

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, March 27, 2003, 3:30 p.m.
Board of Trustees Conference Room

I. Call to order: 3:34 p.m. by President Brian Heuett

Attending: Senators - Brian Heuett (President), Robert Eves (President Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Steve Barney, Rea Gubler, Ty Redd, Steve Evans, Boyd Fife, Darin Wadley, Curt Bostick, Ben Davidson as proxy for Martha Hyder, Steve Heath, Deb Hill, Kathy Black, Eric Brown, Ron Martin, Ken Laundra, John Walser as proxy for Mike McGarvy, Roy Johnson Sara Ann Smith, Kay Andersen, Mike Grady, Scott Lanning, and Jerry Bowler. Visitors: University President Steven Bennion, University Provost Abe Harraf, Dr. Tom Cunningham; Excused: Mike McGarvy, Martha Hyder, Robert Eves

II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of Feb. 27th & March 20th. Motion to approve the February 27, 2003 minutes by Virginia, seconded by Joe Baker, approved by vote of 13 in favor and one abstention, approved by the senate. Motion to approve the minutes from the special senate meeting held on March 20, 2003 made by Virginia Stitt, seconded by Eric Brown, approved by vote of the senate— 10 in favor, 4 abstentions.

III. Officers' Reports

A. President - Brian Heuett: Gave time to President Bennion who thanked the senate for their work and efforts during the past year. He also thanked us for the proactive role taken in helping to craft the suggested mission document for the regents (R312), and for our role in moving into a shared governance mode as faculty.

Deans' Council Report: Brian could not go into great detail, but sometime in the next two weeks, the information regarding the budget and how it will affect the campus for the next year or two. He indicated that we should reassure our colleagues that it will be OK.

B. President Elect - Robert Eves: excused.

Announcement: Read by Brian Heuett to the Senate from Robert Eves regarding the fact that he will not be serving as President next year, nor as Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee as of the April 24th meeting; since he is taking up the responsibility of Department Chair and can no longer serve.

C. Treasurer - Joe Baker

Financial Report \$13747.46 is current balance. We need to decide what to do with our 2 account which has \$1100.

IV. Committee Reports

A. LRT Committee * Ben Davidson (10 minutes) Ben discussed the charge they had been given to revise the policy and to include a post-tenure review component. They have tried to reduce the amount of paperwork that is required, by having only the department committee continue to fill in all of the forms. The biggest change is in the scoring rubric for tenure. Jerry Bowler wanted to know if non-tenured department faculty could serve

on an LRT committee. Ben indicated that this is not the case. Ben then explained that there are no longer five areas of evidence, only three and the document is correlated with the Professional Portfolio document that has been prepared by Tom Cunningham's committee. Ben indicated that their goal has been to clean up and clarify the policy. He thought they were three quarters of the way through the post-tenure policy and hopes to have that document ready within the next week. Brian Heuett told Ben that he appreciates the work of this committee. Ben recommends that both the tenure and post-tenure reviews be reviewed together; but if we wanted to do them one at a time, that would be alright. In conjunction with Tom Cunningham's work, they felt that all of these policies need to be combined into one area as a comprehensive review policy. Brian asked us to read the information handed out by Ben Davidson.

B. Faculty Evaluation * Tom Cunningham (20 minutes) Tom reminded us that the documents (copies in the appendix) they have produced is based on a model that allows faculty to declare the weight of the three areas used for evidence in the portfolio. He explained that the percentages used for weighting have no relation to the time spent. They have revised the way that teaching effectiveness is determined, thus evaluations of teaching are not based solely on student evaluations, but in concert with peers and administration. The form has suggestions for what might be considered evidence for teaching effectiveness. Tom indicated that the reason for so much detail in the area of teaching effectiveness is that it is the most difficult area to judge, and should go well beyond the instructional delivery which is the current focus.

The section on scholarly activity is short and for the most part should be primarily determined by the department/college. Examples of scholarly material and work for instructive purposes are included in the document.

Service is broken out the same way as scholarly activity. This category also includes the information that was formerly listed under professional commitment.

