

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154  
Monday, 1 May 2006  
3:00-4:30 p.m.**

AGENDA

[Click here for Agenda Packet](#)

3:00 Call to Order

Approval of Minutes from 3 April 2006

3:05 Announcements

3:10 University Business—Stan Albrecht

Department Head Evaluation Report—Raymond Coward

3:15 Consent Agenda

EPC Business—Joyce Kinhead

ADVANCE Report—Krista Lynn Minnotte or Christine Hult

Faculty Evaluations Report—Mike Lyons

3:20 Information Items

Committee on Committees Report—Doug Ramsey

3:30 Old Business: Action Items

Domestic Partner Benefits Proposal from the BFW Report—Derek Mason

4:00 Key Issues and Action Items

PRPC Business—Jennifer MacAdam

4:20 New Business

4:30 Adjournment

# **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

Monday, 3 April 2006

Derek Mason called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

## **Minutes**

Terry Peak moved to accept the 6 March 2006 minutes as written, seconded by Tilak Dhiman, carried unanimously.

## **University Business**

Stan Albrecht presented University Business.

## Legislative Review

Presentations are being made to each of the colleges to review how Utah State University budgets came out of the state legislature. State employees were given 3.5% increase in compensation, with 0.5% to be diverted to covering increases in health care benefits.

## Searches

Juan Franco has accepted a position in Lincoln, Nebraska. Glenn Ford will chair the search committee for a new Vice-President. Three candidates have been interviewed for the Graduate Dean position.

## **Consent Agenda**

Janice Hall motioned to accept the consent agenda seconded by Darwin Sorensen, carried unanimously.

Note: EPC Business for April has four action items: 1) a request by the Department of Engineering and Technology Education to offer a Master of Science Degree: Plan C Engineering and Technology Education Degree; 2) a request by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to offer a Master of Science in Computer Engineering and a Master of Engineering in Computer Engineering (Pending approval from the Graduate Council); 3) a request to change the name of the Liberal Arts and Sciences major offered through HASS to Liberal Arts; and 4) approval to suspend enrollment in the two-year Certificate and Diploma programs in the Department of Music.

Note: Honorary Degrees and Awards report has been added at the end of this report.

## **Information Items**

Eden Summers presented the Executive Committee Elections & Committee Interest Survey. Please take a minute and complete the survey.

## **Key Issues and Action Items**

### PRPC Business

Jennifer MacAdam presented PRPC Business.

Action Items for final approval:

- Action Item number 1: *Clarification of Revision of Role Statement*—Greg Jones motioned to recommend the proposed code change to President Albrecht with editorial correction, seconded by Shawn Olsen, carried.
- Action Item number 2: *Dean's Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee*—Janice Hall motioned to recommend the proposed code change to President Albrecht, seconded by Ed Reeve, carried.
- Action Item number 3: *Deadline for Initial Promotion Committee Meeting*—Greg Jones motioned to recommend the proposed code change to President Albrecht, seconded by James Barnhill, carried.

Information Items:

- Information Item number 1: *Academic Rights and Responsibilities: Code 403*—Pat Lambert motioned to have PRPC change the word “intellectual freedom” to “academic freedom” in section 403.1, seconded by Lori Roggman, carried. Lynn Dudley motioned to change the word “content” to “requirements” and use “an alternative course requirement” instead of “modification of course content” in section 403.2, seconded by John McLaughlin, carried. Janice Hall motioned to change the title in section 403.2, seconded by Pat Lambert, carried (3 no's). Barry Franklin motioned to simplify the section 403.3.1(3), seconded by John McLaughlin, carried. Maria Cordero motioned to not accept the changes in section 403.3.1(7), seconded by Pat Lambert, carried (1 no).

Kathy Riggs motioned to end the meeting due to the lateness of the hour and move immediately to new business, seconded, carried.

### **New Business**

Derek Mason asked for nominations for President-Elect for 2006-2007. Doug Ramsey's nomination announced. Diane Calloway-Graham motioned to accept the nomination of Doug Ramsey as President-Elect for 2006-2007 and President for 2007-2008, seconded by Pat Lambert, carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

## **EPC BUSINESS**

### **Introduction: Educational Policies Committee**

Report for Faculty Senate 1 May 2006

Faculty Senate Executive Committee 17 April 2006

Joyce Kinkead-Chair, Stanley Allen-Agriculture, Scot Allgood-Education and Human Services, Todd Crowl-Natural Resources, Richard Cutler-Science, Steven Harris (interim replacement for Jennifer Duncan)-Libraries, Quinn Millet, ASUSU President, Spencer Watts, ASUSU Academic VP, Kathy Fitzgerald-HASS, David Luthy-DEED chair, Ronda Menlove-Extension, David Olsen-Business, Maure Smith-GSS President, Jeff Walters-ASC Chair, Darwin Sorensen-Engineering

**Meeting Dates:**

September 1, 2005, October 6, 2005, November 3, 2005, December 1, 2005, January 5, 2006, February 2, 2006, March 2, 2006, April 6, 2006—all at 3:00 p.m. in Champ Hall, following Curriculum Subcommittee, which commences at 2:00 p.m.

**Curriculum Subcommittee**

In April meetings, the Curriculum Subcommittee approved the following proposals:

**Action Items**

A request from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to offer a Master of Science in Computer Engineering and a Master of Engineering in Computer Engineering.

