

Approved (Chambers/Eberman 4-0-0)

Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

February 1, 2018

Attendees: L. Eberman (Chair), J. Nelson (Secretary), T. Tesmer, M. Chambers, T., Stofferahn (Ex-Officio), R. Guell (Vice-Chair), H. E. Gallatin

Absent: N. Goswami (Sabbatical), S. Powers (Ex-Officio), A. Arrington-Bey,

1. Adopt the Agenda
2. Chair Report (<5 min)
 - a. We need to work swiftly to address changes to the Performance Based Evaluation Model. Upon completion, we have been charged to resolve a lack of timeline for PTOC to hear appeals in the Handbook. There also appears to be contradictory information in 305.15.6.1 about going up for early tenure. 305.15.6.1.1 says that the review process is stopped upon a negative recommendation (i.e., it has to be positive at each point), yet, there is a right to appeal in 305.15.6.1.2.
 - b. Exec took a look at 900 but slowed down on 932. A small group of Exec worked on 932. Up for consideration next meeting. There is a split regarding merit pay and biennial review process. Removal of merit pay as a whole, was not perceived well.
3. Academic Affairs Liaison Report (<5 min)
 - a. No report
4. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison Report (<5 min)
 - a. EXEC is aware of items coming their way.
5. Temporary Faculty Liaison Report (<5 min)
 - a. Parking for Part Time Faculty Ongoing
 - b. New avenue with new president to re-approach 1 year instructor. Guell provided history with President Bradley and comparison with multi-year instructor. Cost and security discussed. Guell suggested Stofferahn (informal or weekly meeting with Provost) bring forth the idea and gauge President Curtis's feelings/attitudes toward these lines.
6. Approach for reviewing incoming Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Guidelines
 - a. PTOC has a mechanism to ensure documents align with the handbook (maintenance)
 - b. Guell recommended small working group to review all department documents for included documents.

Approved (Chambers/Eberman 4-0-0)

- c. Eberman expressed concern that this process was used to alter expectations for tenure. Eberman recommended using those FAQs to ensure all edits were made.
 - d. P&T Review Set Up by Eberman, all documents reviewed, all members to review documents to avoid bias. 3 groups of 2 members. Projected 1st rounds, by mid-march.
7. Charge #3 - Work with AAC, FEBC, and Institutional Research to set up a mechanism for annual reports to be generated by them regarding faculty retention and other desired data
 - a. Status Check – B. Guell indicated this was mid-process and that the group was awaiting more information from Human Resources.
8. Charge #2 – Conduct a review of the biennial review once it is complete this year and offer recommendations for improvement.
 - a. Changes made to the document from the 1.25.2018 discussion.
 - b. 2-1-15 Large discussions debating merit pay removal or submission of biennial review documents. Guell expressed concern that we should be rewarding a very narrow group of people or it is not worth it or sufficient to retain faculty.
 - c. Eberman and Nelson, larger amounts for contributing exceptionally and fewer awards out. Or put the funding on awards? College or University level?
 - d. Additional issues to address:
 - i. Timing and time frame
 - ii. Line 100 Page limit
 - iii. Lines 188-190 Failure of Chairperson to conduct initial review
 - iv. Lines 201-203 Inclusion of “other materials”
 - v. Lines 261-262 School Review
 - vi. Lines 264-268 Dean Review
 - vii. Lines 393-395 Strike?
 - viii. Lines 423-491 Ensuring the rigor from previous discussion
 - ix. Lines 496-504 Overall Performance Evaluation
 - x. Lines 508-536 Compensation Adjustments for Exceptional Performance
 - xi. Lines 550-551 Adding disciplinary action for failure to improve over 2 cycles
 - xii. Lines 553-563 Compensation Adjustments for Contributing Below
 - xiii. Ongoing Improvement – should we charge ourselves to review meeting expectations next year?
 - e. Notes from discussion on 1.25.2018

Approved (Chambers/Eberman 4-0-0)

- i. Document review. Ranking domains still matter as we you need an overall score or level. You need a mechanism to identify those meeting expectations and those who fall below. Chambers have we reviewed criteria for meeting expectations? There is a large variety within colleges and departments.
- ii. Chambers would like to see rigor added for “not meeting” documentation of in progress work. Need for tangible items to show progress.
- iii. All in agreement that ranking of each domain needs to stay for overall ranking.
- iv. Recommendations If 50% of time is spent on “other duties” must be evaluated. Large discussion on whether the evaluation should include review of this item, even if not returning to the role, ex.) chairperson. Need for rigor in performance plan, follow up on performance plan procedures. Academic Affairs to develop template for use.

9. Adjourn