All of this combines to create a score for each faculty. Steve Barney questioned the section on instructional delivery skills. He found only one item on the current student form, and Tom indicated that the current form is inadequate for the proposed system and would need to be revised. Steve also wanted to know why a focused narrative is not included in the Scholarly activity and service sections. Steve suggested that the narrative be added to each section. Jerry Bowler wanted to know what would happen at the upper levels; i. e., how would they be graded? The answer is that they will not be graded at the upper levels of review, they will be approved or not approved. Deb Hill wondered about consulting, she couldn't find it; Tom indicated where it was included. The department would be the definitive voice in what is included in these areas. Kathy Black wanted this area of working the "second job" related to our university work to be removed as being something to use to show expertise because much of this does not contribute to the university. She feels that some line should be drawn to make this distinction. Scott Lanning indicated that the flexibility built into the system allows the faculty member to minimize the value of service to our professional growth. Kathy said we need to keep in mind that our major responsibility is to the university. Provost Harraf indicated that division heads should be stricken from the document, since the department chair has the responsibility for facilitating the rank and tenure process. Division heads may be removed as an administrative position; but even if they are not, they do not have authority in LRT matters by policy. Brian asked if this document is ready to move forward. Tom also wanted to point out the Faculty Self-evaluation of Instruction form, which is optional. This allows the faculty member to have a role in the process.

Jerry Bowler moved that we be given time to take back to the faculty, and be ready to move at the next meeting. Brian indicated that we need to be ready. Second by Steve Barney. Motion to do so passed unanimously in the affirmative. If there any questions regarding the document, they should be directed to Tom. Tom will change the wording to remove division heads from the document. Abe will check to make sure that division heads do or do not have authority to be involved in LRT issues. Abe thought that the level of collegiality within departments should be addressed, as well. Tom said that his committee took that information out of the document, and that it should be addressed in the focused narrative. Part of the committee's difficulty was in defining collegiality and that this issue was dealt with adequately in other areas. Abe wondered how the problem of a colleague not getting along with others is addressed. Ben indicated that they have covered this in other areas. Kathy Black said that in her evaluation it was recommended that she be more visible by walking up and down the halls. Although this was somewhat humorous, it was in fact done. Brian closed the discussion and reminded us to be ready to deal with this at the next meeting and to address questions to Tom. Probably we will have to deal with this on April 24th. Tom requested that suggestions for change must be specific. Steve Barney suggested that under scholarly activity the wording be changed to say that these are examples and that section 4 be combined into section 1, rather than having arts and humanities as a separate section. He also thought that we should add supervision of student research to the list of examples. Jerry wanted to have the document clarify what is counted as consulting or not and whether it be counted for LRT issues. Brian thought it should be up to the department, since we will never agree on this issue. Tom reminded us that since 50% of the evaluation must be teaching, the evaluation would reflect abuse of this idea. Abe reminded us that there is a policy regarding the amount of time that can be spent doing outside work. Kathy brought up the example that they could not have students do more tax work because it would affect the businesses of faculty members. Abe asked that a reference to the policy regarding consulting should be referenced in the current document.

C. Personal letters from Brian Heuett to the current senators thanking them for service were passed out.

D. Faculty Senate Constitution * Steve Barney (10 minutes). Steve Barney passed around the proposed version of the constitution (see appendix for full text). Joe Baker recommended that unless there are substantive changes, we should come prepared to approve the constitution, or if changes are necessary they must be brought in final draft form. There was some concern that restricting the faculty to partially tenured and officers to tenured faculty might be impractical. Brian told us to read carefully and come back on April 10th to discuss the constitution. We want this to be in place by Fall semester. The meeting will be that day.

V. Old Business

Faculty Appointments and Contracts * III.C.4. Joe Baker moved to table, Jerry seconded, approved unanimously. (move to end, just above executive session.)

VI. New Business

A. Election of new senators for April. We must replace nine senators next month. For science it is recommended that science be adjusted by having a one or two year term for one of the new senators to even out the rotation. Brian made assignments to elect new senators in colleges where necessary. Boyd in Applied Science, Steve Evans in Business, Jerry

Bowler in Ed., Eric Brown in PVA, Curtis in Humanities, Robert in Science. Motion to adjust terms made by Steve Barney, Steve Heath second, passed unanimously.

Brian reminded us that with the resignation of Robert, we will need to elect a new President for a one-year term, they could be a current senator or one of the new incoming senators. This and all other elections will occur in the next meeting.

B.Kathy Black indicated that there were faculty who would not respond to the satisfaction survey because of opposition or indifference. We may need to look at this.

VII.Motion for Executive Session made by Joe Baker, seconded by Steve Evans, passed in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the Senate.

VIII.Adjournment 5:08 P.M.