A request from the College of Natural Resources to change the prefix for courses in the new Department of Watershed Sciences (formerly AWER) be designated as WATS and the prefix for courses in the new Department of Wildland Resources (formerly FRWS) be designated as WILD, effective Spring 2007.

A request from the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, together with Continuing Education, to approve the Master of Social Work program to be offered on the Logan campus and 3 distance education sites.

The General Education Subcommittee presented the following language to be included in the *Code* 402.12.6:

The General Education Subcommittee reserves the right to review the syllabi and instructors of all USU courses, and all courses used for Breadth and Depth in the University Studies Program, under the following circumstances:

1. Whenever a new person is assigned to teach the course.
2. Whenever there is a significant change in the course content.
3. Whenever the course has not been taught for at least three years.
4. At five year intervals.
5. Whenever the course evaluations are low enough that there is cause for concern.

The review will determine if the syllabus of the course meets the expectations of the University Studies Program. The Subcommittee will offer an opportunity for the course to be revised as needed to meet expectation; failing that, it has the authority to remove a course or an instructor from University Studies offerings if expectations are not met.

### **Information Items**

Following are the 2007-2008 deadlines for curriculum changes.

<b>Semester</b>	<b>Submission Date*</b>	<b>Curriculum Sub-committee Date</b>
Spring 2007	March 23, 2006	April 6, 2006
Summer 2007	November 13, 2006	December 7, 2006
Fall 2007	November 13, 2006	December 7, 2006
Spring 2008	March 22, 2007	April 5, 2007
Summer 2008	November 12, 2007	December 6, 2007
Fall 2008	November 12, 2007	December 6, 2007

\*Course Approval Forms are due each month two weeks prior to meeting. However, some submission dates have been adjusted to compensate for holidays.

Any Course Approval Form submitted with changes to University Studies designated courses, needs to be approved by the General Education Subcommittee. The subcommittee has drafted a "Review of Courses" policy which reserves the right to review all General Education courses.

Richard Mueller will serve as chair for the Curriculum Subcommittee for the year 2006-2007, replacing Todd Crowl.

Scott Allgood was elected to serve as Chair of the Academic Standards Subcommittee, replacing Jeffrey Walters, who has served with distinction since 1999.

### **Recommendations**

EPC recommends approval of above changes by Faculty Senate.

### **ADVANCE REPORT**

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

**ADVANCE AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**

THE GOAL OF THE NSF ADVANCE PROGRAM IS TO PROMOTE INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FIELDS BY INCREASING THE PARTICIPATION, SUCCESS, AND LEADERSHIP OF WOMEN FACULTY IN ACADEMIC SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Program Overview

**NSF ADVANCE at Utah State University** is a five year program (currently in its third year) with objectives to:

- Increase women's recruitment, retention, and advancement in STEM at USU,
- Improve the climate and work/family balance for faculty at USU,
- Bring about policy and procedural changes to sustain advancement,
- Disseminate successful elements of ADVANCE across USU and to other institutions, and
- Increase collaborative research opportunities for minority women faculty and students.

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Individual Initiatives to Support Women Scientists & Engineers

- Collaborative Research Seed Grants involving Women Faculty
- Faculty Career and Work/Personal Development Workshops
- Associate to Full Professor Grants
- Transitional Support Program

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Departmental Initiatives: Support to Departments Aiming to Become Models for Gender Equity

- Department Transformation Program
- Science & Engineering Recruitment Team
- Department Head & Administrator Training/Workshops
- Measures of Trends and Progress (data research, climate surveys, external evaluation)

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Campus-wide Initiatives: Support for Efforts at Any Level

- Policy Review & Recommendations: e.g., Promotion and Tenure, Dual Career Assistance, Tenure Clock Extensions, Part-Time Tenure-Track
- Organization and Structure for Sustainability: e.g., policy code, administrative positions

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Selected Reports, Publications and Resources Featured on the USU ADVANCE Website

- About ADVANCE at USU including the proposal to NSF
- Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports
- Search Committee Tools
- P&T Advice & Guidelines
- Job Satisfaction Survey Results
- Links to policy code changes and updates

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Selected Results

- USU ADVANCE reports significant progress in the recruitment of women scientists and engineers at Utah State University.

Female STEM Tenure-Track Hires  
National/External Searches

Calendar Year	Percentage
2001	17%
2002	17%
2003	33%
2004	47%

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## STEM Colleges: Percent Female in Tenure-Track Positions

Year	Percentage	Sample Size (N)
2001	17%	38.5
2003	13%	41
2006	15%	51

**ADVANCE**  
AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

## Contact Information

- Website: <http://websites.usu.edu/advance>
- Email: [advance@cc.usu.edu](mailto:advance@cc.usu.edu)
- Phone: (435) 797-8069
- Fax: (435) 797-3318
- Office:
  - TSC 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Women and Gender Programs
  - Dr. Krista Lynn Minnotte, Program Leader
- Mailing Address:
  - NSF ADVANCE at Utah State University
  - 0187 Old Main Hill
  - Logan, UT 84322-0187

# **FACULTY EVALUATIONS REPORT**

Summary Report to the U.S.U. Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
Status of a Proposed Simplification of the U.S.U. Teaching Evaluation Form  
Faculty Senate Faculty Evaluation Committee  
April 16, 2006

Michael Lyons, U.S.U. Faculty Senate Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair

Over the past few years, U.S.U. Faculty Senate members have repeatedly expressed concerns about the U.S.U. teaching evaluation process. Our committee oversees this process. Last April, 2005-2006 Faculty Senate President Janis Boettinger asked the committee consider how the standard U.S.U. teaching evaluation form might be simplified, and also to explore the possibility of substituting on-line evaluations for paper evaluations. The focus on simplification reflects a perception that an excessive number of questions on the form prompts many students to treat the process very casually. Students affirm the validity of this perception, and in informal surveys, students overwhelmingly favor simplification of the form.

