President
Raymond T. Coward, Executive Vice President and Provost

Members: **Susan L. Crowley**, Professor, Department of Psychology
Jacob H. Gunther, Associate Professor, Department of Electrical and
Computer Engineering
Kelly L. Kopp, Associate Professor, Department of Plants, Soils and Climate
R. Douglas Ramsey, Professor, Department of Wildland Resources, Faculty
Senate Past-President
Flora G. Shrode, Associate Librarian, Merrill-Cazier Library
Michael B. Toney, Professor, Department of Sociology, Social Work and
Anthropology
Vincent B. Wickwar, Professor, Department of Physics, Faculty Senate
President-Elect

PRPC Report for Faculty Senate, 16 Feb 2010

SECOND READING (Sections 401.1 through 401.5)

1. Phrase “as determined by professional colleagues” modified to “as determined by appropriate administrator” in sections 3.2(1), 3.2(2), 3.3(2), 3.4(1), 3.4(2). This seems to be more in line with actual practice and alludes to the organizational structure.

FIRST READING (Sections 401.6 through 401.11)

1. As in previous edits, numbering modifications and minor cleanup edits.

FIRST READING (Sections 402.1 through 402.3)

1. Several clarifications in phrasing.
2. The title “Director” be changed to reflect practice of “VP” as head of RCDE and Extension.
3. The number of meetings a senator can miss before the seat being vacated, even when an alternate is arranged, be changed from 5 to 4 to reflect an expectation that a senator attend at least half of the meetings in a year.
4. A condition be added so that if a senator is going to be unavailable for more than half of an academic year, the seat would be automatically vacated.

SECOND READING

POLICY MANUAL

FACULTY

Number 401

Subject: Composition and Authority of the Faculty

Effective Date: July 1, 1997

Effective Date of Last Revision: July 1, 1999

401.1 FACULTY MEMBERSHIP

The faculty consists of the President, the Provost, deans, and other members of the tenured and

tenure-eligible faculty, faculty with term appointments, faculty with special appointments, and emeritus faculty as defined herein.

401.2 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Faculty Defined; Faculty Categories

The terms "faculty" and "faculty members" designate university employees appointed for the purpose of carrying out one or more of the following primary functions of the University: (1) academic instruction, (2) enlargement of knowledge through research and other creative activities, and (3) dissemination of knowledge beyond the campus through extension, service, and other methods.

Faculty members receive appointments in one of the following four separate categories: (1) tenured or tenure-eligible appointments; (2) term appointments without eligibility for tenure; (3) special appointments without eligibility for tenure; and (4) emeritus appointments.

2.2 Academic Units and Academic Departments Defined

An academic unit is a group of faculty of the University with an identifiable teaching, research, or other academic mission. To be designated an academic unit, the group of faculty must fulfill all of the following criteria: (a) have an identifiable curriculum or formal description in current University catalogs or other publications; (b) have a separate, identifiable budget; (c) be designated an academic unit by decision of the Educational Policies Committee and ratification of the Faculty Senate, and approved by the President, the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents.

An academic department is a group of faculty of the University with an identifiable teaching, research, or other academic mission. To be designated an academic department, the group of faculty must fulfill all of the following criteria: (a) offer or administer a degree, certificate, or some other official credential of the University; (b) have an identifiable curriculum and formal description in current University catalogs or other publications; (c) have a separate identifiable budget; (d) be designated an academic department by decision of the Educational Policies Committee and ratification of the Faculty Senate, and approved by the President, the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents.

All academic departments are academic units. Two academic units are not academic departments. These are the Library and Extension.

~~401.3 RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT FACULTY MEMBERS DISTINGUISHED~~

~~The resident faculty consists of all those faculty members who work at the Logan campus and maintain a primary office there. The nonresident faculty consists of all faculty members whose~~

Comment [JE1]: Note: PRPC recognizes that if academic units hold branch campus faculty to the same tenure requirements as main campus faculty, for publishing expectations, for example, branch campus faculty could have difficulty qualifying since their roles statements often reflect, for example, a higher teaching load.

~~primary place of work and primary office is off the Logan campus.~~

401.34 THE TENURED AND TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY

34.1 Description and Eligibility

The tenured and tenure-eligible faculty consists of those individuals appointed to carry out the University's scholarly and educational functions and who have been or may be granted permanent status (policy 405.1.2). They receive their appointments within academic units.