Appendix

Southern Utah University Faculty Portfolio for Evaluation

Evaluation Period: July 1, _____ to June 30, _____

Faculty Member

Department Chair/Division Head

Check the appropriate box:

Annual Review Third-Year Review Rank Advancement Tenure Review Post-Tenure Review

Table of Contents

I. Weights and Rating Scale for Faculty Evaluation

- A. Declaration of Weights for Computing Overall Composite Rating
- B. Sub-Categories and Sub-Weights Used in Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
- C. Rating Scale for Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activities, and Service

II. Faculty Member's Report on Teaching Effectiveness

- A. Focused Narrative
- B. Sample of Course Materials
- C. Course Materials Review Criteria

III. Report and Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

- A. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness from Student Evaluation of Instruction
- B. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Department/Division Evaluation Committee
- C. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Department Chair/Division Head
- D. Summary Sheet for Computing Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating
- E. Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating

IV. Report and Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities

- A. Examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities

- B. Forms of Scholarship
- C. Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities by Department/Division Evaluation Committee
- D. Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities by Department Chair/Division Head
- E. Overall Scholarly/Creative Activities Rating

V. Report and Rating of Service

- A. Examples of Service
- B. Rating of Service by Department/Division Evaluation Committee
- C. Rating of Service by Department Chair/Division Head
- D. Overall Service Rating

VI. Composite Rating of Faculty Member's Performance

- A. Summary Sheet for Computing Overall Composite Rating
- B. Overall Composite Rating

To the best of my knowledge, the information included in my Faculty Portfolio is accurate.

Faculty Member Signature

Date

I. Weights and Rating Scale for Faculty Evaluation

Evaluation Period: July 1, _____ to June 30, _____

A. Declaration of Weights for Computing Overall Composite Rating

The faculty member should complete this form, sign it, and submit it to the Department Chair/Division Head (DC/DH) during April 1 to May 1 of the academic year prior to the evaluation period. The DC/DH will also sign it, keep the original, and return a copy to the faculty member. A signed copy of this form should be included in the Faculty Portfolio. All selected percentages should be within the indicated ranges and must total 100%.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS _____ %
(Choose from 50% - 70%)

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES _____ %
(Choose from 10% - 30%)

SERVICE _____ %
(Choose from 10% - 30%)

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member

Date

Department Chair/Division Head

Date

B. Sub-Categories and Sub-Weights Used in Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The Department/Division Evaluation Committee (DEC), and Department Chair/Division Head (DC/DH) complete their evaluations on the forms that follow. The DC/DH also supplies scores from Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports and tabulates the totals according to the following weights using the *Summary Sheet for Computing Overall Teaching Effectiveness* in Section III. D.

| Sub-Categories and Sub-Weights | Sources and Their Sub-Weights for Determining Performance | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| Content Expertise 40% | DEC DC/DH | 70% 30% |
| Instructional Delivery 25% | SEI DEC | 70% 30% |
| Instructional Design 25% | SEI DEC DC/DH | 30% 60% 10% |
| Course Management 10% | SEI DEC DC/DH | 60% 30% 10% |

C. Rating Scale for Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activities, and Service

- 5 = EP Exemplary Performance**
Consistently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance.
- 4 = HP High Performance**
Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance.
- 3 = SP Satisfactory Performance**
Consistently meets accepted standards of professional performance.
- 2 = MP Minimal Performance**
Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance.
- 1 = UP Unsatisfactory Performance**
Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance.

II. Faculty Member's Report on Teaching Effectiveness

The *Faculty Member's Report on Teaching Effectiveness* will include a *Focused Narrative* and a *Sample of Course Materials* as described below. Provide evidence to support your statements, and be sure to label and include all materials to which you make direct reference in your report on teaching effectiveness.

A. Focused Narrative

In no more than two word-processed pages, present evidence of successful practices you have used *during this evaluation period* that characterize your teaching effectiveness in the four areas below. Examples of criteria to consider are listed under each area. The four areas are not regarded as equal components of teaching effectiveness, so they are weighted differently in the computation of the Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating in Section III. D.

1. Content Expertise is that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area that are developed through advanced experience, training, education, and research/creative activity (40% of Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating).

- Taught regular course offerings and incorporated in them new information, skills, or technologies as appropriate.
- Developed a new course/lab that reflects new information, skills, or technologies.
- Developed laboratory or other instructional materials.
- Conducted training workshops for library use and other specific skills.
- Prepared and coached students for recitals, performances, or presentations.
- Integrated new materials into course based on the results of your own scholarly activities.

2. Instructional Delivery Skills are human interactive skills and characteristics that (1) lead to clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes, and (2) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate and effective learning environment (25% of Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating).

- Presented content with clarity and helped students understand complex concepts.
- Demonstrated enthusiasm toward the subject matter, student learning, and the discipline.
- Demonstrated the ability to motivate and capture the interest of students.
- Encouraged students' questions and expression of ideas.
- Demonstrated respect for students as individuals.
- Demonstrated ability to moderate tensions or conflicts in class.

3. Instructional Design Skills are technical skills in (1) designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences that induce student learning, and (2) designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes (25% of Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating).