The committee responded to Professor Boettinger's request by asking the Faculty Senate conduct a survey to gauge faculty satisfaction with the form, and to probe the faculty on the issue of on-line evaluation. The response rate to the survey was about 35%—adequate in these circumstances. The survey indicates that there is widespread support for simplification of the form, with minimal opposition. The survey also suggests that most faculty are receptive to on-line evaluation, but this is a complex issue that the committee will not tackle until next year.

At a meeting on March 31, 2006, the committee unanimously agreed, in principle, to recommend simplification of the form. The simplification envisioned would preserve the open-ended questions on the back side of the form, which provide input and suggestions for improvement in teaching that many faculty value. It would eliminate many, or perhaps nearly all, of the scaled-response, closed-ended questions on the front of the form. Many of the surveyed faculty, as well as those on the committee, think that the responses to these questions provide very little information not already contained in the responses to the open-ended questions. In other cases, faculty perceive that some of the scaled-response questions contaminate the evaluation process--by, for example, encouraging students to complain about excessive class workloads.

At least one scaled-response, summary question asking students to assess the “overall quality of instruction” will remain on the form if it is simplified, as the committee presumes that at least one such question is essential to the assessment of faculty by the U.S.U. administration. The addition of a summary question focusing on overall student learning is also possible. The committee does not, however, want to remove items from the form that U.S.U. administrators commonly use in the assessment of faculty. Thus, we have distributed to seek your input. A one question survey on the teaching evaluation form appears below. We welcome other comments or recommendations. The committee will meet on Monday, April 24 to review your responses to this survey, and, most likely, it will draw up recommendations to the U.S.U. Faculty Senate at that meeting. I thank you for your attention to this matter.

## **DOMESTIC PARTNER BENEFITS PROPOSAL FROM THE BFW REPORT**

*Domestic Partner Benefits Proposal from the Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee 2005-2006 Summary Report*

The issue of health benefits for domestic partners was referred back to the BFW committee from faculty senate on December 5, 2005. The Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee has overseen the posting to the Faculty Senate website of the information the Senate requested. (See Domestic Partners on the Faculty Senate webpage). The BFW has further investigated the question of costs and although the actual cost to add dependent coverage for same-sex domestic partners is difficult to estimate with certainty, it is clear that the cost would be small in relation to the overall cost of the health plan. The BFW committee only considered cost information for “health benefits to same-sex domestic partners of Utah State University faculty and staff” as requested by the proposal, and did not address the cost of other benefits (e.g. bereavement leave, half price tuition for spouses, health benefits for dependent children of domestic partners, etc.). Such potential additional benefits were not included in the specific proposal under consideration. The most-current version of the domestic partner proposal is available on the faculty senate website. The BFW discussed these issues at the January 31, 2006 meeting and has returned the issue to the faculty senate for their consideration.

## **PRPC BUSINESS**

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee  
Report to Faculty Senate  
May 1, 2006

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Role Statement Revision. Language has been revised to clarify the process of revision of the role statement (Attachment 1). Yellow highlighting indicates changes from the original code; green highlighting indicates changes in response to discussion at the April Faculty Senate meeting.
2. Deans’ Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees. Language providing for the presence of an ombudsperson and faculty notification of membership of committees is presented for final review (Attachment 2).
3. Deadline for Initial Promotion Committee Meeting. Language providing for a February 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for the first meeting of the promotion advisory committee meeting and formation of the promotion committee is presented for final review (Attachment 3). One change, highlighted in turquoise, was made for the sake of consistency.
4. Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility. Revisions to Section 403 as discussed with Faculty Senate are presented for review (Attachment 4). Turquoise highlighting indicates further revisions proposed by PRPC. A clean version of 403.3.1(3) is at the end of this attachment.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

5. Alternative Course Requirements Policy. Revisions as discussed with Faculty Senate are presented for review (Attachment 5).

6. Role Statement Criteria for Award of Tenure and Promotion - Excellence in a Minor Role. Code is proposed to address a concern that the major emphasis as defined in the role statement is not always the area in which evidence of excellence is required for the award of tenure and promotion. (Attachment 6).

7. Supervisors on Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees. Code was proposed to prevent undue influence on the decisions of a committee if one member supervises another (Attachment 7).

## **ATTACHMENTS 1 - 7 TO FOLLOWS**

Attachment 1  
Role Statement Revision

405.6 TENURE, PROMOTION AND REVIEW: GENERAL PROCEDURES

6.1 Role Statement and Role Assignment

The role statement shall be reviewed, signed and dated annually by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and dean, director, or vice provost, and shall be revised as needed. The process of Any subsequent revision may be initiated by either the faculty member or the department head or supervisor. Any revision of the role statement should be mutually agreed to by the faculty member and department head or supervisor and approved by the director (where applicable) or dean. If agreement cannot be reached, individual department, college, and/or University appeal or hearing procedures should be used to resolve disagreements before transmitting revised role statements to P/T committees. A copy of the role statement, and any later revisions, will be provided to the faculty member, the department head or supervisor, director (where applicable), the dean, vice president, the Provost, and the members of the tenure and/or promotion advisory committee.

