

Faculty Senate Minutes

January 26, 2012

4:00 pm in Hunter Conference Center Whiting Room 211

Senators in Attendance: Alan Hamlin, Steve Barney, Robin, David Berri, Wayne Roberts, Emmett Steed, Steven Irving, Richard Eissinger, Tony Pelligrini, Nichole Wangsgard, Jim McCoy, Derek Hein, Bruce Howard, Richard Cozzens, Artis Grady, Helen Boswell, Randle Hart, Rachel Kirk, John Howell, Michael Ostrowsky, Kyle Bishop, Shobha Gurung, David Shwalb, Andy Marvick, Christine Frezza, Lynn Vartan.

Guests: Brad Cook, Ginny Romney, Donna Eddleman.

1. Call to Order: 4:01 PM
2. Approval of Minutes: One error page 3. Item was repeated. One item needs to be removed. Motion to accept minutes with one change. John Howell motioned and seconded by Robin Boneck.
3. President's Report:
 - a. Letters from students- Four separate letters from students thanking faculty senate for money. Scholarships do good things. Encourage college in donating to funding. Four letters to share.
 - b. R 481 leave rank. This lays out what the regents are telling the presidents to do with tenure, post-tenure review, etc. Expectations...we are ahead of the game. Alan met with presidents at the University of Utah and meeting went well. Resurrected some bi laws and amending these. Will meet twice a year. They also met with Bill Cedarburg's second in command and he presented information on what regents are doing. Senator came and assured presidents to not lose sleep over tenure threat. People who are pushing bill are of minority.
 - c. Book store policy in handout.
4. Vice President's Report:
 - a. Board of trustees- 1-Baseball program was discontinued. Came down to a financial decision. Not a viable way to maintain. 2-Virginia Higby director of head start program is retiring. Celebration of her retirement is February 3rd. Tom Morgon will take her place. Everyone is invited to part.
 - b. Several policies were approved- 6.8 Development and Revision of Curriculum, 6.81 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Membership and Role, 6.82 Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Development and Revision Policy, 6.13 Grading, 6.15 Faculty Leaves, 6.28 Faculty Professional Responsibility, 6.39 Annual Report of Academic Colleges, 6.41 Cyclical Academic Program Reviews, 6.46 Academic Scheduling. Policies we have already seen.

- c. Changes to academic schedule. Fall break aligned with Iron County School District made and approved by trustees. New academic calendar will be posted very soon. We will be starting earlier in August to accommodate some of the changes.
- d. Elimination of Nutrition minor. Added emphasis to major. Certificate of international business approved. Graduate certificate in International Business approved. Dual credit program were they get credit at two universities (Dual Degree).
- e. Question for Senators- (What direction should we go?)
 - i. EER requirement aligned with academic road map. We are moving in a great direction. 1500-1600 students enrolling every year and all expected to complete the program. Built within courses are experiential requirements in a capstone like fashion. This will mean time from faculty to help with projects and supervise projects. Steve's guess is that program will get really big. Currently, there is no formalized way (incentives) to reimburse faculty for being engaged in projects.
 - ii. Idea? Incentify projects. For a long time, leave rank and merit pay decisions have been decided by scholarly output. Which is fine but it might be time to look at incorporating flexibility within that system to create more incentives. The projects that students are allowed to do are service learning, practicum experiences, internships, study abroad, interdisciplinary creative pedagogies, undergraduate research, art shows, health fairs...the skies the limit on what students are allowed to do and they will need faculty help. As we move forward as an Engaged Campus, Steve believes we must find ways to recruit, and reward Engaged Faculty. Steve is proposing that we consider building into our incentive documentation allowances for faculty with expertise and interest in this endeavor. Otherwise, it will be difficult, and nearly impossible for SUU to achieve its full potential as an Engaged Arts and Sciences institution.
 - iii. Steve has talked to the provost, deans, faculty members, about this idea. Steve proposed that the senate endorse an exploratory process and look at possibilities. For example what if we:
 - 1. Develop a dual-track system of evaluation and incentive for those who wish to pursue more traditional forms of scholarship, which should never be discouraged on a university campus, and a new track for those who may wish to specialize in Engaged Practices that directly support the new Academic Roadmap and facilitate achieving its role and mission. Supervising these students. To be fair, both tracks need to be in incentives that align with university and treated equally. This would create a need to change culture and

mindset in higher education. We are already being innovative in the experiential requirement and academic road map, let's take it a step further and create a way that faculty can be rewarded for their efforts.