- Developed course materials, syllabi, examinations, quizzes, and assignments that demonstrate student achievement of course objectives.
- Utilized appropriate texts, audio-visual aids, handouts, demonstrations, and other instructional materials or equipment to enhance dissemination of knowledge and student learning.
- Enhanced a course by developing a web site that incorporated such elements as the syllabus, course calendar, study guides, solutions to problems, student-to-student communication, etc.
- Developed a replicable system of instruction.
- Specified course objectives and provided a reasonable opportunity for students to achieve them.
- Experimented with instructional methods that have enhanced student learning.
- Engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning in order to enhance instructional methods (you may include attempts that did not succeed).

4. Course Management Skills are bureaucratic skills in operating and managing a course (10% of Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating).

- Reasonably adhered to the syllabus or to a change in the syllabus that was provided in a timely manner.
- Provided students with periodic summaries of performance.
- Issued mid-semester warnings to students performing at the “D” or “F” quality level.
- Provided evaluation remarks on the content, logic, organization, clarity, and grammatical correctness of all written assignments, such as essays, research papers, projects, and case studies.
- Graded and returned tests, papers, and other assignments in a reasonable amount of time.
- Posted and maintained office hours as required of all faculty members, or if office hours were preempted, provided adequate notice.
- Held classes according to required contact hours.

B. Sample of Course Materials

Your Department/Division Evaluation Committee and your Department Chair/Division Head will review your sample of course materials as a source of information to aid them in determining your content expertise and instructional design skills.

The following is a list of categories of course materials to include in your portfolio. To facilitate the review of your course materials, clearly identify each component. The faculty evaluation system recognizes that instructors select materials from a variety of sources; therefore, any materials included that were not developed by an instructor should acknowledge the original source.

Categories one and two **must** be included in your portfolio:

1. Syllabus for at least one but not more than three courses. Refer to the Course Syllabus Policy (6.36) for a description of required and suggested components for all Southern Utah University syllabi.
2. At least one but not more than three samples of materials demonstrating how you assess student achievement on expected learning outcomes. These materials may include tests but are not limited to tests.

Choose **three** categories from the list below, and submit no more than three items for each selected category:

3. Sample of materials demonstrating innovative instruction.
4. Sample of materials demonstrating the use of writing in a course.
5. Sample demonstrating a revision of course materials.
6. Sample of materials demonstrating grading techniques and comments to students.
7. Sample (from one course) of instructional support materials designed to help students master concepts and content (e.g., study guides, original problem-solving sets, concept maps, annotated bibliographies, etc.).
8. Sample of materials demonstrating efforts to incorporate instructional technology into course content.

C. Course Materials Review Criteria

1. Syllabus

- Syllabus follows guidelines identified in the Southern Utah University Course Syllabus Policy (6.36).
- Syllabus clearly explains instructor’s expectations (i.e., grading attendance, assignments, deadlines, projects).
- Syllabus identifies learning resources for the course and where they are located.
- Syllabus is free of grammatical errors and communicates in simple, clear, positive language.

2. Assessment of Achievement of Expected Learning Outcomes

- Assignments, projects, and exams are related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.

3. Innovative Instruction

- Instructional activity is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
- Instructional activity is appropriate for the target student population.
- Instructional activity promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.
- Instructional activity involves student participation.

4. Writing Activity

- Writing activity is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
- Writing activity is appropriate for the target population.
- Writing activity promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.

5. Revision of Course Materials

- Revision of course materials is clearly related to course outcome(s).
- Revision of course materials is appropriate to target student population.
- Revision of course materials promotes mastery of concept(s) and content of course.

6. Grading/Feedback to Students

- Grading policy is consistent with Southern Utah University policy (6.13).
- Grading techniques are fair and appropriate for course.
- Written feedback to students offers constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement.

7. Instructional Support Materials

- Instructional support materials are clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
- Instructional support materials are appropriate for the target student population.
- Instructional support materials promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.
- Instructional support materials are free of grammatical errors and are written in simple, clear, positive language.

8. Instructional Technology

- Instructional technology use is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
- Instructional technology use is appropriate for the target student population.
- Instructional technology use promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.

III. Report and Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

A. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness from Student Evaluation of Instruction

Include copies of all Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports and student comments that were collected during the evaluation period. You may also include copies of the optional Faculty Self-Evaluation of Instruction (FSEI) forms that you submitted during the evaluation period.

B. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Department/Division Evaluation Committee

Rate the faculty member's performance in each area of Teaching Effectiveness using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for each rating.

