III.7 UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES AND GROUPS

University-wide committees deal with university-wide issues and are made up of a broad range of constituencies (faculty, administration, and staff). Many university-wide committees also include student representatives. Each of these committees is important to the smooth running of the university.

III.7.1 University Cabinet

The Linfield University Cabinet provides effective, proactive, and informed institutional leadership and serves as a venue for shared strategic thinking and collaboration. The University Cabinet surfaces and directs issues that require or would benefit from cross-unit discussion and collaboration and works to ensure that Linfield makes timely progress towards its strategic goals and initiatives. The Faculty Senate leadership are members of the University Cabinet.

Reporting into the University Cabinet are three subcommittees that have university-wide representation. They include the University Budget Committee, the Accreditation Subcommittee, and the Strategic Planning Subcommittee. Of these, the University Budget Committee meets regularly, and the Accreditation and Strategic Planning subcommittees have oversight of critical but cyclical processes that require varying levels of activity reflective of their charge.

III.7.1.1 University Budget Committee (UBC)

The charge of UBC is to:

- Align planning and budgeting to ensure proper use of Linfield's resources.
- Plan and evaluate the effectiveness of Linfield's budgeting process and provide recommendations to the University Cabinet as necessary.
- Assist in the optimization of Linfield's finite resources by recommending allocations in support of the strategic plan, accreditation, and student learning.
- Ensure resources are strategically aligned between the University planning and budgeting processes by gathering and disseminating accurate, current, and timely information to the Linfield community.

Faculty Representation on the UBC and BWG: Four faculty members (one from each College/School and one at-large appointed by the Faculty Senate). Three of these members will serve on the Budget Working Group.

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate will advise on faculty representation on this committee.

III.7.1.2 Accreditation Subcommittee

The charge of the Accreditation Subcommittee is to:

- Provide institutional accreditation oversight.
- Operationalize the required iterative cycle of the NWCCU (Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities) accreditation cycle reports via the self-study (and other) required processes.
- Report accreditation planning, processes, and outcomes to Linfield stakeholders; and periodically review all planning efforts to ensure integration with mission and strategic priorities.
- Membership on this committee is reflective of planning cycle (faculty, staff, students)

See Accreditation - Home (sharepoint.com) (https://linfield.sharepoint.com/sites/Accreditation)

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate will advise on faculty representation on this subcommittee.

III.7.1.3 Strategic Planning Subcommittee

The charge of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee is to:

- Contribute to the institutional process for developing and refining vision, mission, and strategic plans.
- Operationalize the strategic planning process at intervals determined by the President/Board of Trustees of the University.
- Report regularly on strategic plan implementation and progress.
- Oversee strategic plan assessment.

Membership on this committee is reflective of the planning cycle.

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate will advise on faculty representation on this subcommittee.

III.7.2 Safety Committee

The Safety Committee is responsible for making recommendations to the Vice President of Finance and Administration on improvements for Linfield working conditions that affect the safety and health of employees. The committee is charged with the responsibility of defining problems, identifying hazards, and suggesting corrective action. In addition, the committee helps identify employee safety training needs, establishes accident investigation procedures, and reviews accident reports.

Faculty Representation: There shall be one faculty representative to this committee appointed by the Faculty Senate.

III.7.3 University Benefits Committee

University Benefits Committee/Retirement Plan Advisory Committee (RPAC) University Benefits Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the University Cabinet on benefit issues affecting all employees.

Membership:

- Vice President for Finance and Administration (Chair)
- Three faculty members
- Three Staff Members appointed by the Staff Council
- Director of Human Resources
- Assistant Vice President Financial Services/Controller.

See Employee Handbook at linfield-university-employee-handbook.pdf (https://www.linfield.edu/assets/files/humanresources/linfield-university-employee-handbook.pdf)

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate will advise on faculty representation on this Committee.