- iv. Questions on what Steve is proposing? John... "Are you seeing a model that is working? Steve is not seeing any that are work equally. Steve believes we can find models that are working equally. Emmett... "How will the division be made?" Alan was thinking same question. We have 1500 coming in the fall who determines which students go to whom?
- v. Good question and one that Brad Cook and others have already be considering. Solutions:
 - 1. Add more faculty. Last three years 38 new.
 - 2. Capitalize on existing capstone projects.
 - 3. Ideas with Money/Time. While work is being made with adding more faculty, equity and merit. "How can we divide up time during LRT process?" Each department is different. Criteria...Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Collegiality. How time is divided is determined by department and often by percentage. We are proposing that faculty can design their tenure in more innovative and flexible way. For example, set aside a percentage for scholarship engagement. The LRT discussion is critical. What we have is a start. The draft provides credit for engaged work which will be a department decision. What will qualify as an engaged faculty member? Brad does know whether we can get away from the cast system of two tracks. There are systems with two tracks. To the extent possible we would like both valued equally. There will be divisions but Brad believes we can come up with two valued tracks. Together we can have a meaningful process.
- vi. Andy. Why are we considering something that is clearly service or teaching as academic?
 - 1. Steve addressed question. It's not just service and learning. There are several opportunities and yes, scholarship should be peer reviewed but there are other ways which is what we are talking about. Creating a flexible system that does not have to be peer reviewed. Alan...We are exploring experiential that we haven't had before and there needs to be incentives to encourage faculty to participate because of the hours. Steve...there are a lot of questions already and this is something he is just introducing today.

- vii. Alan... We will be looking at this again in the future. Ways to modify the forms and LRT process to include things like this.
- viii. Robin asked how many hours do they need? Experience... 50 hours student driven.
- ix. Several concerns... This needs to be thought through in the future.

5. Provost Brad Cook:

- a. Legislation session started Monday. Brad has scheduled forums with colleges to open conversation and share progress. Two initiatives:
 - i. Surveys on summer school. Reconfigure summer school so it is healthier. We need to get some things right. We asked students. How can we assist them? We do want more summer school so what it can do to help them complete degree earlier.
 - ii. Technology. We are putting together a broader campus technology system. First part, analysis of technology on campus. Look at informational technology structure. Second part, instructional technology needs to be look at. We don't have a strategy about our technology. This is not good so Brad has invited focus groups on this.
 - iii. Apple was on campus today. We have a lot of great things are going on.
 - b. We are also trying to figure out tuition strategy for next year. Stay tune.
 - c. Hopefully we get okay for third installment in the academic road map.
6. Policy 5.25 (Parking) - Minor changes to parking. No fees on policy. Parking permits are paid for but faculty and staff do not have to pay. Do we want clarification in policy? Donna advised not to clarify. Students might not be happy if they know that faculty does not pay. Was not in policy which is why this came to faculty senate. You can appeal in 10 days, pay in 30. If not paid in 30 days, taken from pay check. Bruce asked if vehicles will be towed if left overnight. Donna said that they keep an eye on vehicles and they will not be towed until faculty is contacted or left for a long period of time. Police will report car. It will not be automatically towed. We can never answer every possible scenario. Donna questioned if faculty has to pay for motorcycles. They assured her that they do. Motioned to approve and seconded by Bruce Howard.
7. Policy 13.5 (Bookstore) Look at copy from Alan. Fourth paragraph down book store committee is reducing bookstore committee. "correct wording from wording "two representatives from each college or school" to "two representatives from the academic side (one administrator and one faculty member)." Deans okayed wording." Wayne... What issues do they go over? Meet needs of students and faculty. Make sure complaints are handled. Profits go to student scholarship. There is always way to

improve. We need to reduce committees. How will member be assigned? Alan does not know yet, may be one of the current members. Motion to approve wording was made by Wayne Roberts and seconded Christine Frezza.

