

Summary of the Policy 6.1 Revision Process

This document and its attachments provide a summary of the Policy 6.1 revision process, which was developed in an effort to be as transparent, collaborative, and faculty-driven as possible. If the proposed revision is approved through the Board of Trustees, the Provost's Office is committed to a similar effort to be transparent, collaborative, and faculty-driven as we transition from the existing policy to the revised policy.

Review of the Revision Process (an effort to be collaborative, transparent, and faculty-driven)

- A. Faculty Senate's 2-year effort
 1. Regular Task Force meetings
 2. Workshop with an off-campus consultant, Cathy Trower, on December 1, 2015 (see page 4 of this [summary](#) that includes eight tasks for the revision effort, disseminated by then-President of Faculty Senate, Kevin Stein)
 3. Draft disseminated on 12/17/2016, rejected by Faculty Senate on March 7, 2017 (see this [letter](#) disseminated by then-President of Faculty Senate, Bruce Howard)
- B. [Blueprint](#) - The plan, prepared in August 2017, to engage faculty in the revision process:
 1. Construct a new work group through a collaboration between Nathan and Brad that consists of a variety of faculty voices representing tenured and non-tenured faculty from across campus
 2. Identify faculty ideas and guiding principles from previous efforts, including feedback from SUU faculty regarding the "ideal" SUU faculty member
 3. Hold open faculty fora
 4. Disseminate drafts of sections to faculty as the revision systematically grows
 5. Collect faculty feedback via anonymous surveys
 6. Respond to every comment with explanations of our reasoning
 7. Revise the drafts according to faculty feedback
 8. Meet with Faculty Senate and Deans' Council every month
- C. Mid-year additions to the plan
 1. Added more open faculty fora for a total of 5 sessions--1 in fall and 4 in spring (see agendas [here](#) and [here](#))
 2. Met with 15 departments during their faculty meetings
 3. Met with 21 department chairs
 4. Met with all deans
 5. Met with numerous faculty members
 6. Created a poll (approved by Faculty Senate President) to measure faculty sentiment on general ideas
 7. Met with all Faculty Senators
- D. Results
 1. Six (6) drafts, including the April 6 draft that is up for a Faculty Senate vote on April 17 and Deans' Council vote on April 23
 2. Over 60 pages of single-spaced [comments and responses](#) (and the vast majority of suggestions were accommodated)
 3. [Faculty poll](#) showing significant support for general ideas
 4. [Highlights](#) of proposed Policy 6.1
 5. [Final proposed Policy 6.1](#)

Next Steps (another commitment to be collaborative, transparent, and faculty-driven)

- A. The 2018-2019 academic year will retain the existing policy.
- B. A few departments will voluntarily opt in to pilot the new policy.
- C. The Provost's Office and the CETL will work closely with departments to ensure a smooth transition into the new policy. This transition likely will include:
 - 1. Training for mentors
 - 2. Training for faculty
 - 3. Assistance in revising departmental evaluation criteria (if the departments desire assistance)
- D. Evaluations of faculty members' previous years' reports will use previous departmental evaluation criteria, and evaluations of subsequent years' reports will use subsequent departmental evaluation criteria.