Attachment 2  
Deans' Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees

405.7 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE TENURE PROCESS

405.7.2 Additional Events During the Year in which a Tenure Decision is to be Made

(4) Evaluation and recommendation by the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president.

The director (where applicable), dean, or vice president will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's recommendation, and the tenure advisory committee's recommendation to the provost on or before January 11, except that for third-year appointees the date is November 20 (see Table 405.1.4). A copy of the director's (where applicable), dean's, or vice president's letter shall be sent to the tenure advisory committee and the candidate and placed in his or her file.

The dean, director, or vice president may convene an ad hoc advisory committee to review tenure and promotion recommendations under his or her purview. The members of this committee shall have tenure and rank equal to or greater than that sought by the candidate and shall not have appointments that are primarily administrative, including that of department head and supervisor. The dean, director, or vice president shall chair the committee. Any advisory committee formed to evaluate the candidate shall also utilize an ombudsperson and the names of the members of the committee shall be made known to the faculty of the college.

405.8 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE PROMOTION PROCESS

405.8.3 Procedures for Promotion

(4) Evaluation and recommendation by the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president.

The director (where applicable), dean, or associate or assistant vice president for Extension will send his or her own recommendation, the department head's or supervisor's recommendation, and the promotion advisory committee's recommendation to the Provost on or before January 11. A copy of the director's (where applicable), dean's, or vice president's letter shall be sent to the promotion advisory committee and the candidate and placed in his or her file.

The dean, director, or vice president may convene an ad hoc advisory committee to review promotion recommendations under his or her purview. The members of this committee shall have tenure and rank equal to or greater than that sought by the candidate and shall not have appointments that are primarily administrative, including that of department head and supervisor. The dean, director, or vice president shall chair the committee. Any advisory committee formed to evaluate the candidate shall also utilize an ombudsperson and the names of the members of the committee shall be made known to the faculty of the college.

Attachment 3  
Initial Meeting Prior to Promotion

405.8 PROCEDURES SPECIFIC TO THE PROMOTION PROCESS

8.2 Faculty with Tenure

(1) Meetings of the promotion advisory committee

[one paragraph]

When the faculty member is ready to be considered for promotion to full professor, the promotion advisory committee shall meet upon request of the faculty member, to consider a recommendation for promotion to full professor the following fall. This initial meeting shall take place ~~prior to~~ by February 15, six months before the faculty member submits materials for consideration and review.

405.6.2 Advisory Committees

(2) Promotion advisory committee.

[one paragraph]

Following tenure, if a faculty member so desires, he or she may request in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed and meet with the faculty member. This will be done by the department head in consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, vice provost or vice president within 30 days of receipt of the written request. The promotion ~~advisory and tenure~~ committee must be formed by ~~March 30<sup>th</sup>~~ February 15<sup>th</sup> of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) ~~below~~ above be held at this time.

[two paragraphs]

When a department head or supervisor is being considered for promotion, the director (where applicable), the appropriate dean, or vice president shall appoint the promotion advisory committee; when a director (where applicable), dean, or vice president is being considered, the Provost shall appoint the promotion advisory committee. When a faculty member with tenure wishes to be considered for promotion, at the request of the candidate for promotion the department head or supervisor shall, by ~~October~~ February 15 of the ~~Fall~~ Spring Semester ~~one year~~ six months prior to that consideration, convene the promotion advisory committee to meet with the candidate.

**POLICY MANUAL  
FACULTY**

---

**Number 403**

**Subject: Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility**

**Effective Date: July 1, 1997**

---

**403.1 INTRODUCTION**

The University is operated for the common good which depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to teaching, research, and service. (See policy 401.9.1 regarding provisions which are the same or similar to certain statements of the AAUP).

The University is a community dedicated, through promulgation of thought, truth, and understanding, to teaching, research, and service. It must, therefore, be a place where innovative ideas, original experiments, creative activities, and independence of thought are not merely tolerated but actively encouraged. ~~Because thought~~ Thought and understanding flourish only in a climate of intellectual academic freedom and integrity, expressed collectively by colleges and departments as well as individually through research and teaching and as they exist within the wider context of advanced study as commonly understood by all universities. The community also values diversity and respect, without which there can be no collegiality among faculty and students. In addition, the University community values individual rights and freedoms, including the right of each community member to adhere to individual systems of conscience, religion, and ethics. Finally, the University recognizes that with all rights come responsibilities.

~~and because~~ Because the pursuit of truth is fundamentally a personal enterprise, a statement of faculty responsibility must be strongly anchored to principles of intellectual freedom and personal autonomy. While faculty must abide by standards of professional responsibility, the University must provide and safeguard a climate of intellectual freedom. Relationships within the university should consist of shared confidence, mutual loyalty, and trust. Dealings should be conducted with courtesy, civility, decency, and a concern for personal dignity. Such an atmosphere can be achieved only when all concerned behave responsibly. While the right of academic freedom is respected, the exercise of the right cannot be through disruptive actions or physical force. The University works to uphold its collective values by fostering free speech, broadening fields of inquiry, and encouraging generation of new knowledge that challenges, shapes, and enriches our collective and individual understandings.

**403.2 ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Academic freedom is the right to teach, study, discuss, investigate, discover, create, and publish freely. Academic freedom protects the rights of faculty members in teaching and of students in learning. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. The faculty member is entitled to full freedom in teaching, research, and creative activities, subject to the limitations imposed by professional responsibility.