8. Policy 5.13-Event services. Charging of using facilities on campus and the charging of using facilities. Christine is reporting. Expand the number of people that stand on the events committee. New document spells out the priority. Categories to help decide....How does event get charge? Who decides? Rules are spelled out. Event services take care of 25,000 events. A lot of people and a lot of events. These events cost money. Setting it up, prepare, take down, and cleaning takes times which is not a part of facilities maintenance.

This might need tweaking in the future. This new document will be in place until January 2013. Motion to approve by Andy Marvick and seconded by Shobha Gurang.

9. Policy 5.48 (Facility Utilization and Rental) Bicycle policy. SUU is not responsible for damage. Eliminated responsibility. Bruce asked if we can bring bikes into office. Faculty is currently bringing bikes into office. Don't ask don't tell at this point. This should be a problem since we are already doing it. Donna advised to be careful with wording and being the exception to rules. Robin asked, "Do we need a permit for every Bike?" Yes, bike permit is required for all bikes on campus just in case bike is stolen. Permit is free. It is easier to reach out to owner or bike if it has been registered. Motion was made seconded by Bruce Howard.
10. Policy 6.1- Background. Because of the academic road map Brad and the deans decided there needed to be some changes made. Alan was in those meetings and the deans listened. We then sent to academic affairs. They decided to tighten up the policy. For example, department chairs didn't know exactly what to do. So policy was reformatted. No new content. Policy was re-casted with specific guidelines for each category. There are some items that Alan wants to bring to your attention.

- a. Addition..Page 2. Value statement added by dean's council. We needed value statement of what is important to us. Set tone for document. See page 2 IV. Value statement. "The academic mission.....and collegiality." Added academic road map and experiential model.
- b. Changes
 - i. P. 6. Debate in whether the word Boyer should be in policy. See Item A2 under Scholarly/Creative Contribution: Each department can choose their own destiny, and Boyer was not left out.
 - ii. See Item 3 under Service: Faculty will serve on no more than four committees. Average of four on standing long term committees. Several questions on what equals a committee. Alan clarified that this policy

allows each school to have their own merit pay policy. Each department/college decided what is important and how many points. Each group becomes a master at their own rubric. Reward someone who is on more, yes. Brad wanted to give faculty the power to say no. Variations will always happen and it is up to department chair.

- iii. P. 6 B. Category on exceptional performance. In order to allocate merit pay money. There in a new mechanism in place to help the allocation of merit money. “Merit money will be allocated....” Each department and school will have to define exceptional. Not everyone is exceptional. Others, who don’t have those policies, need them. Policy to reward faculty for excellence. Brad assured us that money has been set aside. Hopefully, this will not be based on economic state of state. Positive review and each level and positive from a majority. Robin asked how standards will play into this. Alan clarified that exceptional is for merit. Robin is worried that meeting standards will not be enough to a dean. Alan said there could be language to clarify this. What is going to define standards/exceptional? Colleges will define this. The intend of this is for merit not for full professor. Robin thinks there should be a standard, too freely interpreted. Steve agrees. Steve has encouraged faculty to compose a statement under standard to clarify this. Something like faculty will not be deprived of rank advancement or tenure based on performance. Katy stated that this was a no change issue. Katy also stated, in practice, the LRT committee in departments and colleges will make the decisions (wide range). Broader might be better. Since merit pay is one year at a time. There is a chance that someone could get merit pay and turned down on rank in the same year. Should we fix now or take down to dean. Steve stated that maybe we can come back later with better language. Not just driving Merit. There is pressure from the outside.
 1. Brad stated that this all started at the full professor level. How do we make a distinction for full rank and post tenure review? There are those that are standard and exceptional. Conversion then asked why we don’t have this distinction at other ranks. Are standards aspirational? We want something for people who go above and beyond.
 2. Katy hopes that discussion will continue and be aware that there is a charge from the legislatures to increase rigor at post tenure review.
- iv. Bruce noticed that under 5.2 it should have be 5.18 on page 4. Motion to approve Michael Ostrosky and Randle Hart seconded.