All faculty in this category either hold tenure or enter the process that leads to the granting of tenure.

Tenured and tenure-eligible faculty appointments shall not be made for less than .5 FTE. ~~50 percent time.~~

34.2 Academic Ranks: Core Faculty

Tenure and tenure-eligible faculty members appointed to an academic department are the "core" faculty and hold one of the following ranks: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. A description of each follows. (See policy 405.2 for a complete discussion of the criteria for appointment or promotion for these ranks.)

(1) Instructor.

Appointment as instructor requires, a master's degree or its equivalent, as determined by appropriate administrator, and demonstrated ability related to the role assignment.

(2) Assistant professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to assistant professor requires a terminal degree or its equivalent; demonstrated ability in teaching, research, extension, or other qualifying work; ~~evidence of scholastic promise;~~ and evidence of progressive professional development as determined by appropriate administrator.

(3) Associate professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to associate professor requires all the qualifications prescribed for an assistant professor; an established reputation based upon a balance of scholarship, teaching, and service; and/or broad recognition for professional success in the field of appointment.

(4) Professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to professor requires all the qualifications prescribed for

Comment [JE2]: The phrase "evidence of scholastic promise" is also found in Sec 405.2.1, 3.1, and 5.1. PRPC recommends it be stricken in all cases, as vague and already covered by other verbiage.

an associate professor and an established outstanding reputation in the field of appointment.

34.3 Academic Ranks: Librarians

Faculty members appointed to the academic unit of the library hold one of the following ranks: Affiliate Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, or Librarian. A description of each follows. (See policy 405.3 for a complete discussion of the criteria for appointment or promotion for these ranks.)

(1) Affiliate librarian.

Appointment as affiliate librarian requires, a terminal degree in library and information science, which is a master's degree in library and information science, from an institution accredited by the American Library Association or a master's degree and appropriate credentials for assignment to areas with specialized needs and demonstrated ability related to the role assignment.

(2) Assistant librarian.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to assistant librarian requires all the qualifications prescribed for an affiliate librarian; demonstrated ability in librarianship, research, or other qualifying work; ~~evidence of scholastic promise~~; and evidence of professional development as determined by appropriate administrator.

(3) Associate librarian.

Appointment as or advancement to associate librarian requires all the qualifications prescribed for an assistant librarian; an established reputation in librarianship based on scholarship, and service; and/or broad recognition for professional success in librarianship.

(4) Librarian.

Appointment as or advancement to librarian requires all the qualifications prescribed for an associate librarian and an established outstanding reputation in the field of academic librarianship.

34.4 Academic Ranks: Extension

Faculty members appointed to the academic unit of Extension and who fulfill general Extension responsibilities hold one of the following ranks: Extension Instructor, Extension Assistant Professor, Extension Associate Professor, or Extension Professor. A description of each follows. (See policy 405.4 for a complete discussion of the criteria for appointment or promotion for these ranks.)

(1) Extension instructor.

Appointment as Extension instructor requires a master's degree or its equivalent, as determined by appropriate administrator, and demonstrated ability related to the role assignment.

(2) Extension assistant professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to Extension assistant professor requires a terminal degree or its equivalent; demonstrated ability in teaching, research, extension, or other qualifying work; ~~evidence of scholastic promise~~; and evidence of progressive professional development as determined by appropriate administrator.

(3) Extension associate professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to Extension associate professor requires all the qualifications prescribed for an Extension assistant professor; an established reputation based upon a balance of scholarship, teaching, and service; and/or broad recognition for professional success in the field of appointment.

(4) Extension professor.

Appointment as or advancement in rank to Extension professor requires all the qualifications prescribed for an extension associate professor and an established outstanding reputation in the field of appointment.

34.5 Academic Ranks: Extension Agents

This historic title is no longer in use; instead, refer to “Academic Ranks: Extension” (see Section 401.3.4).