Attachment 4  
Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility

## 2.1 Freedom and Responsibilities of the University

Subject to the power and authority of the Board of Regents to control, manage, and supervise the State System of Higher Education, and Utah State University as a member institution, the University has the freedom to pursue its ends without interference from government. Included therein are the four essential freedoms of the University to determine for itself on academic grounds: 1) who may teach; 2) what may be taught; 3) how it shall be taught; and 4) who may be admitted to study. Consistent with principles of academic freedom, the faculty, individually and collectively, has the responsibility for determining the content of the curriculum.

The University consists of many components all of which support the interactive, collegial enterprise that exists in the quest for knowledge and its transmittal. The University has the general responsibility to protect the academic freedom of every faculty member and the freedom of every student to learn. The University itself shall not violate the academic freedom of any faculty member or the freedom of any student to learn and shall use its powers and resources to defend its faculty and students from unjustified attempts to compromise or restrict those freedoms, even should the exercise of those freedoms generate hostility.

## 2.2 Freedom and Course Content Requirements

Students are expected to take courses that will challenge them intellectually and personally. Students must understand and be able to articulate the ideas and theories that are important to the discourse within and among academic disciplines. Personal disagreement with these ideas and theories or their implications is not sufficient grounds for requesting an alternative course requirement. Alternative requirements requested on such grounds will not necessarily be granted. The University recognizes that students' sincerely held core beliefs may make it difficult for students to fulfill some requirements of some courses or majors. *The University assumes no obligation to ensure that all students will be able to complete any course or major.*

## 2.2 2.3 Violations of Academic Freedom or Standards and Regulations

Persons having a formal association with the University shall not be involved in acts which violate the academic freedom or constitutional rights of others, or the standards and regulations of the University or the State Board of Regents.

## 403.3 PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY; STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The concept of academic freedom is accompanied by an equally demanding concept of professional responsibility. The standards for professional responsibility listed in the following subsections are standards to which faculty members are expected to adhere. University faculty members are citizens, members of learned professions, and officers of an educational institution. When speaking or writing as citizens, faculty members are free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As individuals of learning and as educational officers, they should understand that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their individual utterances. Hence, they should at

Attachment 4  
Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility

all times strive to be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

### 3.1 Standards of Conduct – Faculty Responsibilities to Student

- (1) Faculty members engage in reasonable and substantial preparation for the teaching of their courses, appropriate to the educational objectives to be achieved **and consistent with the standards of the discipline.**
- (2) Faculty members meet scheduled classes. Schedules are altered or classes canceled only for valid reasons and only after adequate notice is given to students and to the department head, dean, or other appropriate academic officer. Failure to meet a class without prior notice to students is excusable only for reasons beyond the control of the faculty member.
- (3) Faculty members **shall select course content requirements based on the legitimate pedagogical goals of the course and discipline, and inform students of the general content, requirements, and evaluation criteria in the syllabus or comparable documentation** at the beginning of any course ~~that~~ they teach. Faculty members evaluate student course work promptly, conscientiously, without prejudice or favoritism, and consistently with the criteria stated at the beginning of the course **in the course documentation** and related to the legitimate ~~academic purposes~~ **pedagogical goals** of the course. **The documentation for the course should define, to the extent possible, the writings, lectures, films, or presentations, performances, or other course content requirements in sufficient detail to allow the student to identify course materials requirements that may conflict with a the student's sincerely held core beliefs.** ~~Instructors may include a statement in the course documentation if they believe course materials may conflict with students' sincerely held core beliefs. However, Faculty will not always be able to predict in advance which if any materials requirements that may conflict with the sincerely held core beliefs of a given student or group of students. If conflicts arise, Procedures for Alternative Course Requirements due to Conflicts with Sincerely Held Core Beliefs [location] provides guidance to students and faculty for the resolution of conflicts.~~ [See the end of this attachment for a clean version of this policy.]
- (4) Faculty members with teaching responsibilities maintain regular office hours for consultation with students, or they otherwise assure accessibility to students.
- (5) Faculty members do not plagiarize the work of students. When faculty members and students work together, appropriate credit is given to the students. Faculty members do not limit or curtail the right of any student to publish or otherwise communicate the result of the student's own independent scholarly activities.
- (6) Faculty members do not use their positions and authority to obtain uncompensated labor or to solicit gifts or favors from students. Faculty members do not ask students to perform services unrelated to legitimate requirements of a course unless the student is adequately compensated for such services.

Attachment 4  
Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility

(7) Faculty members do not reveal matters told to them in confidence by students except as required by law, and then only to persons entitled to such information by law or institutional regulation. Faculty members may, however, report their assessment of a student's performance and ability to persons logically and legitimately entitled to receive such reports.

(8) Faculty members create and maintain environments in which students are provided the opportunity to do original thinking, research, and writing.

(9) Faculty members avoid the misuse of the classroom by preempting substantial portions of class time for the presentation of views on topics unrelated to the subject matter of the course. Faculty members do not reward agreement or penalize disagreement with his or her views on controversial topics.

(10) Faculty members do not engage in the sexual harassment of students (policy 407.9).