1. Content Expertise DEC RATING: _____

2. Instructional Delivery Skills DEC RATING: _____

3. Instructional Design Skills DEC RATING: _____

4. Course Management Skills DEC RATING: _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH RATING:

C. Rating of Teaching Effectiveness by Department Chair/Division Head

Rate the faculty member's performance in each area of Teaching Effectiveness using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for each rating.

1. Content Expertise DC/DH RATING: _____

2. Instructional Delivery Skills (not rated by DC/DH)

3. Instructional Design Skills DC/DH RATING: _____

4. Course Management Skills DC/DH RATING: _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR EACH RATING:

D. Summary Sheet for Computing Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating

The Department Chair/Division Head (DC/DH) will complete this summary with data supplied on the DEC and DC/DH Rating of Teaching Effectiveness forms and from the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports for the evaluation period.

| | | | | Weighted Rating |
|---|-------|--------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Content Expertise | | | | |
| DEC Rating | _____ | X 0.7 | = | _____ |
| DC/DH Rating | _____ | X 0.3 | = | _____ |
| Overall Content Expertise Rating | | | | |
| Add the products above and multiply the sum by 0.40 | _____ | X 0.40 | = | _____ |
| 2. Instructional Delivery Skills | | | | |
| SEI Rating | _____ | X 0.7 | = | _____ |
| DEC Rating | _____ | X 0.3 | = | _____ |
| Overall Instructional Delivery Rating | | | | |
| Add the products above and multiply the sum by 0.25 | _____ | X 0.25 | = | _____ |
| 3. Instructional Design Skills | | | | |
| SEI Rating | _____ | X 0.3 | = | _____ |
| DEC Rating | _____ | X 0.6 | = | _____ |
| DC/DH Rating | _____ | X 0.1 | = | _____ |
| Overall Instructional Design Rating | | | | |
| Add the products above and multiply the sum by 0.25 | _____ | X 0.25 | = | _____ |
| 4. Course Management Skills | | | | |
| SEI Rating | _____ | X 0.6 | = | _____ |
| DEC Rating | _____ | X 0.3 | = | _____ |
| DC/DH Rating | _____ | X 0.1 | = | _____ |
| Overall Course Management Rating | | | | |
| Add the products above and multiply the sum by 0.10 | _____ | X 0.10 | = | _____ |
| E. Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating | | | | |
| Sum of the four Weighted Ratings above | | | | _____ |

IV. Report and Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities

Include and label materials to which you make direct reference in your report on scholarly/creative activities. Please refer to your department/division guidelines for discipline-specific evaluation criteria.

A. Examples of Scholarly/Creative Activities

The following activities are commonly regarded as scholarly and creative:

1. Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

- Attended professional conference.
- Gave presentation at professional conference.
- Served on discussion roundtable/panel at professional conference.
- Gave keynote/plenary speech at professional conference.
- Published article, short story, or poem in scholarly or non-scholarly publication.
- Published book or new edition of book.
- Published book review in scholarly publication.
- Served as editor or referee of scholarly publication.
- Reviewed manuscript(s) for publication.
- Published comment, note, or letter to editor in scholarly publication.

2. Further Education and Degrees

- Received credit for graduate course (other than thesis hours).
- Participated in scholarly, pedagogical, or technological workshops or presentations at SUU.
- Participated in workshops, institutes, short courses, graduate level course, etc.
- Completed graduate degree from an accredited institution.

3. Awards, Grants, Artistic Commissions, and/or Fellowships

- Received award, grant, artistic commission, or fellowship.
- Served on grant review panel/committee.

4. Fine Arts and Humanities Faculty Only

- Performed in musical, dance, dramatic, or media production.
- Created musical, dance, dramatic, or media work that was performed, published, exhibited, and/or broadcast.
- Directed or produced musical, dance, dramatic, or media event/performance/broadcast recording/exhibition.
- Designed and/or implemented the technical work (scene, costume, lighting, sound, etc.) for musical, dance, dramatic, or media production.

B. Forms of Scholarship

Scholarship creates something that did not exist before that is validated and communicated to others: new understanding in the minds of students, new knowledge about ourselves and our universe, new beauty that stimulates the senses, new insights, and new technologies and applications of knowledge that can benefit humankind.