~~Faculty members appointed to the academic unit of Extension and who serve as Extension agents hold one of the following ranks: Affiliate Extension Agent, Assistant Extension Agent, Associate Extension Agent, or Extension Agent. A description of each follows. (See policy 405.5 for a complete discussion of the criteria for appointment or promotion for these ranks.)~~

~~(1) Affiliate extension agent.~~

~~Appointment as affiliate extension agent requires a bachelors degree and demonstrated ability in Extension related to the role assignment.~~

~~(2) Assistant Extension agent.~~

~~Appointment as or advancement in rank to assistant Extension agent requires a master's degree or its equivalent; demonstrated ability in teaching and developing programs relevant to the identified population; evidence of scholastic promise; and evidence of progressive professional development.~~

~~(3) Associate Extension agent.~~

~~Appointment as or advancement in rank to associate Extension agent requires all the qualifications prescribed for an assistant Extension agent; an established reputation based upon a balance of scholarship, teaching, Extension work and service; and/or broad recognition for professional success in Extension.~~

~~(4) Extension agent.~~

~~Appointment as or advancement in rank to Extension agent requires all the qualifications prescribed for an associate Extension agent and an established outstanding reputation in the field of appointment.~~

34.6 Exceptions

Under extraordinary circumstances exceptions [to Section 401.3](#) may be made to the qualifications for appointment in the various ranks in order to fulfill the mission of the University. Exceptions require petition to and approval by the President, and must specify a time period for meeting the qualifications.

401.54 THE FACULTY WITH TERM APPOINTMENTS

54.1 Description and Appointment Requirements

The faculty with term appointments consists of individuals appointed to perform specialized academic duties who make substantial and regular contributions to a University academic unit, but do not have the permanence of appointment of tenured ~~and/or the prospect of permanence of appointment of tenure eligible~~ faculty.

~~These appointments must be commensurate with the specialized duties to be performed. Proposed term appointments must be considered by committees using appropriate standards and procedures which apply to an appointment to a tenured and/or tenure eligible faculty position.~~

Term appointments are for one academic or fiscal year in duration and are automatically renewed based on funding and performance, unless the faculty members holding such appointments are given notice of nonrenewal (policy 404.1.2(4)). The faculty member who holds a term appointment has no claim to a de facto permanent appointment based on length of service. Appointments for less than one academic or calendar year's duration are made to the temporary ranks (policy 401.6.2(3)). For those faculty whose appointments depend on extramural funds, the appointment is dependent upon the availability of those funds. Term appointments are

established only in an academic unit. ~~In other units, term appointments are not made.~~

54.2 Academic Ranks

The academic ranks for the faculty with term appointments follow.

(1) Lecturer ~~R~~ranks.

Faculty members whose function it is to teach remedial, beginning, or, on occasion, intermediate university courses, are appointed to one of the following titles: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer. ~~Appointments to lecturer positions are made only in academic units.~~

(2) Clinical ~~R~~ranks.

Faculty members whose primary function is the supervision of students in clinical practicum, residency, and intern programs are appointed to one of the following ranks: Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor. Clinical appointments are made through academic units.

(3) Research ~~R~~ranks.

Faculty members whose primary function is research and whose source of funding is extramural are appointed to one of the following ranks: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor. ~~Appointments to research ranks are made only in academic departments.~~

Comment [JE3]: A question was raised about whether these faculty have become tenure-eligible. PRPC members are not aware of any change.

(4) Federal ~~C~~ooperator (FC) ~~R~~ranks.

Faculty members who are federal employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal government, whose primary function at the university is equivalent to core faculty, and who serve as faculty under cooperative agreements between the University and the federal government (e.g., U.S. ~~Department~~ of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service) are appointed to one of the following ranks: Instructor (FC), Assistant Professor (FC), Associate Professor (FC), or Professor (FC).

Appointments to federal cooperator ranks are made only in academic units where such cooperative agreements exist.

(5) Federal ~~R~~esearch (FR) ~~R~~ranks.

Faculty members who are federal employees, who are paid by agencies of the federal government, whose primary function at the University is research, and who serve as faculty under agreements between the University and the federal government (e.g., U. S. Department of Agriculture) are appointed to one of the following ranks: Assistant Professor (FR), Associate Professor (FR), or Professor (FR). Appointments to federal research ranks are made only in

academic units where such agreements exist.

(6) Edith Bowen Teachers.

Faculty members who hold certification or licensure required by public schools and whose primary function is teaching preschool, elementary school, or developmentally disabled students at Edith Bowen Elementary School, are appointed to one of the following titles: Teacher, Mentor Teacher, or Master Teacher. Appointments to teacher ranks are made only by the College of Education and Human Services.