**CLEAN COPY OF CODE 403.3.1(3) WITH SUGGESTED REVISIONS**

(3) Faculty members shall select course requirements based on the legitimate pedagogical goals of the course and discipline, and inform students of the general content and evaluation criteria in the syllabus or comparable documentation at the beginning of any course they teach. Faculty members evaluate student course work promptly, conscientiously, without prejudice or favoritism, and consistently with the criteria stated at the beginning of the course in the course documentation and related to the legitimate pedagogical goals of the course. The documentation for the course should define, to the extent possible, the writings, lectures, films, presentations, performances, or other course requirements in sufficient detail to allow the student to identify requirements that may conflict with the student's sincerely held core beliefs. Faculty will not always be able to predict in advance requirements that may conflict with the sincerely held core beliefs of a given student or group of students. If conflicts arise, Procedures for Alternative Course Requirements due to Conflicts with Sincerely Held Core Beliefs [location] provides guidance to students and faculty for the resolution of conflicts.

Attachment 5  
Alternative Course Requirements Policy

**USU ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL**

**403.4 PROCEDURES FOR ALTERNATIVE COURSE REQUIREMENTS DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH SINCERELY HELD CORE BELIEFS**

It is the student's obligation to determine, before the last day to submit a petition for late course drop without penalty, when course requirements conflict with the student's sincerely held core beliefs. ~~and the~~ The class should be dropped if a conflict exists. A student who finds this solution impractical may request **an alternative requirement** from the instructor. Though the University provides, through this policy, a process by which a student may make such a request, the policy does not oblige the instructor to grant the request, except in those cases when a denial would be arbitrary and capricious or illegal. A request for **an alternative requirement** must be made to the instructor in writing, and the student must deliver a copy of the request to the office of the department head. The request must articulate the burden the requirement would place on the student's sincerely held core beliefs.

The instructor must respond to any request for **an alternative requirement** within **two school days** of receiving it. The response must be made in writing and a copy must be delivered to the office of the department head. In the event that the class does not meet on the day by which the instructor must respond, the student must make arrangements to receive the response in a timely manner. *Instructors are not required to provide an alternative requirement, as long as the original course requirement has a reasonable relationship to a legitimate pedagogical goal.* ~~but they~~ They may do so, only if a reasonable alternative means of satisfying the **curricular course** requirement is available and only if that alternative is fully appropriate for meeting the academic objectives of the course, after considering (i) the fundamental importance of the particular requirement to the legitimate pedagogical requirements of the course; (ii) the burden on the student's sincerely held core beliefs; ~~and~~ (iii) the difficulty of administering the alternative requirement.

In considering whether or not to provide an alternative requirement, the instructor may evaluate the sincerity but not the validity of the student's beliefs. If an instructor in a course provides an alternative requirement, the instructor must similarly consider all other requests made during the same semester for the same course for **alternative requirements** to address all students' sincerely held core beliefs. Requests will be individually evaluated in relation to the same considerations; however, the granting of one such request will not guarantee that all requests will be granted. Because the criteria and requirements for granting requests will apply differently to each instructor and to each section of each course, decisions made by an instructor in one course will not affect decisions by the same instructor in other courses or by other instructors in the same or other courses.

If an instructor does not grant a request **for an alternative requirement**, the student may appeal that denial in writing to the dean of the college. If the dean is the instructor of the course, the student may appeal the denial to the office of the provost. The dean (or designee) will, in consultation with the faculty member and the department head (or designee), act within two school days. The dean (or designee) will uphold the denial unless she or he finds that the denial was arbitrary and capricious or illegal. The dean's determination shall be final as it pertains to the

Attachment 5  
Alternative Course Requirements Policy

specific request **for an alternative requirement**. Faculty challenges to the appropriateness of this decision should follow established grievance procedures. The student may but is not required to participate in these further reviews.

If the faculty instructor disagrees with the dean's decision that the instructor's denial of the student's request was arbitrary and capricious or illegal, the faculty instructor may not be compelled against his/her professional judgment to administer the requested **alternative requirement** for the student. If the faculty instructor declines to administer the **alternative requirement**, it will be the responsibility of the dean in consultation with the department **head chair** to design and administer the alternative **academic** requirement for the student in order to satisfy the student's request. The dean (or dean's appropriate designee) will determine the student's grade on that specific alternative **requirement** and will report that grade to the course instructor, who will incorporate that grade for the **requirement** into the total grade for the course. The final grade in the course will be determined by the faculty instructor and will be calculated in the same way as the final grade is determined for all other students in the course.

If a student in good standing determines, after the last day to **submit a petition for late course drop courses** without penalty, that a **course requirements may** conflicts with the student's sincerely held core beliefs, and the instructor has denied the student's written request **for an alternative requirement**, the student may seek permission in writing from the dean to withdraw without receiving a W on his/her transcript and to receive a refund of tuition for that class. It is the student's responsibility to determine any effect withdrawing **from the course** may have on the student's financial aid. In making this request the student must demonstrate that he or she could not have made this determination prior to the last day to drop courses without penalty, or that the request was made prior to the last day to drop a course and a decision was made after the drop date. The dean's determination shall be final.

Decisions on requests for alternative requirements shall not be considered adversely to a faculty member in retention, promotion and tenure, or other proceedings as long as those decisions are made in good faith. Faculty shall not take adverse academic action against students requesting alternative requirements. The dean or department head shall not take any adverse action against an instructor based on his/her decision to provide or not to provide an alternative requirement for a student.