| | Teaching and Learning | Discovery | Artistic Creativity | Integration | Application |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| <i>Nature of the Scholarship</i> | With learners, develops and communicates new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior. | Generated and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods. | Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; develops and refines methods. | Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods. | Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters invention; develops and refines new methods. |
| <i>Primary audiences for scholarship</i> | <u>Learners;</u> Educator peers. | <u>Peers;</u> Supporters of research; Educators; Students; Public. | <u>Various Publics;</u> Peers; Patrons; Students. | <u>Users;</u> Educators; Students; Peers. | <u>Users;</u> Customers; Educators; Peers. |
| <i>Primary means of communicating scholarship</i> | <u>Teaching materials and methods;</u> <u>Classes;</u> <u>Curricula;</u> Publications and presentations to educator peers and broader public. | <u>Peer-reviewed publications and presentations;</u> Patents; Public reports and presentations. | <u>Shows, performances and distribution of products, reviews, news reports;</u> copyrights; peer presentations and juries, publications. | <u>Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents.</u> | <u>Demonstrations and presentations to audiences;</u> <u>Patents;</u> <u>Publications for users;</u> Periodicals and reports; Peer presentations and publications. |
| <i>Primary criteria for validating scholarship</i> | Originality and significance of new contributions to learning; depth, duration and usefulness of what is learned; lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers. | Originality, scope, and significance of new knowledge; applicability and benefits to society. | Beauty, originality, impact, and duration of public value; scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation. | Usefulness and originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights. | Breadth, value, and persistence of use and impact. |
| <i>How scholarship is documented.</i> | Teaching portfolio: summaries of primary new contributions, impacts on students and learning; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, public interest, and impact; communication to public, peer recognition and adoption; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, significance and scope of use and benefits; commercial and social value; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. |

Source: C.J. Weiser, *College of Agricultural Sciences, Oregon State University, Corvallis* February 3, 1994 Shared files, Scholarship Forms.

C. Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities by Department/Division Evaluation Committee

Rate the faculty member's performance in Scholarly/Creative Activities using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for the rating.

**Weighted
Rating**

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES DEC RATING: _____ X 0.7 = _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING:

D. Rating of Scholarly/Creative Activities by Department Chair/Division Head

Rate the faculty member's performance in Scholarly/Creative Activities using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for the rating.

**Weighted
Rating**

SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES DC/DH RATING: _____ X 0.3 = _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING:

E. Overall Scholarly/Creative Activities Rating

Sum of the two Weighted Ratings above

V. Report and Rating of Service

Include and label materials to which you make direct reference in your report on service. Please refer to your department/division guidelines for discipline-specific evaluation criteria.

A. Examples of Service

The following activities are commonly regarded as service:

1. Service to the Department/Division and College/School

- Active member on department or college committee.
- Chair of department or college committee.
- Leader of department or college workshop/presentation.
- Maintain labs and equipment.
- Mentor new faculty or part-time faculty member.
- Maintain a budget.
- Academic advisor.

2. Service to University

- Active member on university-wide council or committee.
- Chair of university-wide council or committee.
- Leader of university workshop/presentation.
- Organizer of lecture series.
- Advisor to student organization recognized by SUUSA.
- Advisor/editor of university publication.
- Member of Faculty Senate.
- Guest lecturer.

3. Service to Profession

- Active member in professional organization.
- Member of committee in professional organization.
- Leadership role in state or local professional organization.
- Leadership role in regional or national professional organization.

4. Service to Community

- Participation in local, state, or national civic organizations and activities.
- Participation in university-sponsored outreach activities.
- Participation in service-learning project.
- Application of recognized area of expertise in community (with or without pay).
- Consultation to organizations, corporations, or associations.
- Activities (other than those previously noted) that directly contributed to either the academic or administrative functioning of the university.

B. Rating of Service by Department/Division Evaluation Committee

Rate the faculty member's performance in Service using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for the rating.

**Weighted
Rating**

SERVICE DEC RATING: _____ X 0.7 = _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING:

C. Rating of Service by Department Chair/Division Head

Rate the faculty member's performance in Service using the numerical values assigned from the Rating Scale in Section I. C. Justification must be given for the rating.

**Weighted
Rating**

SERVICE DC/DH RATING: _____ X 0.3 = _____

JUSTIFICATION FOR RATING:

D. Overall Service Rating

Sum of the two Weighted Ratings above

VI. Composite Rating of Faculty Member's Performance

A. Summary Sheet for Computing Overall Composite Rating

| | Declared Weight | X | Overall Rating | = | Weighted Rating |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|-------------------|---|--------------------|
| TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS | _____ | X | _____ | = | _____ |
| SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES | _____ | X | _____ | = | _____ |
| SERVICE | _____ | X | _____ | = | _____ |

B. Overall Composite Rating

Sum of the three Weighted Ratings above

Faculty Self-Evaluation of Instruction (Optional)

The instructor may choose to submit this form to be included with the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) report for a course, but the **form must be completed by the end of the term, before the instructor receives the SEI report for this course.**

Instructor: _____ Term: _____

Course: _____ Enrollment: _____

The quality of the students in this course this term was...

