Members Present: Anderson, Bownas, Erskine, Franklin, Gardiner, Luger, Merrill, Temkin.
Member(s) Absent with Alternate: Glen (Temkin)
Member(s) Absent: Bovaird-Abbo, Burgett, Daehnke, Straw, Wacker.
Guest(s): None.

Call to Order
Approval of the agenda/January 29, 2014 minutes
The agenda was amended to place New Business ahead of Unfinished Business. The amended agenda was approved without objection.
The January 29, 2014 minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report/Announcements
Temkin outlined his discussion with Wacker and Sheehan regarding the proposal for biennial review (vs. annual), noting that they agreed overall with the Committee’s proposals but recommended that the requirements of a pre-tenure review be included with the revision of the annual evaluation policy. Additional discussion items included the role of the department chair, director, and dean in the various aspects of the overall evaluation process. Wacker and Sheehan also recommended that the Committee address the biennial evaluation proposal separately from the ongoing discussion of the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policies.

Unfinished Business
Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure
The Committee discussed the history of annual evaluation (implemented with merit pay), biennial review vs. annual review, variations of review throughout the University, prior motions approved by the committee regarding the evaluation process, and who should decide the timeline of the evaluations. Committee members agreed that the program area should be responsible for review timelines, and a faculty member should be able to request an evaluation at any time.

MOTION: Charge Chair Temkin to amend the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure policies to reflect that the annual review timeline should be determined by the program area: Erskine.
SECOND: Gardiner.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.
The Committee discussed the terms “program”, “program area” and the rationale for terms used throughout the University, including the history of the term “program area” as used in faculty contracts. Temkin suggested retaining the term “program area” due to possible implications with faculty contracts. The Committee agreed that terms outlining areas of the University should be consistent. The Committee also discussed free-standing areas (e.g. Africana Studies), faculty members who have a workload in an area outside of their discipline, and how the evaluation process should be outlined in these instances: who participates in the evaluation process, who are the voting faculty when the number of faculty is minimal, who develops the criteria. The Committee agreed that a process for evaluation should be outlined for areas that are smaller, as well as a faculty member whose job requirements are in other areas outside of their discipline (>50%).

MOTION: Charge Chair Temkin to draft language outlining criteria development, to include the term “program area” vs. “faculty” to enable Chair input. Language should outline a structure that can be used throughout the University: Luger.
SECOND: Merrill.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.
The Committee discussed possible solutions for disagreements on criteria development (program area and the dean), and scenarios where a program area may want to change the criteria for evaluation.

MOTION: Charge Chair Temkin to draft language outlining criteria retention and a process to allow recommendations for changes: Luger.
SECOND: Merrill.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee discussed the evaluation process in relation to promotion and/or tenure. Temkin recommended the term “decision” be used in the language outlining evaluation outcomes.

MOTION: Charge Chair Temkin to draft language using the term “decisions” (at the specific level) regarding evaluation outcomes for promotion and/or tenure: Gardiner.

SECOND: Merrill.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Annual/Biennial Review
See Chair’s Report. Additional discussion: Luger suggested that the Committee discuss the biennial review at the same time as the overall discussion of the evaluation, promotion, and tenure policies, and subsequently present one package to the Faculty Senate. The Committee discussed timelines for amendments to the current policies, and the effect on current/future annual evaluations. The Committee agreed to continue discussion at the February 26, 2014 meeting and gauge the timeline for completion of all aspects of the evaluation, promotion, and tenure policies, to determine if the biennial evaluation proposal should be addressed separately/first.

Annual Timeline for Comprehensive Reviews-topic not covered.
Procedure for Recusal in Tenure Decision-topic not covered.

New Business
Curriculum Approval Process and Form
Temkin outlined concerns he received regarding the current Curriculum Review Course Form and the current Curriculum policy in the Board Policy Manual (3-3-501). The Committee discussed the current curriculum recommendation/approval process, and the drop down menu selections of “Approved” versus “Recommend”. The Committee agreed that the course form needs additional discussion for possible revisions to align with the current curriculum approval process outlined in the Board Policy Manual. Riley/Temkin will forward the corresponding Board Policy Manual Curriculum section (3-3-501) to the Committee for discussion at the February 26, 2014 meeting.

Other New Business
Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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