USU FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
APRIL 4, 2016
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154

Call to Order
Ronda Callister called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of March 14, 2016 were adopted.

University Business – President Stan Albrecht, Noelle Cockett. President Albrecht announced that Dean Hailey will be leaving her position as Dean of Engineering and they will be beginning the search process as soon as possible. The Presidential search is underway. There will be three meetings held to solicit input on the job description, one on the Logan campus which will include community voices as well, in Vernal and at USU Eastern.

Information Items

New Criteria for Scholar of the Year – Janet Anderson. The criteria for the award have been revised to focus on academic achievement. The letters of recommendation will be put forward by faculty who know the nominees instead of the deans. The award will be presented at the Robins Awards ceremony.

402.12.7(1) Name Change for Undergraduate Faculty Advisor of the Year Award – Tom Lachmar. The proposal is to change the name of the award to “Undergraduate Faculty Mentor of the Year”. There was a motion and a second to consider this discussion a First Reading and to send the proposal to PRPC to draft code language.

HR Code Change Policy 350 Educational Benefits – BrandE Faupell. No HR representative was in attendance. This item will be presented at the next meeting.

Solicitation for Faculty Senate President-Elect Nominations – Ronda Callister. Ronda asked for nominations for the next President-Elect. Kimberly Lott was nominated from the floor and accepted the nomination. No other nominees came forward at this time.

The current President-Elect Lindsey Shirley will be leaving the University next year for a position elsewhere. This leaves the Senate President position vacant. The Senate leadership is looking for someone with working knowledge of the Senate to fill the vacancy.

Reports

EPC Report – Larry Smith. Ed Reeve presented the report in Larry’s absence. One R401 proposal was discussed from Engineering making a change to their PhD program. The Curriculum sub-committees discussed allowable reasons for excused student absences and clarified the section “Other Allowable Reasons” in the catalog. The Academic Standards sub-committee discussed, but did not put forward any new policy language regarding faculty members in a class.

Honorary Degrees and Awards – Sydney Peterson. The President presented the list of Honorary Degrees and Awards at the last senate meeting. The list is included in the agenda packet.
Budget and Faculty Welfare Committee Report – Diane Calloway-Graham. Diane highlighted a few of the items covered in the report. The committee has worked this last year on financial issues, health and safety policy changes, and are currently working on the committee size changes. Diane has recently met with the Provost to discuss the legislative outcomes.

Professional Responsibilities and Procedures Committee – Jerry Goodspeed. Currently PRPC is working on the committee size change proposal.

Doug Jackson-Smith made a motion to accept all of the reports as presented. The motion was seconded by Vince Wickwar and passed unanimously.

Unfinished Business

402.10.1 Reapportionment fix for missed section (Second Reading) – Ronda Callister. The second reading contains a one word correction changing the word “one” to “two”. It was also suggested to update the Regional Campuses and Distance Education designation to Regional Campuses.

Mark McLellan made a motion to approve the second reading and corrections and Doug Jackson-Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

405.6.2(2) and 405.8.2 PAC (First Reading) – Ronda Callister. The senate conducted a lengthy discussion about when the formation of the PAC committee should take place and whether the wording should be that it “shall” be formed or it “will” be formed. This resulted in changes to the first and second paragraphs of the proposal to read:

“At any time following tenure, a faculty member may request, through a letter to the Department head or supervisor, that a promotion advisory committee (PAC) be formed for him or herself and this will occur within 30 days of receipt of the written request.

Although promotion to professor is not under defined time constraints as for tenure, in the interests of supporting faculty timely promotion to full professor, a PAC will be formed by the department head after meeting with the candidate and in consultation with the academic dean, or vice president for extension, and, where appropriate, the chancellor or regional campus dean by the third year following tenure. The PAC and candidate shall meet shortly thereafter.”

Charles Waugh made a motion to send this back to PRPC and suggest they pair a strong statement like “will be formed” with an “escape clause” or no penalty for faculty whose committee was not formed within the 30 day deadline. A second was received and the motion passed with one objection.

PTR Edits Remaining Sections 405.12.3 – Doug Jackson-Smith. There are a few technical changes to the PTR process that have been reviewed by the Provost’s office, the FS leadership and the FSEC. As it is now, the only path to a professional development plan is following tenure having a negative annual review and having a committee formed and be in agreement that the performance does not meet the standard, then a PDP is to be formed.

Changes to the section are primarily editorial such as adding sub-section numbers, deleting references to a policy that was confusing, deleting extra words and redundant text. There are three substantive changes, first is what happens if there is no agreement about a PDP. A question was previously raised by Larry Smith if the College Faculty Appeals Committee would be appropriate to handle disputes about the PDP plan. The idea that this committee would take on this responsibility had not been considered in the previous discussions. The other two
recommended changes are setting a two week time limit for PRC input and what happens to the PRC report. A vote today would be to send these edits and proposals to PRPC for the summer and would be revisited again in the fall for votes on first and second readings. A straw poll was taken about who should be the arbiter in a dispute, the Peer Review Committee assigned to the faculty or the CFAC which is a college level committee. Voting was 14 in favor of the CFAC and 17 in favor of the PRC. PRPC will be asked to write the code reflecting these results.

A motion was made and seconded to send the edits with the above suggestions to PRPC for drafting code language. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:35 pm.