- c. Meaningful Changes. Let's emphasize what is necessary to meet the needs of faculty. Katy's committee is now going to look at forms in appendix and consider Steve's recommendations/ideas that will affect some forms, David Tuffe's recommendations on forms. This could take three months. Right now let's just take Deans have given us and what Katy has.
- i. Under P. 3 5A1 Robin has an issue with the last sentence phrase "high professional competence." How does this tie into the ranking of exceptional or standard? Robin wants this statement to correlate with current rankings for exceptional or standard. If you are high professional competence, what is your ranking? The intent of "high" is to allow each level to determine their own destiny. Robin has seen Deans say no and he feels high professional competence could sway deans to feel different. Randle mentioned that a criterion is listed in section 6. Now there are ways to deal with discrepancies between dean and department chair. Emmett wondered what we should do at this point. Alan wants us to pass an acceptable document. Michael asked everyone if you have a suggestion, bring a solution. Rachel recommended that we take section out. Bruce doesn't feel this sentence will make a difference. Steve mentioned that the core issue here is what we are going to do with the exceptional category vs. standard category. Once we address that we can address this issue. We need language to help clarify in that stage that people will not be denied tenure (rank advancement) if they are standard. We do we expect as standard. We need to clarify definition of standard. Then Alan advised that we go to page 7 and do this.
 - ii. Page 7. Right now it says, "standards professional performance meets exceptional standards of professional performance." How do we change? How about this? "Meets accepted standards for professional performance for tenure and rank consideration." This will solve Robin's concerns. We want it to tie into rank and tenure. Lynn recommended, "Meets expectations of professional performance for tenure and rank considerations." Everyone likes recommendation. For low performance we need to be consistent. Therefore, change the wording in EACH category from "accepted standards" to "expectations". For example, in EP, "Exceeds accepted standards of professional performance" is changed to "exceeds expectations of professional performance." In SP, we also added "for tenure and rank considerations." So in SP it now reads "Meets expectations of professional performance for tenure and rank considerations." For LP, it should now read "Does not consistently meet

expectations of professional performance. Original motion amended by Rachel Kirk.

- iii. P 4. Table under voting members. Three for department and five for college. Tony wants to know if three is too small. Alan will hold on this one and talk to deans.
- iv. P. 5 or 6. Section VI. Evaluation criteria under VI. Section two is for changing requirements for non-tenure tract. Even non-tenure need to have heartbeat in publishing. Not true in all schools so this allows flexibility.
- v. Tony asked about international funding for Non-tenure vs. tenure tract. Can they still go to the provost office to ask for money? Alan said, "yes." Two funds for scholarly or other kind. Tony wanted to know if they be treated equal? Yes.
- vi. Alan..Any more questions on section VI evaluation criteria?
Kyle...committee assignments. A lot of non-tenure track faculty members do not have committee assignments or other types of service obligations. Each department is free to do its own thing. This part could be re-worked in the future.
- vii. Steve wants feedback under Sections VI section 2. At the bottom it talks about what if there is a discrepancy between the department and the dean. Is language here clear enough that if there is conflict and how it will be resolved? We want mechanism to power to the faculty not the dean. Committee of three can out vote the dean. Deans are okay with this. Change consensus to majority vote. Dean does not have the right to do whatever they want. Steve also wants to clarify who is the faculty. Add "together with the department chair and dean." So the faculty selects the faculty member. Depends on the Boyer model. Changed to "In the case of a dispute over criteria for scholarly/creative contributions, the question will be resolved by a majority vote of a committee consisting of a faculty member selected by the faculty, together with the department chair and dean."
- viii. Scholarship is the only one the dean has to sign off on according to this policy. Randle wanted to know how it is we only have say in scholarship. Do faculty have some say? Move sentence up to criteria so it applies to all four. A blanket statement that applies to all the categories that says, "In the case of a dispute over criteria for teaching, scholarly/ creative contributions, and/or service the question will be resolved by a majority vote of a committee consisting of a faculty member selected by the faculty, together with the department chair and dean."

