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

Approval of the agenda/September 10, 2014 minutes
The agenda was amended to place New Business ahead of Unfinished Business, and add “Discussion of Senate Action 1058 (Promotion Guidelines)” to New Business. The amended agenda was approved without objection. The September 10, 2014 minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report/Announcements: No report.

New Business
Chair Evaluation Policy
Temkin outlined the rationale for the proposed amendments to the Department Chair Evaluation policy, to align the language with the newly approved biennial review process language, and to clarify the dean’s role in assignment of scores for the “Chair Responsibility” section of service.

MOTION: Accept the proposed revisions to the Department Chair policy to align with the newly approved biennial review process language: Temkin.

SECOND: Gardiner.

DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the procedures for evaluation throughout the University (who assigns scores), and variations throughout the University. The Committee also discussed the proposed language “does not assign”, and Temkin noted that the language aligns with the Biennial Review document language, which has been approved.

VOTE: The motion passed with a hand vote of 11-0, 1 abstention.

The amendment proposal will be presented at the September 29, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting.

Senate Action 1058: Promotion Guidelines 2-3-901
Temkin outlined the language addition of Senate Action 1058 (May 6, 2013), noting that the administration did not sign the action, and the Faculty Senate does not have record of the action being returned for further discussion. Temkin also outlined the importance of the language proposed in the evaluation process. Wacker will research (rationale for the action not being forwarded to the President’s for approval).

Each college will determine the evaluation levels required for promotion. For tenured and tenure-track faculty members, these requirements will reflect responsibilities in all three traditional areas of workload (instruction, professional activity, service). For contract-renewable faculty members, these requirements may reflect responsibilities in fewer than all three of the traditional areas of workload.

The Committee also discussed Senate Action 1054: Workload Assignments 2-3-401(3) (April 22, 2013, which was not approved by the administration. Wacker will research (rationale for the action not being forwarded to the President’s for approval.
(a) Assignments. A full-time faculty workload (1.0 Full-Time Equivalent -- FTE) consists of 30 workload units per academic year. Department chairs/school directors are responsible for assigning workloads. It is essential that in making workload decisions, the implications for promotion and tenure be carefully considered so as not to harm a faculty member's potential for tenure or promotion. School directors and chairs of departments with multiple program areas will assign workload under the following guidelines:

The Committee will continue discussion of Senate Actions 1054 and 1058 at the October 8, 2014 meeting.

**Unfinished Business**

Curriculum Approval Process and Form (3-3-501)
The Committee discussed the rationale for this agenda item being presented to the Faculty Welfare Committee versus the Academic Policies Committee. Temkin noted that the Curriculum Approval Process in the University Regulations was written/revised by the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the form should align with the current policy outlined in 3-3-501. The Committee discussed the importance of the form flowing with policy procedure, outlining the responsibility/authority of each level, and the signature order aligning with current policy. The Committee agreed on the importance of “areas affected” being consulted in the process, and that the course form should clarify who is recommending what to whom. Schuttler outlined the course form that is currently on the Registrar’s website versus the Committee’s working form from the spring 2014 semester (Wacker draft). Schuttler noted that the course form on the Registrar’s site has been updated to add informational links, and the order of some of the information has been changed (e.g. signature lines) (Office of the Registrar>Faculty and Staff>Curriculum>). The Committee discussed Provost Wacker’s draft Approval Signature page. A recommendation was made to add language in the College Curriculum Committee section: “forward remarks to the originating unit as well as the **Department Chair and Dean**, but the Committee agreed not to include the additional language in order to align with the current policy language. A recommendation was made to add policy language to clarify the role of the College Curriculum Committee.

**MOTION:** Add language from the current Curriculum Approval Process 3-3-501(2)(II)(B) to the Course Form Approval Signatures, to clarify the role of the College Curriculum Committee: Gardiner.

**SECOND:** Temkin.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee also discussed the designation of “review” (RV?) versus “recommend”, the role of the Registrar’s Office in the curriculum approval process (include Registrar’s Office items on checklist), and course form training procedures (who is responsible for training faculty on the revised form), as well as distribution of information regarding course form changes (Provost’s Office). The Committee will continue discussion on Course Form revisions at the October 8, 2014 meeting.

Faculty Grievance Procedure (2-3-1201)
Temkin outlined the current policy/procedure for Faculty Grievance, noting that the timelines should be reviewed/clarified (Section 2-3-1201(2)). The Committee also discussed assignment of authority (Director of Human Resources?) to grant an extension (under extenuating circumstances). The Committee will continue discussion/review of the current policy at the October 8, 2014 meeting, and agreed to charge Temkin to draft a revision of the timelines and outline the procedure for an extension.

Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure: Topic not covered due to time constraints.

**Annual Timeline for Comprehensive Reviews:** Topic not covered due to time constraints.

**Procedure for Recusal in Tenure Decision:** Topic not covered due to time constraints.

**Other New Business**

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
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