45.3 Limitations on Positions: Faculty with Term Appointments

(1) No Tenure

Faculty with term appointments are not eligible to enter the process that leads to the granting of tenure, unless the faculty member's status is changed.

(2) Changes in Status.

All changes in status from term-appointment faculty to faculty with tenure or tenure-eligibility require a national search.

(3) Leave.

Faculty with term appointments are not eligible for sabbatical leave, but ~~under appropriate conditions~~ may be granted professional leave under appropriate conditions, as determined by the appropriate administrator.

(4) Limitations on Faculty Participation.

Faculty with term appointments are eligible to be elected to and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate. The participation in faculty affairs of faculty members holding lecturer, clinical, research, federal research, or teacher positions is subject to the following limitations: (a) they may participate in the processes of setting policy within their academic units only to the extent determined by their appointing departments, colleges, or other academic units; (b) they may serve as members of appointed faculty committees and may vote on all matters except those relating to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion of tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty; and (c) they may not be counted among the number of tenured and tenure-eligible resident faculty members for purposes of apportioning Faculty Senate members. Federal Ceooperator ranks are exempt from the foregoing limitations on faculty participation with the following exceptions: they may not serve on committees or vote on matters relating to retention or tenure of tenure-eligible faculty.

401.56 FACULTY WITH SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS

Comment [JE4]: A question was raised whether these committees need to be specified. PRPC believes the existing language is sufficient.

Comment [JE5]: PRPC poses the question to FS as to why FC are the only term faculty exempt from the foregoing limitations?

56.1 Description and Appointment Requirements

The faculty with special appointments consists of those individuals whose appointments confer a limited association with the University. Such appointments are made to establish an association with professional peers for temporary or part-time service.

Faculty members with special appointments must possess qualifications and experience commensurate with those required for tenured and/or tenure-eligible or term appointment faculty. Proposed special appointments must be considered by appropriate departmental procedures. Periodic reviews of the performance of faculty members with special appointments may be conducted. Faculty with special appointments are not eligible for tenure.

56.2 Academic Ranks

The academic ranks for the faculty with special appointments follow.

(1) Adjunct Ranks.

Faculty members whose association with an academic department is secondary to an appointment within a different department, institution, organization, or other personal and professional interests are appointed to one of the following ranks: Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are made for less than 50 percent time only.

(2) Visiting Ranks.

Faculty members from other academic institutions who are participants in a university exchange program or who are employed to teach one or more ~~quarters~~ semesters for an academic department while on leave from another academic institution are appointed to one of the following ranks: Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor.

(3) Temporary ranks.

The term temporary may precede all tenure-eligible academic ranks. In extraordinary circumstances, academic units may ~~be forced to~~ fill faculty appointments on a temporary basis. The temporary nature and the length of the term of such a position must be clearly specified in advance. The term cannot exceed one academic year and is renewable up to an additional two years. An exception may be made for long-term international assignment. Temporary appointments shall not be used as long-term strategies for accomplishing the duties of academic departments or academic units.

56.3 Limitations on Positions: Faculty with Special Appointments

(1) No tenure eligibility.

Comment [JE6]: A questions was raised about whether this statement should be removed. PRPC feels strongly that it should be kept to deter replacing benefits-eligible faculty with adjunct faculty.

Comment [JE7]: A question was raised about whether who specifies "extraordinary circumstances" should be specified. PRPC believes the existing language is sufficient.

Faculty with special appointments are ineligible for tenure.

(2) Limitations on faculty participation.

The participation of faculty members holding adjunct, temporary, or visiting positions is subject to the following limitations: (a) they may participate in the processes of setting policy within their departments only to the extent determined by their appointing departments; (b) they may serve as voting members of appointed faculty committees except those relating to appointment, retention, tenure, or promotion of tenured and/or tenure-eligible faculty and faculty with term appointments; (c) they may not be counted among the number of ~~resident~~ faculty members for the purposes of apportioning the Faculty Senate members; and (d) they are ineligible to be elected to and to vote for members of the Faculty Senate.

FIRST READING

401.67 EMERITUS FACULTY

At the time of retirement and upon recommendation of the President and the approval of the Board of Trustees, faculty members may be awarded the honorary rank of Emeritus preceding their final academic rank.