- ix. Next page faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure Part B. We agreed already to change the wording. We are going to say “meets expectations of professional performance for tenure and rank considerations.” And change that same wording in each of the other categories.
- x. Artis...Typo...p. 6. Evaluation and criteria. Previous page at the top. Should refer to VI. Just get rid of the IV. In looking at post tenure review, when we established criteria for tenure so do we want to do that for faculty in less time periods? Expectations could be different for five years vs. seven years. The word generally allows exceptions.
- xi. 6.1.1 II B. Katy did not get this typed in. It Should say, “An example of the content and format of the FAAR is contained in Appendix B. Non-tenure track faculty are not required to fulfill the Scholarly/Creative Contribution portion **unless required by the department.**”
- xii. Page 9 Responsibilities. Any problems. No
- xiii. Page 9 6.1.2 Three-year review process. Any changes. No.
- xiv. Page 10 6.1.3 Rank Advancement. No changes. But p. 14 there is a number issue with III and III.
- xv. Christine recommended taking out the repeat of tenure tenure on page 14.
- xvi. Bruce caught typo. 6.1 IV should be VI page 14.
- xvii. Page 16, 17, and 18 any questions? On page 18. 6.1, IV should be 6.1 VI again. Made recommendation to Katy to check all situations.
- xviii. Any questions on part III post tenure review p.23. Artis asked about a grievance process? Giving a lot of power to the Dean. Steve suggests that language be proposed regarding the grievance process beyond. Is there grievance beyond the Dean. Nowhere else to go. Seems that there should be somewhere to go. Alan stated that there is a committee on campus when they have a grievance. This is a development plan that can include up to termination. If faculty does not improve two years later, then faculty member could be terminated. See 6.22 Due process is laid out. Following the implementation, the development plan could vote that individual out. Steve said, “What if we just got rid of resignation?” Think about how you can re-word this.
 - How about we stop sentence after leave of absence and take out voluntary resignation, or early retirement? Then we are not forcing someone out with plan. Then Alan suggested, “How about we stop after time table?” This will work. Get rid of clause.
- xix. #9 page 23 is okay.

- xx. Eliminate J under 6.1.7.
- xxi. Last page. Now we get into the charts.

d. Let's stop for now, go with what we have done. Let's meet in two weeks. Same day and time. Alan will type up what we have done so far and send to Katy. Randle Hart made a motion to accept changes so far and Michael Ostrowsky seconded.

1. Summary of changes as of January 26, 2012. V1.A.2 Evaluation Criteria (page 6)

Change the last sentence in part 2 (Scholarly/Creative Contribution) to read "In the case of a dispute over criteria used for teaching, scholarly/creative contributions and/or service evaluations, the question will be resolved by a majority vote of a committee consisting of the Dean, Department Chair and a faculty member selected by the faculty affected." Then, MOVE THIS SENTENCE FROM ITS CURRENT LOCATION IN SECTION 2 TO THE TOP OF THE PAGE UNDER V1.A, FOLLOWING THE SENTENCE "Decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use the following criteria. INSERT THE SENTENCE HERE.

2. V1.B. Ratings

- A) The references to 6.1.1V are wrong. It should just be 6.1 here, and also on top of page 8, in section V.A.1. etc. Please check for this error throughout the report.
- B) Change the wording in EACH category from "accepted standards" to "expectations". For example in EP, "Exceeds accepted standards of professional performance" is changed to "Exceeds expectations of professional performance." In SP, we also added "for tenure and rank considerations." So, in SP it now reads "Meets expectations of professional performance for tenure and rank considerations." For LP, it should now read "Does not consistently meet expectations of professional performance. In the case of Low Performance a development plan is required." And for UP it reads "Does not meet minimal expectations of professional performance. If the faculty member is retained, a development plan is required."

