

Senate Advisory Committee on University Strategic Planning (SACUSP)
Report to Academic Senate
April 2023

INTRODUCTION

The Senate Advisory Committee on University Strategic Planning (SACUSP) was created in 2020 as a vehicle to institutionally involve faculty at an early stage in the central administration's long-term strategic decision-making process. The Committee membership and the terms of office may be found at <https://academic-senate.utah.edu/committees/senate-advisory-committee-on-university-strategic-planning/>

AREA OF COMMITTEE FOCUS FOR 2022-23.

SACUSP met monthly during the 2022-23 AY and, after considerable discussion and reflection, decided to focus on two questions for this academic year:

1. Whether the current policy which allows only one career-line faculty member from each college to serve in the Academic Senate should be removed in light of the growing percentage of career-line faculty at the University; and
2. Whether the current RPT, TFR & CAV templates used for faculty promotions, retentions and reviews should be revised to better reflect the growing emphasis on public-facing activities of faculty considering President Randall's goal of having the University become a Top 10 Public Institution in terms of societal impact?

Subcommittees to examine the above questions and propose any possible changes were created and the subcommittees brought to the full Committee two recommendations, both of which were discussed, revised, and ultimately adopted by the full Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The first recommendation is to revise existing University policy to give colleges greater flexibility in apportioning the Senate membership between tenure-line and career-line faculty, subject to a set of articulated guardrails. The details of this proposal, which would require amending existing policy and Senate approval, is attached as Exhibit A.

The second recommendation is to add specific, optional language to the three promotion and review templates that would explicitly recognize certain public-facing faculty activities that academic units could include in their faculty review process. The specific language is set out in the attached Exhibit B. This recommendation has been communicated to the Senate Faculty Standards Review Committee (SFSRC) which has been delegated the power by the Academic Senate to adopt guidance documents for the faculty review process. The SFSRC has endorsed the recommendation in concept and is finalizing specific language. No action by the Academic Senate is needed.

I want to thank the members of the Committee for their time and thoughtful development of the attached proposals.

Randy Dryer, Chair
SACUSP

EXHIBIT A

Career-Line Faculty Representation on the Academic Senate

Senate Advisory Committee on University Strategic Planning (SACUSP)

March 2023

INTRODUCTION:

In 2013, Policy 6-002 was revised to allow career-line faculty to serve on the Academic Senate. The number and apportionment of tenure-line faculty senators did not change; instead, one career-line faculty senator was added for each of the 17 colleges, the libraries considered as a unit, and the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program (QITP). This policy change reflected the growing importance of career-line faculty at the University.

In 2017, the Senate Career-Line Task Force, after a year-long study, issued a report that noted, among other things, that career-line faculty senators “have been conscientious in attending Academic Senate meetings and contributed effectively to discussions and debate while representing a valuable perspective” and recommended “amending existing policy to allow Colleges to apportion Academic Senators between Tenure-line and Career-line faculty, thus allowing more than one Career-line faculty member at a time to serve as Academic Senators within a given College.”

Since 2017, the number of career-line faculty at the University has continued to increase much more rapidly than the number of tenure-line faculty. According to the Spring 2022 OBIA report (see Table 1), 55% of full-time faculty campus-wide are in the career-line and seven colleges now have a majority career-line faculty. This change in faculty composition has resulted in several instances of inequitable representation on the Academic Senate, particularly in the health sciences. For example, the School of Medicine, because of its size, has 16 Senators. Although 69% of School of Medicine faculty are career-line, it is limited to only one career-line Senator. This inequity is even more pronounced in the College of Dentistry. Dentistry has three Senators, with a faculty composed of six tenure-line faculty and 54 career-line faculty. Among the non-health sciences colleges, there is considerable variance between individual colleges. For example, in the College of Engineering, only 25% of its 267 faculty are career-line, whereas 54% of the faculty in Social Work are career-line. See Table 1 for a college-by-college breakdown.