Comment [JE8]: PRPC recommends that it remain unspecified who makes these recommendations.

401.78 LIST OF FACULTY

Prior to the end of fall semester of each year the University shall publish a list of all faculty which states the faculty category and the academic unit to which they are appointed.

Comment [JE9]: It appears this requirement is no longer being met in print, but via the USU online faculty directory

401.89 AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY

89.1 Policy Statement

(1) American Association of University Professors Joint Statement.

~~Although t~~ This policy statement may contains some provisions ~~which that~~ are the same or similar to certain principles promulgated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). ~~T~~his policy statement is not intended to incorporate AAUP principles and interpretations, and any such incorporation by reference is expressly disclaimed.

(2) Faculty Responsibility for Educational Process.

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, and methods of instruction, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. In those exceptional circumstances when the power of review or final decision of the President is exercised adversely on these matters, it shall be communicated to the faculty. Following such communication, the faculty shall have the opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its view to the President.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered, determines when the requirements have been met, and recommends to the President that the degrees be granted.

Comment [JE10]: In response to a question about which faculty this entails, please see refer to PRPC's Term Faculty Review recommendation.

(3) Faculty Status and Related Matters.

Faculty status and related matters, such as appointments, reappointments, nonrenewals of appointments, terminations, dismissals, reductions in status, promotions, and the granting of tenure are primarily a faculty responsibility. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Determination in these matters should be first by faculty action through established university procedures, reviewed and approved by - the President, followed, where necessary, by the approval of the Board of Trustees and/or the Board of Regents.

Comment [JE11]: In response to a question about which faculty this entails, please see refer to PRPC's Term Faculty Review recommendation.

(4) Collegial Governance of the University.

There is shared responsibility in the governance of the University with a meaningful role for the faculty. This role includes participation in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the University, such as budget matters and the appointment of administrators. The faculty should actively advise in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

Organizations and methods for faculty participation in the collegial governance of the University should be established wherever faculty responsibility is present. The organizations and methods may consist of meetings of the faculty members of a department, college, library, extension, other academic unit, or the University as a whole; or they may take the form of faculty-elected committees in academic units and a faculty designed, approved, and established through joint effort of the faculty and the administration.

(5) Faculty and Administration Communications.

Suggested means of communication among the faculty, the University administrators, and Board of Trustees are:

- (a) circulation of memoranda and reports,
- (b) joint ad hoc committees of the groups,
- (c) standing liaison committees of the groups, and

(d) membership of faculty members on administrative councils, committees, and other bodies.

89.2 Legislative Authority of the Faculty

Subject to the authority of the Board of Regents, the Board of Trustees, and the President, faculty shall legislate on all matters of educational policy, enact such rules and regulations as it deems desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and decide upon curricula and new courses of study.

The legislative power will normally be exercised by the Faculty Senate. In all matters except those within the authority of the Faculty Senate, the faculty retains original jurisdiction.

~~Whenever the faculty is acting within the scope of its authority, its actions shall be effective.~~

Comment [JE12]: PRPC agrees with the recommendation to strike this paragraph.

89.3 Appellate Authority of the Faculty:

Right to Review and to Modify Faculty Senate Actions

Faculty shall have the appellate power to review all Faculty Senate actions by means of a special meeting. ~~See policy 402.1.~~ Upon the written petition of 10% of ~~resident~~ faculty who are eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections, or upon the written request of 25 senators, the faculty must meet to reconsider Faculty Senate actions and to ratify, modify, or repeal them. The petition or request must be submitted to the President as chair of the faculty.

Comment [JE13]: In response to a question about which faculty this entails, please see refer to PRPC's Term Faculty Review recommendation.

401.911 MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY

911.1 Calling Meetings

Meetings of the faculty may be convened upon the call of the President. Upon receipt by the President of a written request or a written petition as provided in policy 401.9.3, the President must call a meeting of the faculty within ten working days to discuss and/or act on issues raised in the request or petition.

Comment [JE14]: PRPC recommends that this sections be placed ahead of the section "Chair of the Faculty" to improve clarity.

910.2 Notice

Faculty must receive individual notice of the meeting and its agenda a minimum of five days before the meeting, unless a majority of them waives that notice prior to or at the meeting or unless the President waives the notice on the grounds of emergency.