3. 6.1.1.B

Add "unless required by the department or school" to the end of the sentence.

4. On Page 15 (Subject: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure) Section 111 Procedure For Rank Advancement for Non Tenure Track Faculty: That section is OK as is. But the next

section is also Section 111, and it is for Tenure Track Faculty. Just eliminate the bottom section entirely because your Section 1V is also for Tenured Faculty (redundant).

5. On my Page 24, Section 6.1.5.1V.7 the middle of the paragraph reads “As such, the faculty member in consultation with the department chair prepares and implements a plan for improvement, with a time table, THAT MAY INCLUDE TRAINING, GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, THERAPY, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, VOLUNTARY RESIGNATION, OR EARLY RETIREMENT. Stop the sentence at “with a time table.” And eliminate the rest of the sentence.
6. 6.1.7 Merit Pay Process – eliminate the J next to Purpose

Faculty Senate Continuation Meeting Minutes
February 9th, 2012

Senators in Attendance: Alan Hamlin, Steve Barney, David Berri, Emmett Steed, Steven Irving, Richard Eissinger, Tony Pelligrini, Nichole Wangsgard, Derek Hein, Bruce Howard, Artis Grady, Rachel Kirk, John Howell, Kyle Bishop, David Shwalb, Andy Marvick, Christine Frezza, Lee Montgomery.

Guests: Julie Simon, Pat Paystrup, Jerimias Paul, Katy Herbold, Keith Bradshaw.

1. Call to order: 4:01
2. Anti tenure bill did not make it out of committee. Excellent news. Another bill to eliminate board of regents. May or may not make it out of committee. Eliminating board of regents would put the running of the higher education system in the hands of legislators and governors. Has any states done this? John. The Board of Regents was originally created to represent the interests of higher ed. Let Alan know how you feel about this. Read about it and send comments to Alan. Alan is not familiar with new bill. Bill may not go anywhere. Good news about tenure issue. If you have any feedback on regents issue, let Alan know.
3. Deans looked at changes we made and there was no grief. Body of 6.1 has now been changed to reflect these changes. They did not vote on body yet, because they have not seen final copy yet.
4. Let's go through page by page the appendix. The charts, graphs, and the appendix.
5. The first 25 pages have been approved. Alan wants us to wait and make in changes to these approved pages later since this policy will be revisited again. If we make a change to a chart or table that will affect the wording, Alan will change the first 25 pages to reflect change.
6. Katy. Due Process Issue. Input is for those cases were people applied for rank advancement and there was a mistake. They tallied evaluations wrong or publications wrong. What is the recourse? This is a Mike Carter issue that we not focus on today.

7. Policy time line. Artis wants Alan to walk us through. This edition that reflects the provosts experiential statements, reward exceptional faculty, and things the provost and deans have already agreed upon we are taking a look at and making sure it agrees with us. The next step is to revisit two or three months down the road. The next step is to look at EER and other issues. We are safe to start the process at this point. The provost started the process, gave it to the deans, and then to us. We are fortunate to have a say in the process. We will give our input the policy will go to the deans and then the trustees.
8. Can we add things now? Merit pay? Bruce. There is a model in policy. There is no way to tell who got the money. This might be illegal to disclose...Katy. It seems like it is public money. Mike Carter needs to answer this. We have to go by what is legal and private. We should encourage fair, transparent allocation of money.
9. Now let's get into Appendix.
 - a. Page 1. Committee made some changes to what we are seeing in Appendix. Tony...Are we going to have non-tenured track faculty evaluating tenure track faculty? Faculty need to be tenured track to be on LRT committee.
 - b. Any more questions on page 1. The process and policy is as read. Three tenured faculty are making decisions because they can. Committee should help make sure the decisions are made appropriate. Committee would have input on designation. Table does not reflect policy. This table does not what is currently done. Small departments will have to resort to outside help. It is hard to find people to serve on LRT. We will be reviewing our help or asking our faculty to help.
 - c. Katy. Department set at 3? Yes.
 - d. Narrative and chart with post tenure review. The responsibility of department chair and dean and LRT committee is the tenured faculty will submit fair between post tenured reviews. So they will need to submit fair to department chair. When there is going to be money and merit and exceptional. The more eyes the better.
 - e. Katy. If a post tenure person goes from chair to dean, where is the faculty involvement with post tenure review? Alan..the fairs will have merit pay (exceptional pay) associated with them. Adding more faculty input will help if there is a clash between dean and faculty member. Don't you think we need the LRT input? Help decide if someone was truly exceptional. In case there is a mistake, the committee is going to deal with this. This process means more work for faculty and faculty will be reviewing each other.
 - f. Can we pass this table for now (page 1)...Alan? Narrative reads according to table right now. Department LRT is required for faculty right now. If we need to alter wording down the road, fine. Version 1 for now. EER is another effort. Chart is in sync with report and we will revisit chart later if necessary.