III.7.4 Emergency Preparedness Committee

The Emergency Preparedness Committee develops and implements policies and procedures that the University will follow in response to critical events that require an immediate response. The committee assigns responsibilities for carrying out identified tasks and establishes a process for keeping actions and responsibilities current.

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate will advise on faculty representation on this committee.

III.7.5 Academic Council

Linfield's Academic Council is a strategic administrative body under the direction of the provost (or designee) that considers educational issues that concern the institution holistically, may cut across a variety of units, and address current and prospective student needs. The Academic Council promotes transparency through shared stakeholder input, improved intra-campus communication, and effective information dissemination. The Council identifies internal barriers to successful delivery of the educational mission and works to reduce them or find effective alternatives, reviews innovative educational proposals that have substantial curricular, financial, and/or other organizational impact beyond the unit making the proposal, and provides feedback as to mission relevance, feasibility, and budget implications, provides oversight of student learning outcomes assessment for continual program improvement and as required for external review and accreditation. The Council is a recommending body and refers items and issues as appropriate to other bodies at the university. The Council does not develop curriculum or have curricular oversight.

Faculty Representation: The Faculty Senate leadership and curriculum committee chairs from each of the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Nursing attend.

Full list of members here (https://linfield.sharepoint.com/sites/AcademicAffairs/SitePages/Academic-Council.aspx)

III.7.6 The Chemical Hygiene Committee (required by federal law)

The Chemical Hygiene Committee is charged with maintaining the University Hazardous Substances Communication Program and staffing the committee with a chemical hygiene officer. The chemical hygiene officer is appointed by an officer of the college and is an ex-officio member of this committee. The chemical hygiene officer has latitude in determining the appropriate size and composition of the committee, subject to the federal law that stipulates committee size and professional qualifications of those that serve on the committee.

III.7.7 Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) (required by federal law)

This committee reviews all proposed research protocols and teaching laboratory protocols involving nonhuman animals and ensures the welfare of nonhuman animals used in research and teaching at Linfield University. IACUC policies and procedures are guided by the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA), Animal Welfare Act, November 2013, and the Institute for Laboratory Animal Research, National Research Council's, Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, 8th Ed, 2011. Committee membership is drawn predominantly from faculty members whose research or teaching are affected by these policies. Members also include a community person and a consulting veterinarian. The chair has latitude in determining the appropriate size and composition of the committee, subject to the federal law that stipulates committee size and professional qualifications of those that serve on the committee.

III.7.8 Radiation Safety Committee (RSC) (required by federal law)

This committee reviews all research protocols that involve radioactive isotopes, conducts an annual review of the entire radioactive isotope program on campus, reviews records for all departments, inspects facilities, and is responsible for annual license renewal and periodic major license renewal applications. As this committee exists to assure that the university conforms with state and federal regulations governing health and safety, membership will be drawn predominately from faculty members whose research or teaching is affected by such regulations. The chair has latitude in determining the appropriate size and composition of the committee, subject to the federal law that stipulates committee size and professional qualifications of those that serve on the committee.

III.7.9 Committee for Human Research Participation (required by federal law)

The federal government mandates Committees on Human Research Participation (CHRP) or Human Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at colleges, universities, and other research institutions in order to ensure that all research involving human subjects at these institutions is carried out ethically and within legal limits. See 45 CFR part 46 (http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/45-cfr-46/) and "Common Rule (https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/)" for more information about these guidelines.

The Linfield University CHRP/IRB reviews faculty and student research proposals involving human participants for the protection of the rights, welfare, and well-being of the participants, and the rights of the researcher and of the university. The CHRP/IRB also educates the campus about carrying out ethically sound research, provides additional resources upon request, and otherwise works to keep Linfield University in compliance with federal regulations on human research.