Attachment 6  
Role Statement Criteria – Excellence in a Minor Role

405.2.2 Criteria for the Award of Tenure and for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Tenure, and promotion from assistant to associate professor, are awarded on the basis by which a faculty member performs his or her role assignment. Although tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members are expected to carry out the major university functions of teaching, research/creative endeavor, extension, and service, individual emphasis will vary within and among academic departments as described in each faculty member's role statement. Each candidate must present evidence of effectiveness in all of the professional services which he or she performs, and must present evidence of excellence in the major emphasis of his or her role statement. Academic units may deviate from this standard by requiring excellence in any one area of the role statement. When they do deviate they must provide a written statement of their standards to candidates when they are hired and must adhere to these standards throughout the process, up to and including the central administration level.

405.2.4 Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

In addition to the criteria for promotion to associate professor, promotion to the rank of professor shall require an established outstanding reputation for excellence in teaching, research/creative endeavors and/or extension, according to the role statement. Excellence is measured by national standards for professors within the professional peer group. Academic units may deviate from this standard by requiring excellence in any one area of the role statement. When they do deviate they must provide a written statement of their standards to candidates when they are hired and must adhere to these standards throughout the process, up to and including the central administration level.

Attachment 7  
Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

405.6.2 Advisory Committees

(1) Tenure advisory committee.

For each new tenure-eligible faculty member who is appointed, the faculty member's department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president appoint a tenure advisory committee. All tenure advisory committees will be appointed during the faculty member's first semester of service. The committee shall consist of at least five members, at least one of whom is from outside the academic unit. The department head or supervisor will designate the chair of the committee. The dean of the college will appoint a tenure advisory committee for department heads appointed without tenure in academic departments. The Provost will appoint a tenure advisory committee for directors, deans, or vice presidents (where applicable) appointed without tenure.

The tenure advisory committee members shall be tenured and hold rank higher than that held by the faculty member under consideration unless that faculty member is an untenured full professor, Extension professor, librarian, or Extension agent. If there are fewer than five faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. The department head or supervisor of the candidate shall not serve on tenure advisory committees, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the tenure advisory committee. The candidate may request replacement of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor, the director (where applicable), and the dean, or vice president.

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 non-renewal 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) to non-renew 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, to non-renew the appointment (407.2.1(5)) at the end of the probationary period.

(2) Promotion advisory committee.

When a faculty member without tenure is to be considered for promotion, the tenure advisory committee shall also serve as a promotion advisory committee. The term of this committee shall expire when the faculty member is awarded tenure.

Attachment 7  
Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

Following tenure, if a faculty member so desires, he or she may request in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed and meet with the faculty member. This ~~will~~ shall be done by the department head in consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, vice provost or vice president within 30 days of receipt of the written request. The promotion and tenure committee must be formed by March 30<sup>th</sup> of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) below be held at this time.

If the promotion advisory committee meets for the first time in the fifth year post tenure, this committee would also perform the functions of the post-tenure review committee. If this committee has met prior to the fifth year then this committee or a three member subcommittee may form the post-tenure review committee and carry out the Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty 405.12.2.

The promotion advisory committee ~~will~~ shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and higher rank than does the faculty member. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a chair other than him or herself. Normally, two academic unit members of higher rank who have served on the candidate's tenure advisory committee shall be appointed to the promotion advisory committee, and at least one member shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than four faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee. The candidate may request removal of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president.

When a department head or supervisor is being considered for promotion, the director (where applicable), the appropriate dean, or vice president shall appoint the promotion advisory committee; when a director (where applicable), dean, or vice president is being considered, the Provost shall appoint the promotion advisory committee. When a faculty member with tenure wishes to be considered for promotion, at the request of the candidate for promotion the department head or supervisor shall, by October 15 of the Fall Semester one year prior to that consideration, convene the promotion advisory committee to meet with the candidate.

(3) Review committee for tenured faculty.

The review committee shall consist 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 the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president and shall include at least one member from outside the academic unit. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall

Attachment 7

Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

not serve on this committee, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member (see 405.12(2)).

Attachment 8  
Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

405.6.2 Advisory Committees

(1) Tenure advisory committee.

For each new tenure-eligible faculty member who is appointed, the faculty member's department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president appoint a tenure advisory committee. All tenure advisory committees will be appointed during the faculty member's first semester of service. The committee shall consist of at least five members, at least one of whom is from outside the academic unit. The department head or supervisor will designate the chair of the committee. The dean of the college will appoint a tenure advisory committee for department heads appointed without tenure in academic departments. The Provost will appoint a tenure advisory committee for directors, deans, or vice presidents (where applicable) appointed without tenure.

The tenure advisory committee members shall be tenured and hold rank higher than that held by the faculty member under consideration unless that faculty member is an untenured full professor, Extension professor, librarian, or Extension agent. If there are fewer than five faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. The department head or supervisor of the candidate shall not serve on tenure advisory committees, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the tenure advisory committee. The candidate may request replacement of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor, the director (where applicable), and the dean, or vice president.

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 non-renewal 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) to non-renew 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, to non-renew the appointment (407.2.1(5)) at the end of the probationary period.

(2) Promotion advisory committee.

When a faculty member without tenure is to be considered for promotion, the tenure advisory committee shall also serve as a promotion advisory committee. The term of this committee shall expire when the faculty member is awarded tenure.