914.3 Quorum

Any number over ten percent of the ~~resident~~ faculty eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections shall constitute a forum for discussion at faculty meetings, but no vote shall be binding unless a quorum is present. Fifty percent plus one member of the voting faculty shall constitute a quorum. A quorum being present, all actions shall be by majority vote of those in attendance with voting

power. Meeting procedures shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

401.10 CHAIR OF THE FACULTY; SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY

The President of the University (and in the President's absence, the Provost) is the chair of the faculty and presides over all ~~its~~ meetings of the faculty.

The President of the University shall appoint a secretary for the faculty who will also be ex officio Executive ~~s~~ecretary of the Faculty Senate. The secretary shall record all actions of the faculty when it meets, and shall preserve the records in a form convenient for reference.

See also policy 402.8

401.1~~2~~ COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

The faculty may appoint, at any time, such committees as the work of the University may require. These committees must report to the faculty and to the Faculty Senate the progress of their work and the action they have taken.

FIRST READING

POLICY MANUAL

FACULTY

Number 402

Subject: The Faculty Senate and Its Committees

Effective Date: July 1, 1997

Revision Date: November 16, 2001

Revision Date: April 29, 2002

Revision Date: January 12, 2007

Revision Date April 30, 2007

Date of Last Revision: May 6, 2009

402.1 AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY TO REVIEW FACULTY SENATE ACTIONS

Actions of the Faculty Senate (Senate) shall be subject to the appellate power of the faculty, as

provided in policy 401.9.3. The agenda and actions of the Senate shall be reported to the faculty as provided in policy 402.4.2(3).

402.2 AUTHORITY OF THE SENATE

The authority of the faculty is delegated to the Senate. The Senate legislates and sets policy for matters within the collective authority of the faculty. See policy 401.9. The Senate shall have the power to act for and represent the faculty in all matters of educational policy, including requirements for admission, degrees, diplomas, and certificates; and in curricular matters involving relations between colleges, schools, divisions, or departments.

The Senate shall also have the following powers: (1) To receive and consider reports from any faculty committee, and from any council, department, division, administrative officer, library, or college; and to take appropriate action. (2) To consider matters of professional interest and faculty welfare and to make recommendations to the President of the University and other administrative officers. (3) To propose to the President amendments or additions to these policies.

2.1 Senate Power of Internal Governance; Referral of Matters to the President

The Senate shall have the power to make rules governing its own procedures and to establish its own order of business. All other matters considered and approved by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Executive Secretary to the President of the University and, in appropriate cases, to the Board of Trustees.

2.2 The President, University Administrators, and Board of Trustees

The Senate is an advisory body to the President of the University. While the Senate votes on policy and procedural issues, including but not limited to policy and procedural issues in these policies, these actions and recommendations cannot be implemented without the approval of the President of the University. The Board of Trustees advises the President of the University and approves or disapproves any substantive policy or procedural change, ~~addition or deletion in the policies~~. Approval or disapproval of Senate actions, whether by the President of the University or by the Board of Trustees, shall be reported back to the President of the Senate by the President of the University, or a designee, in a timely manner following the Senate action. When Senate actions receive final approval, it is the responsibility of University administrators and administrative bodies to implement the action.

2.3 Senator's Handbook

Each senator shall receive a current Senator's Handbook which explains briefly the role and operation of the Senate. The Handbook will include: (1) provisions of this policy pertinent to Senate proceedings, rules, and membership; (2) a simplified statement of the Rules of Order; and (3) rules for calling meetings. The Senate Executive Secretary must ensure that each newly

elected Senator receives a Handbook no later than the September meeting of the Senate.

402.3 MEMBERSHIP; ALTERNATES; TERM; VACANCIES

3.1 Membership

The Senate shall be composed of the following members: (1) Fifty-five faculty members elected by and from faculty members eligible to vote in Senate elections (see policy 401.6.3(2)(d)); (2) the President and the Provost of the University or their designees; (3) eight appointees of the President of the University who shall be vice presidents and/or deans, six of whom must hold faculty appointments and must be designated annually preceding elections to the Senate; (4) the four chairs of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee, the Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee, and the Faculty Diversity, Development and Equity Committee, if they are not one of the faculty members elected to the Senate; and (5) three students, who shall include the Associated Students of Utah State University (ASUSU) President or a designee, the ASUSU Academic Senate President or a designee, and the Graduate Student Senate (GSS) President or a designee.