- i. Julie is concerned with level current assessment and evaluation.
Steve...something to think about is whether deans need to evaluate tenured faculty every year. We don't want to put any unnecessary burden on anyone.

Motion to accept table Lee seconded by Emmett.

- g. Addition to Faar forms. "Describe any activities that demonstrate Exceptional teaching effectiveness." There is not box in Faar. Box on application for (Appendix D) three year review form should not be there, Kyle. Good find. Box will be taken off all applicants form. On all the applications...get rid of box, but all evaluators should have box.
- h. Appendix B. Departments will have model of where something is supposed to go. Artis is questioning how faculty will know where to separate where information should go (Standard vs Exceptional). "How will I know what to put in which box?"
 - i. Committee hoped that each department will come up with a model. Katy...Committee feels that faculty now has an opportunity to list exceptional points. Motion to remove lines by Andy. Emmett seconded. Take out "Describe any activities that demonstrate Exceptional" ...in each section.
- i. Appendix C. Move exceptional to the back. Don't have at beginning of list...stem. Remove box in Appendix C. Motion to get rid of table/box and line above, first page. Motioned by David Berri and Kyle Bishop seconded. These changes should carry to other forms. On form where there is a spot for Yes or No, NO missing. Added.
 - i. Question regarding unspent merit pay. Unspent merit pay will return to pot. This will then be redistributed.
- j. Appendix D. Box gone and lines on exceptional.
- k. Appendix E. Box gone.
- l. Appendix F. Box gone.
- m. Appendix G. Box gone.
- n. Flow Chart Appendix H. No comments.
- o. Appendix I. Any errors? No comments.
- p. Appendix J. School of Business model. Idea here was to show what one school is doing. You are free to decide what to do. Develop your own model. Developed on college or department level and approved by dean and provost.
- q. 6.1.7 Merit Pay process p. 24 and 25. Artis...We need to reflect department level in narrative. How do we change wording?
 - i. B. The faculty "of each department will develop or adopt" written regulations including formulas, processes and models to guide the

distribution of these funds. Department added and College and School removed.

- ii. C. Any adoption or revision of “department” merit pay procedures by faculty must be finalized no later than September 1 each year. The model with procedures will be approved by majority vote of full-time faculty, including chairs, tenured faculty, tenure track faculty, non-tenure tract faculty. The approved model with procedures will be distributed to all faculty members annually. Revision and updating of the merit pay regulations are subject to majority approval of the faculty of the College/School. College/School removed.
 - 1. Deans might not like this change. Departments have right to their own plan.
- iii. D. To support faculties in initial work to develop a merit pay for their department, the Academic Affairs Committee includes a sample regulation, used by the SUU School of Business, in Appendix J. It is included for the generation of ideas and discussion purposes, and is not prescribed or necessarily recommended for other “department” School or College. Department added.
 - 1. Motion to make these changes by Artis Grady and seconded by Keith Bradshaw.

11. Motion for Executive Session: Did not happen

12. Motion to Adjourn: Did not happen.