By federal law an IRB must have at least five members. There should be one faculty from the Portland campus on this committee as well as faculty who do human subjects research. As this committee exists to ensure that the university conforms with state and federal regulations governing health and safety, membership will be drawn predominantly from faculty members whose research or teaching is affected by such regulations. The chair has latitude in determining the appropriate size and composition of the committee, subject to the federal law that stipulates committee size and professional qualifications of those that serve on the committee. The criteria for IRB membership are stipulated in 45 CFR 46.107.

IRB chairs are nominated by current committee members and forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate for approval. They must have at least one year of experience on the IRB and be a tenured member of the faculty. IRB chairs shall be appointed for three-year terms and may not be appointed for more than two consecutive three-year terms. The chair shall receive a five-credit

reduction in teaching load per year, to be arranged with their departments and the relevant dean.

An investigator can be a member of the IRB, however, the investigator-as-member cannot participate in the review and approval process for any project in which they have a present or potential conflict of interest. Where the investigator-member has a conflicting interest, they may be present only to provide information requested by the IRB. If the investigator-member is the chair, then they may appoint an interim chair to assume the regular duties of the IRB chair for the purposes of that review.

Potential IRB members must complete the Human Subject Assurance Training on the United States Health and Human Services Office for Human Research Protections website by the second meeting of their first year of service on the IRB.

III.7.10 University Hearings Committee

The membership of the University Hearings Committee will consist of five faculty members with two at-large and three academic unit-specific seats. Each unit will be responsible for holding elections for its unit-specific seat. Terms of service for unit-specific seats will be two years beginning on July first of a given year with individual faculty serving no more than two consecutive terms. The CAS representative will be elected in even years in the SOB and SON representatives will be elected in odd years. The two at-large seats will be held vacant while no hearings are ongoing. Upon initiation of a hearing the academic unit that is home to the faculty member involved in the hearing will send two faculty from that unit to serve on the committee for the duration of the hearing. These two faculty members will be released from service at the conclusion of a hearing. The committee will review faculty grievances and dismissal proceedings per the policies in this section.

III.7.10.1 Termination of Faculty Appointments Involving Allegations of Inadequate Consideration of a Faculty Member's Qualifications

Complaints of inadequate consideration are likely to relate to matters of professional judgment, where the department should have primary authority. For this reason, the basic functions of the university Hearings Committee should be to determine whether the appropriate faculty body gave adequate consideration to the faculty member's candidacy in reaching its decision.

The term "adequate consideration" refers essentially to procedural rather than to substantive issues: Was the decision conscientiously arrived at? Was all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the candidate sought out and considered? Was there adequate deliberation by the department over the import of the evidence in light of the relevant standards? Were irrelevant and improper standards excluded from consideration? Was the decision a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgment? These are the kinds of questions suggested by the standard "adequate consideration." The committee should not substitute its own judgment for that of members of the department on the merits of whether the candidate should be reappointed or given tenure.

If, in applying this standard, the university Hearings Committee concludes that adequate consideration was not given, its appropriate response should be to recommend to the department that it assess the merits once again, this time remedying the inadequacies of its prior consideration. The Hearings committee should provide copies of its report and recommendation to the faculty member, the relevant Promotion and Tenure Committee, the relevant dean, the provost, and the President.

III.7.10.2 Termination of Faculty Appointments Involving Allegations of Discrimination or Violation of Academic Freedom

The best safeguard against a proliferation of grievance petitions on a given campus is the observance of sound principles and procedures of academic freedom and tenure and of institutional government. Observance of the procedures recommended here help assure faculty members of a fair professional evaluation, and enlighten them concerning the reasons contributing to key decisions of their colleagues.

Even with the best practices and procedures, however, faculty members will at times think that they have been improperly or unjustly treated and may wish another faculty group to review a decision of the faculty body immediately involved. Fairness to both the individual and the institution requires that the institution provide for such a review when it is requested. The possibility of a violation of academic freedom or of discrimination is of vital concern to the institution as a whole, and, where either is alleged, it is of cardinal importance to the faculty and the administration to determine whether substantial grounds for the allegation exist. The institution should also be concerned to see that decisions respecting reappointment are based upon adequate consideration, and provision should thus be made for a review of allegations by affected faculty members that the consideration has been inadequate.