The SACUSP Subcommittee on Career-Line Faculty Representation on the Academic Senate was asked to address the recommendation of the 2017 task force that colleges have a more direct say in determining their Senate representation. Specifically, the Subcommittee was asked to examine whether existing University policies should be revised to allow an increase in the number of career-line faculty on the Academic Senate if a college wished to do so and, if so, to review options for implementing that change.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Subcommittee reviewed various options for increasing career-line faculty representation on the Academic Senate and brought it to the full SACUSP for discussion. Because of the complexity, the discussion addressed the components sequentially by answering the following questions:

1. *Should SACUSP recommend to the Senate that current policies be revised to increase career-line representation on the Academic Senate?*

YES. Given the effective service of career-line faculty on the Academic Senate and on numerous Academic Senate Committees, the 2019 revision to policy 6-002 that allows career-line faculty to serve as Academic Senate President, and the growing inequity of career-line faculty representation in some colleges, the full SACUSP Committee voted in favor of increasing career-line representation on the Academic Senate. Specifically, the Committee recommends that **the appropriate University policies (primarily 6-002) be revised to allow each individual college (plus the Libraries as a unit) to determine, through a vote of the faculty and subject to appropriate limitations, how best to apportion the college's allotted number of senators between tenure-line and career-line faculty.**

The college level decision could be made either through a vote of the College Council or the entire faculty; **the Committee recommends that this be left to the discretion of the college.**

The Committee then considered whether there should be any limitations on the representation of either career-line or tenure-line faculty, as well as what policy revisions would be required to implement any such limitations.

2. *Should individual colleges be limited in the apportionment of their allotted number of Senators between career-line and tenure-line faculty so that the percentage of tenure-line faculty from each college is at least 50%?*

YES. The Committee concluded **that the above limitation would ensure that the Academic Senate has a majority of tenure-line faculty, in line with existing Policy 6-300:** “Tenure-line faculty members shall have the primary roles in shared governance activities.” **The Committee voted in favor of this recommendation.**

Ensuring at least 50% tenure-line senators from each college would maintain a majority of tenure-line faculty in the Senate, but would not automatically result in increasing the number of career-line faculty and mitigating existing inequities in representation.

3. ~~Number of Career-line representation in the senate should be increased.~~ *Should the minimum*

YES, in most instances. Currently, 9 colleges and the Libraries have 3 academic senators, two tenure-line and one career-line. The Committee recommends that, **to ensure at least 50% tenure-line senators, the number of career-line senators in colleges with 3 senators should not be increased, with one exception.** For colleges with fewer than 10 tenure-line faculty and at least 70% career-line faculty (currently this only applies to the School of Dentistry, which, in 2022, had 6 tenure-line faculty and 90% career-line faculty), electing 2 tenure-line senators can be challenging. The committee therefore recommends that **for colleges with fewer than 10 tenure-line faculty and at least 70% career-line faculty, the college could choose to elect up to 2 career-line faculty senators.** The Dean of the College of Dentistry supports this exception.

Increasing career-line faculty representation would require that colleges with four or more senators be required to have at least 2 career-line senators. Thus, **the Committee recommends that when colleges with at least 4 senators determine apportionment, at least 2 of the senators must be career-line, with the maximum number limited by the stipulation that at least 50% must be tenure-line.**

4. Would 6-002 have to be revised to redefine the apportionment of Senators to incorporate career-line senators within the apportionment rather than as a separate line item?

YES. The Senate currently has a total of 101 faculty senators: 81 tenure-line senators for 19 areas of representation, apportioned by formula every two years under Policy 6-002, and 19 career-line senators representing each of those areas, plus a career-line senator from the QITP. While it would be possible to simply increase the number of career-line senators by one in each college, that would increase the size of the Academic Senate by 19 and it would not address the variability of career-line faculty numbers across

colleges. Rather than increasing the size of the Academic Senate to increase career-line representation (as was done in 2013), **the Committee recommends revising Policy 6-002 so that the Senate Office will apportion all faculty Senate seats by the usual formula among the colleges without specifying whether they are tenure-line or career-line seats.**

This recommendation allows the representation inequities to be addressed and gives colleges maximum flexibility in determining who represents them, but does not grow the Senate into an unwieldy body.