(Circle a number on the scale). Excellent ----- Poor
 Comments: 5 4 3 2 1

What effect did classroom and course scheduling have on the effectiveness of the course?

My overall teaching effectiveness for this course was...

(Circle a number on the scale).
Comments:

Excellent ----- Poor
5 4 3 2 1

Were there any personal or professional situations that significantly affected your performance during this semester?

What, if any, other factors (positive or negative) affected either the effectiveness of the course or your performance as a teacher (e.g., new textbook, new objectives, etc.)?

The grade distribution (number of students per letter grade) for this course was...

A ___ B ___ C ___ D ___ F ___ UW ___ I ___

Signature: _____ Date: _____

SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY

PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION

Preamble

The Faculty Senate is the advisory body for academic issues to the President of Southern Utah University. The Senate's status derives from the Policy and Procedure Manual, and the history of the University, and its authority from the individual faculty members it represents.

The Senate shall have the power to make rules governing its own procedures and to establish its own order of business. The Senate shall also 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 all curricular matters involving relations between colleges, schools, divisions, or departments. All appropriate matters considered and approved by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Senate to the President of the University.

Article 1-General Faculty Membership

1.1 The general faculty shall be composed of faculty members holding full-time appointments, with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, and whose primary function is that of instruction but who may also hold administrative appointments at the organizational level of department chair, or lower. Each member of the general faculty shall have voting power and shall have representation through an organizational unit as defined in this constitution.

1.2 Deans, Vice Presidents, Provosts and others holding rank may be considered faculty, but will not be eligible; to vote in Faculty Senate elections, or to serve as senators.

Article 2-Duties of the Faculty Senate

2.1 The Faculty Senate will represent the faculty in all negotiations with the administration, student body officers, staff, or other entities which are vital to the functioning of Southern Utah University.

2.2 The faculty has primary responsibility for the following areas:

Curriculum.

Pedagogy.

Research.

Faculty status.

Requirements for academic degrees, certificates, and awards. Leave, Rank, tenure, academic freedom, and review of all faculty.

Student classroom behavior.

Formulation of all constitutional articles and amendments governing all nominations, elections, and organizational considerations stipulated by this constitution.

Faculty teaching load.

Grievance policies.

Insuring faculty representation in hiring, or reviewing academic administrators and/or faculty.

Receipt and action on reports from any faculty committee, and from any council, department division, administrative officer, library, or college.

Consideration of all matters of professional interest, and faculty welfare, and recommendations to the President of the University and other administrative officers.

Any other policies, requirements, programs, or activities which bear directly on the faculty.

2.3 In addition to these areas of primary input, the faculty should also have substantial input in the following areas:

Design and construction of classroom buildings.

Budgeting for academic concerns.

Other concerns that directly affect faculty and curriculum.

Article 3-Composition of the Senate

3.1 Faculty Senators will be elected for three-year terms—they may serve multiple, but not consecutive terms of office. Total number of senators will be eighteen members.

3.2 Each college will popularly elect three members to the Senate...two of them must be tenured.

3.3 There will be one at large member elected who must be tenured.

3.4 One non-tenure, non-tenure track member will be elected for a one year, non-successive term.

3.5 One student will be selected by the student government to serve on the Senate. That student will have observer status—he/she may speak, and introduce legislation, but cannot vote. The student representative will be selected annually.

3.6 Non-Senate members including the University President, Provost, other university administrators, faculty members, and the public at large may attend Senate meetings in the capacity of observers.

3.7 The Faculty Senate President and President-Elect must be tenured faculty, and will serve one-year terms in their particular capacity.

3.8 The Faculty Senate President will continue to represent his or her college, but will not have a representative vote. The President will have a tie-breaking vote.

3.9 The Faculty Senate President, President-Elect and all other executive positions in the Senate will be nominated and elected from and by the full Faculty Senate. A simple majority of the Senators present will prevail.

3.10 The President-Elect shall serve a term of one year and then shall assume the duties of Senate President the next year.

3.11 A Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall consist of the Senate President, President-Elect, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian.

3.12 The Executive Committee, with the exception of the President-Elect, shall serve one year.

3.13 The former Faculty Senate President will serve one year as President Post-Tempore in a strictly advisory capacity.

Article 4-Facully Senate Committees

4.1 The Faculty Senate has the right and obligation to create and appoint members to Faculty Senate Committees.

4.2 Standing Committees will include one faculty representative from each college (except the Faculty Development and Distinguished Faculty committees which shall have two representatives from each college) plus an at large member for a term of three years.

