FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE
April 22, 2015
MINUTES

Members Present: Anderson, Desjardins, Franklin, Houser, Jares, Keaten, Merrill, Temkin.
Member(s) Absent with alternate: Gardiner (Temkin), Henry (Merrill).
Member(s) Absent: Bownas, Wacker.
Guest: Luger.

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of the agenda/April 15, 2015 minutes
The agenda was approved without objection.
The April 15, 2015 minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report/Announcements
Timeline: Temkin noted that he met with Wacker on April 20th to discuss the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure amendment proposals. Wacker will continue discussion with the deans in the interim and will follow up with the Committee at the April 29th meeting (see Special Orders).

Special Orders
Temkin outlined Wacker’s concerns/questions regarding the current amendment proposals to Section 2-3-801, and asked for Committee input.

- Final decision on tenure-CAO should have the final decision on tenure, before the BOT. Should the BOT be included in the process?
- Emphasis on discipline expertise in the process puts an undue burden on those in interdisciplinary and/or specialized areas. What happens if a faculty member refuses to evaluate someone in another program? How can the policy be amended to accommodate the needs of the interdisciplinary units?

  Committee Discussion: Should the interdisciplinary areas follow the same procedures that are outlined for smaller units? How is expertise in sub-discipline determined? The Committee discussed additional language to clarify procedures for cases where there are fewer than 3 faculty members able to evaluate due to lack of expertise and the use of faculty boards in the evaluation process. Temkin asked the Committee to review Section 2-3-801(3)(a)(II) and present any amendment proposals at the April 29th meeting.

- Clarify collegiality statement. Can the proposed statement on collegiality be amended to clarify collegiality as an independent factor?
- Include a summary of accomplishments on dossier (narrative). Include in definition of dossier?

  Committee Discussion: The Committee agreed that a narrative of accomplishments should be included in the dossier definition section of 2-3-801(1).

- Include all student evaluation in the dossier (versus sampling). Include peer observation of teaching in dossier.

  Committee Discussion: The Committee agreed that all student evaluations and all peer observations (of teaching) should be included in the dossier. The Committee also discussed requirements regarding peer observation and the inclusion of assessment data in the dossier.

- Contract-renewable faculty in professorial ranks-fully participate in evaluation process of contract-renewable faculty.

  Committee Discussion: Should contract-renewable faculty in professorial ranks be involved in the assignment of scores? The Committee discussed hiring methods throughout the University, and the pros and cons of inclusion of contract-renewable faculty in the entire evaluation process.

- Clarify the responsibilities of the Tenure Review Committee (function).

Unfinished Business
Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

- Note: All references are made to the clean copy versions of the document(s).
- RE: Section 2-3-801(1) Definitions. The Committee discussed ways to incorporate inclusion of a narrative and the inclusion of all student evaluations in the dossier definition section.
MOTION: Amend Section 2-3-801(1)(a) Dossier as follows:

Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance and accomplishments during the comprehensive evaluation period, which shall include a narrative of accomplishments during the review period, an updated vita; appropriate documentation, a representative sample of all student evaluations, from each year, covering the range of all teaching assignments; and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate. Student evaluations chosen as a representative sample will include all responses submitted by students for each course selected.

- RE: April 15th MOTION: If the disagreement among the dean, chair/director/coordinator and the faculty is the scoring, but the decision as to the outcome is not affected, the case should not go to the Tenure Review Committee: Gardiner.

Temkin suggested that Section 2-3-801(3) (VI) be amended to reflect the April 15th motion.

MOTION: Amend Section 2-3-801(3) (VI) to incorporate the April 15th motion language: If there is disagreement among the program area faculty, the chair/director/coordinator, the dean and the chief academic officer that makes a difference as to the outcome (yes or no on tenure, satisfactory or unsatisfactory on post-tenure review), the case will be referred to the Tenure Review Committee for final determination.

MOTION: Split Section 2-3-801(3) (VI) into two paragraphs. The second paragraph will begin with the following phrase: “In the case of application for tenure and in the case of post-tenure review…”

- RE: Section 2-3-801: The Committee discussed sections that need to be omitted to clarify the intent and align the language with other sections that outline the same information.

MOTION: Strike the following phrase in Section 2-3-801(3)(b)(IV)-(reference is incorrect):

“in accordance with 3-3-801(2) (a)(iv) for tenure/promotion and in accordance with 3-801(2)(b)(v) for post-tenure review.”

MOTION: Strike the following sentence in Section 2-3-801(4) (a) (III):

“A school director will add his or her evaluation of the faculty member’s contributions to the school in accordance with the following procedure:”

- RE: Evaluation Forms.

Temkin reminded the Committee that the forms will need to be updated, to align with policy when the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policy amendments are finalized.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.