5. How should the recommended policy revisions be implemented?

In order to respect the current terms of the existing elected members of the Academic Senate and to give colleges adequate time to (a) determine how they will apportion the college's allotted number of senators between tenure-line and career-line faculty and (b) adjust their annual Academic Senate elections to achieve that apportionment, the Committee **recommends that these changes be implemented over a three-year period as terms expire. The Committee further recommends that colleges be required to achieve the new apportionment within each college no later than three years from the effective date of the policy changes.**

The Committee further recommends that the Senate, upon approval of these changes, charge the Senate Policy Liaison with shepherding these policy changes through the normal University procedures for policy revisions.

BACKGROUND:

I. Table 1. Percentage of Tenure-Line and Career-Line Faculty by College (Spring 2022)

AS OF SPRING 2022	Tenure Line		Career Line (total)		Lecturer		Clinical		Research	
	#	% of TL & Cl	#	% of TL & Cl	#	% of TL & Cl	#	% of TL & Cl	#	% of TL & Cl
Architecture + Planning	23	68%	11	32%	2	6%	6	18%	3	9%
Cultural & Social Transformation	18	82%	4	18%	4	18%	0	0%	0	0%
David Eccles School of Business	87	56%	69	44%	66	42%	3	2%	1	1%
Education	53	49%	55	51%	1	1%	54	50%	0	0%
Engineering	199	75%	68	25%	37	14%	0	0%	31	12%
Fine Arts	83	61%	53	39%	46	34%	7	5%	0	0%
Honors College/Undergraduate Studies	0	0%	16	100%	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Humanities	144	75%	48	25%	46	24%	0	0%	2	1%
Law	21	60%	14	40%	4	11%	8	23%	2	6%
Marriott Library/Law Library	41	89%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	5	11%
Mines & Earth Sciences	49	60%	33	40%	5	6%	1	1%	27	33%
Science	157	66%	81	34%	45	19%	0	0%	36	15%
Social & Behavioral Science	118	69%	52	31%	29	17%	6	4%	17	10%
Social Work	22	46%	26	54%	8	17%	9	19%	9	19%
MAIN CAMPUS TOTAL	1015	65%	536	35%	309	20%	94	6%	133	9%
Dentistry	6	10%	54	90%	0	0%	53	88%	1	2%
Eccles Health Sciences Library	7	58%	5	42%	0	0%	5	42%	0	0%
Health	60	45%	74	55%	33	25%	34	25%	7	5%
Medicine	606	31%	1364	69%	32	2%	1169	59%	163	8%
Nursing	30	30%	70	70%	0	0%	68	68%	2	2%
Pharmacy	39	55%	32	45%	0	0%	14	20%	18	25%
HEALTH SCIENCES TOTAL	748	32%	1599	68%	65	3%	1343	57%	191	8%
UNIVERSITY TOTAL	1763	45%	2135	55%	374	10%	1437	37%	324	8%

SOURCE: OBIA

ANALYSIS: Office for Faculty, Main Campus & Office of Academic Affairs, Health Sciences

MAIN CAMPUS: Joint appointments counted in smaller college

Colleges with a majority career-line faculty include Education (51%), Social Work (54%), Health (55%), Medicine (69%), and Nursing (70%), Dentistry (90%), and Honors College/Undergraduate Studies (100%).

II. Academic Senate Apportionment Policy (6-002.III.B.2.a.i.b)

Policy 6-002.III.B.2.a.i.B. Tenure-line faculty membership in the Senate shall be apportioned by allocating not more than 79 representatives among the eighteen areas of representation (seventeen academic colleges, and the University libraries area*) on a prorated basis of 50 percent according to the number of Tenure-line faculty members in each area and 50 percent according to student credit hours, including evening residence hours, taught in each area during the preceding academic year (regardless of whether taught by faculty, of any faculty category, or by non-faculty instructional personnel). The base allocation of not more than 79 Tenure-line faculty members shall be adjusted to ensure that each area of representation will have a minimum of two representatives. The Senate Personnel and Elections Committee shall reapportion the Senate according to the foregoing formula every two years.