Comment [JE15]: The question was asked: Why 55 senators? PRPC has no knowledge of where the number originated, nor do we propose a change.

With the exception of faculty holding special or emeritus appointments, any member of the faculty who is not designated as a presidential appointee is eligible for election to the Senate.

3.2 Alternates for Elected Members

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. (see policy 402.10.2) The alternate shall have full voting rights.

Senators must notify the Executive Secretary of the Senate in writing (email is acceptable) whenever alternates will replace them. If an absent senator fails to arrange for a substitute more than once during an academic year, then that senators' position will be considered vacant (see policy 402.3.4). Senators are considered absent whenever they are replaced by designated alternates (see policy 402.3.4).

3.3 Term

Faculty members elected to the Senate shall serve three-year terms or, as provided in policy 402.3.4, complete the three-year term vacated by a faculty member. Terms shall begin July 1 following elections and ~~may be re-elected~~ ~~are renewable~~ once, after which a faculty member is ineligible to stand for election for one year. The term of office for student members of the Senate shall be one year and shall coincide with the term of ASUSU and GSS officers. The term of office for presidential appointees shall be one year and shall begin July 1. A presidential appointee can be reappointed to consecutive terms, up to a maximum of six years, after which the appointee is ineligible for appointment for one year.

3.4 Vacancies

A senate seat shall be declared vacant if a senator (1) resigns, (2) is terminated, (3) goes on extended medical leave, (4) will otherwise be unavailable for more than half of the academic year, (5) misses more than one regularly scheduled meeting during an academic year without arranging for an alternate, or (6) misses ~~five-four~~ regularly scheduled senate meetings even when an alternate is arranged during any one academic year, or misses more than one regularly scheduled meeting without arranging for an alternate. The Executive Secretary of the Senate reports all vacancies to the Committee on Committees. For vacancies ~~owing to resignation, termination, incapacitating illness or four absences from regularly scheduled Senate meetings,~~ an alternate elected senator will be appointed by the affected ~~college~~ Dean or ~~Director~~ VP to fill the seat in accordance with policies 402.3.2 and 402.10.1. For vacancies among Presidential appointees, the President shall appoint a new Senator within 30 days.

402.4 RECORDS; AGENDA; MINUTES; ORDER OF BUSINESS

4.1 Records

The records of the Senate shall be kept by an executive secretary for the use of the members of the faculty, the President of the University, and the Board of Trustees. Records are public unless otherwise specified by action of the Senate in accord with state law (see policy 402.8).

Under the supervision of the President of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Secretary shall ensure that Senate actions approved by the President of the University, or where necessary by the President and the Board of Trustees (see policy 402.2.2), are published in campus media within an appropriate time frame and included in the Senate records.

Comment [JE16]: A question was asked about defining "campus media." PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

4.2 Agenda and Minutes

(1) Senate agenda.

The Executive Committee shall meet at least 14 days in advance of regularly scheduled Senate meetings to prepare the agenda and make assignments to those who are to report to the Senate. A copy of the agenda must be sent to each senator at least five days before regularly scheduled meetings.

Comment [JE17]: A question was asked if a copy being sent is appropriate. PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

(2) Faculty petition to place matter on the agenda.

Any 25 faculty members may petition the Senate to obtain consideration of any matter within the Senate's authority. The petition shall be presented in writing to any Senate member, who shall then give notice of the petition to the Senate or to its Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall place the matter raised in the petition on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting or, at the discretion of the Senate President, on the agenda of a special meeting called in accordance with the provisions of policy 402.6.2.

Comment [JE18]: PRPC was asked if 25 is an appropriate number to require use of senate time. PRPC recommends the language stand as is.

(3) Distribution of agenda and minutes.

One week prior to each Senate meeting, the Executive Secretary shall provide each academic unit, for public posting, a copy of the agenda of the next meeting, without attachments, and minutes of the prior Senate meeting.

(4) Publicizing and publication of recommended changes in policies or procedures.

Under the supervision of the President of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Secretary shall ensure that Senate actions recommending a change in this policy or in other University policies or procedures are publicized in a timely manner to the campus and reported to campus news media.

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.