## Attachment 8 Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

Following tenure, if a faculty member so desires, he or she may request in writing to the department head or supervisor that a promotion advisory committee be formed and meet with the faculty member. This ~~will~~ shall be done by the department head in consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, vice provost or vice president within 30 days of receipt of the written request. The promotion and tenure committee must be formed by March 30<sup>th</sup> of the third year following tenure and it is recommended that the informational meeting outlined in 405.8.2(1) below be held at this time.

If the promotion advisory committee meets for the first time in the fifth year post tenure, this committee would also perform the functions of the post-tenure review committee. If this committee has met prior to the fifth year then this committee or a three member subcommittee may form the post-tenure review committee and carry out the Quinquennial Review of Tenured Faculty 405.12.2.

The promotion advisory committee ~~will~~ shall be composed of at least five faculty members who have tenure and higher rank than does the faculty member. The department head or supervisor shall appoint a chair other than him or herself. Normally, two academic unit members of higher rank who have served on the candidate's tenure advisory committee shall be appointed to the promotion advisory committee, and at least one member shall be chosen from outside the academic unit. If there are fewer than four faculty members in the academic unit with higher rank than the candidate, then the department head or supervisor shall, in consultation with the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president complete the membership of the committee with faculty of related academic units. Department heads and supervisors of the candidate shall not serve on promotion advisory committees, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member. The appointing authority for each committee shall fill vacancies on the committee as they occur. In consultation with the faculty member and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president, the department head or supervisor may replace members of the promotion advisory committee. The candidate may request removal of committee members subject to the approval of the department head or supervisor and the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president.

When a department head or supervisor is being considered for promotion, the director (where applicable), the appropriate dean, or vice president shall appoint the promotion advisory committee; when a director (where applicable), dean, or vice president is being considered, the Provost shall appoint the promotion advisory committee. When a faculty member with tenure wishes to be considered for promotion, at the request of the candidate for promotion the department head or supervisor shall, by October 15 of the Fall Semester one year prior to that consideration, convene the promotion advisory committee to meet with the candidate.

### (3) Review committee for tenured faculty.

The review committee shall consist 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 the director (where applicable), dean, or vice president and shall include at least one member from outside the academic unit. Department heads and supervisors of the faculty member being reviewed shall

## Attachment 8

### Supervisory Relationships on Tenure and Promotion Committees

not serve on this committee, and, where possible, no committee member may have a supervisory relationship with another member (see 405.12(2)).

**Utah State University**  
**Honorary Degrees and Awards Screening Committee Report**  
**April 3, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**The information contained in this document is CONFIDENTIAL and for review by the Faculty Senate only. It is not to be disseminated to any person outside of the Faculty Senate.**

**To:** Utah State University Faculty Senate  
**From:** Honorary Degrees Committee

**Committee Composition**

D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D., Chair  
Ms. Lynnette Hansen, Board of Trustees Member  
Lance Littlejohn, Ph.D., USU Professor  
Mr. Quinn Millett, ASUSU President  
Mr. Brent Nyman, Board of Trustees Member  
Ms. Sydney Peterson, President's Office  
Ed Reeve, Ph.D., USU Professor  
Gary Strquadine, Ph.D., Provost Office  
Ms. Marilyn Watts, Alumni Council  
Ms. Kellie Schultz Wood, Alumni Council President

**Commencement Speaker**

It is our pleasure to present to the Faculty Senate the name of that individual who has been recommended to the Board of Trustees as the Commencement Speaker for Spring 2006. The Honorary Degree and Award Screening Committee recommend the name of Dr. C. Peter Magrath for Commencement Speaker.

Dr. C. Peter Magrath assumed the presidency of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) on January, 1992. As CEO of the nation's oldest higher education association, Dr. Magrath represented NASULGC's member institutions in Washington, D.C. and in educational settings around the nation on issues of national importance to the higher education community. On January 1, 2006 he became the Senior Advisor to the College Board in Washington, D.C.

**Honorary Degrees**

The Honorary Degree and Award Screening Committee recommended five candidates for honorary degrees. The Board of Trustees chose the following two individuals:

**Ms. Manon Russell**

Ms. Manon Caine Russell is deeply committed to the arts and in particular she is dedicated to enhancing the arts experiences of students at Utah State University. The Caine School of the Arts within the College of Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences was recently established and Manon Russell was a central figure in developing the vision for the School. As a board member of the Marie Eccles Caine Foundation, Manon Russell

has championed the mission of the foundation to support scholarship, foster creativity, and ensure excellence in the Arts. The Marie Eccles Caine Foundation sponsors an extensive visiting artists program in the College of Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences' Caine School of the Arts at Utah State University. This program emphasizes collaboration and brings in renowned artists in the fields of art, art history, landscape architecture, music, theater, interior design, and creative writing. The foundation provides scholarship support to recruit and retain our most talented students.

**Mr. Lorenzo Hoopes**

Mr. Lorenzo Hoopes retired in 1979 as Senior Vice President and Director of Safeway, Incorporated, headquartered in Oakland, California. At that time Safeway was the largest food retailer in the world, operating stores throughout the United States, Canada, Great Britain, West Germany, and Australia. He led the management group responsible for the introduction of Safeway Stores in Saudi Arabia in 1979. Prior to retirement, 1979, Mr. Hoopes earned his MBA from Pepperdine University. In recent years, as executor of the estate of Ray and Eloise Lilywhite, Mr. Hoopes has been a good friend to the College of Education and Human Services at Utah State University, helping us realize our dreams for the future.

**Dr C. Peter Magrath**

Dr C. Peter Magrath, as the commencement speaker, will also receive an Honorary Degree.