4.3 Standing Committee chairs shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate. Committee members will be chosen by committee chairs.

4.4 Eight Standing Committees are hereby established by this constitution:

Academic Affairs Committee.

Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee.

University Leave, Rank, and Tenure Committee.

Distinguished Faculty Lecture Committee.

Faculty Publication Committee (Achievement).

Faculty Recruitment and Retention Committee.

Finance Committee.

Leave, Rank, and Tenure Policy Revision Committee.

4.5 The Faculty Senate has the right to create ad hoc committees for reasons and terms it deems necessary.

4.6 A Constitution Review Committee shall remain in place for two years following ratification of this constitution in an advisory role to provide historical interpretation, and field questions regarding the letter and intent of this constitution. This committee will include one representative from each college.

4.7 The Faculty Senate reserves the right to appoint faculty members to all University Committees in consultation with the President's Office and appropriate administrative divisions.

Article 5-Senate Procedures

5.1 The Faculty President shall preside over the Senate.

5.2 In the absence of the President, the Vice President shall preside.

5.3 In the absence of both the President and the Vice President, the Parliamentarian shall preside.

5.4. The Senate shall hold at least one regular meeting at a previously posted time each month from September through April.

5.5 In addition, special meetings shall be convened by the President, or in the President's absence the Vice President, for the following reasons:

When requested by the President of the University. When requested by written petition of at least ten percent of the Faculty. When requested in writing by five Senators. When approved by the Senate in a regular meeting.

5.6 The Executive Committee shall prepare an agenda for each meeting of the Senate and communicate this agenda to the faculty and designated administrators at least four days prior to every scheduled meeting.

5.7 Petitions by ten percent of the faculty shall suffice to place an item on the agenda of next scheduled Senate meeting provided the petition is received at least seven academic days before that meeting.

5.8 Matters not on the agenda may be considered by the Senate at any meeting with the consent of a majority of those Senators present.

5.9 Minutes of all Senate meetings shall be recorded by the Secretary and communicated to the faculty, the President of the University, the Provost, members of the Senate, and to the University Archives. The minutes of regular Senate proceedings shall be available for examination by any Senator or faculty member.

5.10 The Senate shall also maintain a file of Senate Committee reports.

5.11 The President of the Senate shall make written biannual reports to the university faculty, and provide copies for the President of the University and the Provost.

5.12 A meeting of the general faculty may be called by the President or the Vice President of the Senate or by the petition of one third of the faculty, to review any action taken by the Senate or its committees. Such petitions shall specify the items to be considered.

5.13 A quorum of the Senate shall be one-half or more of its members.

5.14 No motion shall carry unless it receives a simple majority of votes cast by the quorum present unless stated otherwise in this Constitution.

5.15 The Executive Committee of the Senate shall prepare and transmit a budget request for funds necessary to accomplish the activities of the Senate to the President of the Senate who will then deliver a copy of the budget to the President of the University.

Article 6-The Southern Utah Faculty Senate Doctrine of Academic Freedom

Consonant with its belief that knowledge lives forever and that Southern Utah University exists to nurture thought in all its finest forms; and in order to protect that community's right to investigate, analyze, and subject all ideas to the most rigorous scrutiny; and given the propensity of all organizations to resist new ideas, regardless of their merit or the expertise of those presenting them; the Faculty Senate hereby upholds the contractual right of academic freedom for all faculty. Fundamental to the university is the contractual right of the professor to teach, research, write, create, and generally express himself or herself on matters of public concern free of constraint and fear of reprisal.

Article 7-Amendments

7.1 Additions to the constitution and deletions from the constitution shall be by formal amendment. Amendments to the Constitution may be initiated by written petition signed by twenty percent of the faculty.

7.2 Such petition shall contain the exact wording of the proposed amendment.

7.3 Proposed amendments shall be voted upon by the Senate, and shall require the approval of two-thirds of the eligible voting members of the Senate.

7.4 Voting shall be by secret ballot

7.5 Approved amendments shall then be presented to the university faculty for ratification. Voting by the faculty shall be by secret ballot, which shall also include the full wording of the amendment.

7.6 Ratification of amendments shall require the affirmative vote of two thirds of the faculty casting ballots, and shall go into effect thirty days after the completion of the vote.

7.7 The Board of Trustees will be advised of amendments ratified by the faculty.

Article 8-Adoption of the Constitution

8.1 This Constitution shall be considered adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the Faculty Senate, and a two-thirds vote of the entire faculty.

8.2 The Faculty Senate and the university faculty votes shall be by secret ballot.

8.3 The Board of Trustees will be advised of the adoption of the Constitution by the Southern Utah University Faculty.