Policy 6-002.III.B.2.a.ii.B. There shall be one Career-line faculty representative elected from each of the following *nineteen* areas of representation: the seventeen individual academic colleges, the University Libraries considered as a unit, and the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs identified in [[Rule 6-310](#) (IDTP)] considered as a unit.

EXHIBIT B

Optional language for inclusion in the University templates regarding retention, promotion, and review criteria for RPT, CAV and TFR standards for the purpose of recognizing public-facing faculty activities outside the University.

Drafting Note: The proposed template additions outlined below may be adopted in whole or in part and are designed to be flexible to meet the needs of specific academic units and as they are relevant to a faculty member's respective areas of responsibility, i.e. teaching, service or research/creative activity. Academic units that adopt one or more of the criteria may wish to also (1) specifically detail how public facing activities are measured and weighted in relation to other review and promotion criteria; (2) assess whether existing unit resources are appropriate and sufficient to support public-facing activities; and (3) clearly indicate whether the new public-facing activities may be considered in promotion and tenure reviews or are an additional requirement. Some units, particularly in the area of service, already make general references to public-facing activities, but the language below provides greater clarity and guidance in the review process.

Public-facing Teaching

Educational activities outside the University that are consistent with existing University policy, and which increase the public's knowledge and understanding of [insert the faculty members' area of expertise, e.g. Science, Healthcare, Social Work, Law, Fine Arts, History, Engineering, etc.] Examples include

- teaching public-facing courses (e.g. courses offered by the Osher Institute, Continuing Education at the University and the School of Medicine);
- providing instruction and in-service training designed to assist professionals in maintaining professional certifications, licensing or competency in a field relevant to the faculty member's expertise (e.g., continuing legal, medical, accountant, architect and other professional education requirements);
- developing curriculum and other community engaged public educational programs (e.g., University Neighborhood Partners and the Bennion Center CEL courses);

- participating in seminars, webinars, lectures, panels, workshops, and other public presentations; and
- mentoring students and participants in community engaged pedagogy, scholarship, or research.

Public-facing Service

Service activities performed outside the University which draws upon the professional expertise and knowledge of the faculty member, and which benefits society and communities beyond the University and academia. Examples include

- serving on boards, councils, task forces, or committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations;
- consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies, schools and other educational organizations, state government agencies, and healthcare and mental health organizations as appropriate within university guidelines;
- contributing professional expertise to the local, state, or larger populaces with little or no compensation. (Volunteer activity not germane to the faculty member's professional area of expertise does not qualify); and
- giving lectures, seminars, webinars and responding to requests for professional opinions or professional assistance in the faculty member's area of expertise from school groups, civic organizations and government entities.

Public-facing Dissemination of Research/ Creative Activity

Activities which engages, translates, or directs a faculty member's research, scholarship and creative activity primarily to or with audiences outside academia, including the public, thought leaders and policy makers. Examples include

- submitting testimony before legislative bodies;
- providing expert testimony in judicial proceedings;
- providing expert advice to governmental and non-governmental entities by preparing white papers, reports, or studies;
- authoring op-eds, guest columns and granting interviews in state, regional, national, or international media outlets;
- authoring articles, books, essays, poems, plays, films, exhibits, book chapters and reviews, performances and similar writings or creative activities related to the faculty member's area of expertise that appear in publications, mediums and venues that are primarily targeted to audiences outside the academy;

- authoring or contributing to blogs, podcasts, YouTube channels or other electronic forums which have a significant number of followers, subscribers, or page views and which have a significant and demonstrable impact on public discourse, benefit the public good and help translate the academic world to a broader audience; and
- participating in community engaged research.