Because of the broader significance of a violation of academic freedom or of improper discrimination, the procedures to be followed in these kinds of complaints should be kept separate from a complaint over adequacy of consideration.

The functions of the university Hearings Committee in cases involving violations of academic freedom or of discrimination will be:

- Determine whether or not the recommendation of non-reappointment constitutes on its face a violation of academic freedom and/or discrimination.
- Seek to settle the matter by informal methods

If the matter remains unresolved, the report will be sent to the Provost and the President, and they shall recommendation whether or not the evidence submitted in support of the petition warrants reversal of a negative tenure decision.

III.7.10.3 Cases Involving Termination of Appointment of Tenured Faculty for Cause

Members of the university Hearings Committee deeming themselves disqualified for bias or interest will remove themselves from the case, either at the request of a party or on their own initiative. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. Each academic unit will be responsible to fill vacancies on the committee following recusals of faculty from that unit, ensuring that the final composition of the committee matches the composition mandated in III.7.10.

The university Hearings Committee may, with the consent of the parties concerned, hold joint prehearing meetings with the parties in order to;

- Simplify the issues.
- Effect stipulations of facts.
- Provide for the exchange of documentary or other information.
- Achieve such other appropriate prehearing objectives as will make the hearing fair, effective, and expeditious.

The committee, in consultation with the President and the faculty member, will exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private.

During the proceedings the faculty member will be permitted to have an academic adviser and counsel of the faculty member's choice.

At the request of either party or the committee, a representative of a responsible educational association will be permitted to attend the proceedings as an observer.

A verbatim record of the hearing or hearings will be taken, and a copy will be made available to the faculty member without cost, at the faculty member's request.

The burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the institution and will be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.

The committee will grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

The faculty member will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence. The administration will cooperate with the committee in securing witnesses and in making available documentary and other evidence.

The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witnesses cannot or will not appear, but the committee determines that the interests of justice require admission of their statements, the committee will identify the witnesses, disclose their statements, and, if possible, provide for interrogatories.

In the hearing of charges of incompetence, the testimony will include that of qualified faculty members from this or other institutions of higher education.

The committee will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available.

The findings of fact and the decision will be based solely on the hearing record.

Except for such simple announcements as may be required, covering the time of the hearing and similar matters, public statements and publicity about the case by either the faculty member or administrative officers will be avoided so far as possible until the proceedings have been completed, including consideration by the governing board of the institution. The President and the faculty member will be notified of the decision in writing and will be given a copy of the record of the hearing.

If the committee concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has not been established by the evidence in the record, it will so report to the President. If the President rejects the report, the President will state the reasons for doing so, in writing, to the committee and to the faculty member and provide an opportunity for response before transmitting the case to the governing board. If the committee concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has been established, but that an academic penalty less than dismissal would be more appropriate, it will so recommend, with supporting reasons.

III.7.11 University-Wide Ad hoc Faculty/Administration Task Groups

Any ad hoc group created by the Faculty Senate or Collegium shall have a mandate for at most two academic years after its creation by the Faculty Senate or Collegium. If such an ad hoc group should see the need for its continuation, either as an ad hoc group or permanent committee of the Faculty Senate or Collegium, then within one month of the end of the group's mandate they shall present a written report to the Faculty Senate or Collegium providing a self-assessment of their work and a rationale for their continuance. The Faculty Senate or Collegium will then evaluate that report and make a decision regarding the need for continuation.

III.7.12 Technology Advisory Committee

The TAC's mission is to advance technology use at Linfield through collaborative analysis.

Faculty and other employees may be invited to TAC meetings based on their expertise or subject matter knowledge on specific issues being addressed in TAC meetings. See Technology Advisory Council - Home (sharepoint.com). (https://linfield.sharepoint.com/sites/tac)