

**Faculty Senate Special Session
Thursday, September 16, 2004
ELC, 4th floor conference room**

Subject: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document

Present: David Rees, Luciane Berg, Helen Boswell, Seth Armstrong, Doug Molash, Kathy Black, Arlene Braithwaite, Shawn Christiansen, Kim Craft, Richard Eissinger, Kirk Fitzpatrick, Artis Grady, Scott Hanson, Judy Higbee, Kenny Laundra, Britton Mace, Carol Modesitt, Paul Ocampo, Art Porter, Bob Robertson, Kevin Robinson, Jeff Salehi, Jessica Tvordi, and Abe Harraf.

1. Call to order by President David Rees and call for senators to refer to revised document to see if there were any changes that were not made from the last meeting.
 - (Jeff Salehi) Under Annual Evaluation, section II. D. 4, change wording to, “If a tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty member is to be retained but the faculty member receives a “Low Performance...,” instead of, “When...”.
2. Motions/discussions under “Annual Evaluation of Faculty” section.
 - a) Discussion: Under II. A. 2. Scholarly/Creative activity section: need for mediator in the event of expectations that are misaligned (e.g., between Dean and faculty or faculty and department); provost would be willing to resolve disputes but faculty involvement may be adequate; alternative would be to give Deans and Provost approval authority.
 - b) Motion (Kathy Black): II. A. 2. Establish that once faculty develop criteria for scholarly/creative activity, approval must be given by department chair, dean, and provost such that majority (two out of three) approves. Provost would only have a role if there is a disagreement between department chair and Dean.
 - Seconded (Seth Armstrong) followed by discussion: This may take decision-making process out of department hands; Provost role would be absent unless there is a disagreement between Dean and department chair.
 - Motion defeated with only one vote in favor.
 - c) Motion (Kathy Black): II. A. 2. Criteria for scholarly/creative activity would be approved by department chair and Dean. If one of those individuals disagree, then the Provost would make recommendations.
 - Motion dies due to lack of second.
 - d) Motion (Doug Molash): II. A. 2. In the case of a dispute over criteria for scholarly/creative activity, the question will be resolved by a committee of a representative faculty member, department chair, and Dean.
 - Seconded (Luciane Berg) followed by discussion: Decisions would arise from the department but worst-case scenarios would be addressed. Faculty with the disputed criterion would select his/her own faculty representative.
 - Motion defeated with only three votes in favor.

- e) Discussion: Dean needs to be involved in process or it will not pass Dean's council; faculty would determine the level of Scholarly/Creative activity, and department chair and Dean would approve; alternatively, Deans would have written comment only; Provost would be removed from decision.
- f) Motion (Luciane Berg): II. A. 2. Leave statement as it reads, "As approved by the department chair and reviewed for written comment by the Dean of the college/school," and strike the role of the Provost. Add wording from previous motion: "In the case of a dispute over criteria for scholarly/creative activity, the question will be resolved by a committee of a representative faculty member, department chair, and Dean."
- Seconded (Carol Modesitt) followed by no further discussion.
- **Motion passed with 2 opposed and 1 abstention.**

- g) Other wording changes:
- i. Under II. C.1., "Responsibility of faculty member" section: Wording should read, "Every non-tenured faculty member..."
 - ii. Motion (Jessica Tvordi): Any grammar or other such changes should be taken care of at a later time.
- Seconded (Art Porter)
- **Motion passed unanimously.**
 - iii. Under II. E. 1. "Responsibility of department LRT" section: Mention of non-tenured track faculty should include parenthetical definition; i.e., (tenure-track and non-tenure track)
 - iv. Kathy Black will reword sections (Responsibilities of department chair, department LRT, and College/School Dean sections) to provide clarity in the sequence of the evaluation process as it is to occur.

3. Motions/discussions under "Three Year Review of Faculty" section.

- a) Motion (Kathy Black): Make rating system of 1-5 consistent for department chair and other evaluators instead of utilizing the current system of having only two choices (a vs. b).
- Seconded (Carol Modesitt) followed by no discussion.
- **Motion passed unanimously.**
- b) Discussion: Having the department chair, LRT chairs, and the Dean jointly make decisions to not retain a faculty member could be a liability issue; Dean should be the one who takes responsibility because he/she is in the administrative position; suggestion that LRT and department chair send their recommendation to the Dean, who then forwards it to the Provost; concern that standard set by Department and the Chair may be used despite disapproval from Dean or Provost.
- Discussion reached an impasse: this issue needs to be revisited after the Dean's Council has had a chance to comment.

- c) Motion (Doug Molash): Deans will forward documentation and accompanying recommendations to the Provost as to whether to retain the faculty member or terminate employment at the end of the year. (Merge II. E.3. and II. E.4.)
 - Seconded (Seth Armstrong) followed by no further discussion.
 - **Motion passed with one opposed.**
- d) Wording change: Section I. Change reference to timing of submission in beginning of this section to read, “fourth year of probationary period” instead of current wording, “fourth year of employment” to account for differences in contracts or time awarded towards tenure.

4. Motions/discussion under “Academic Rank” section

- a) Discussion: Non-tenure track individuals may not need to go through same committees as those on tenure track; may only need approval from chair and dean with perhaps departmental faculty LRT input; sunset provision may not accommodate individuals in certain specific cases; wording of sunset provision needs to be clarified; current faculty progressing towards rank advancement under the old policy will have five years to achieve rank advancement under the old policy or else must follow new policy.
- b) David Rees will work on wording of sunset provision (Section II. C.) to make more clear.
- c) Motion (Art Porter): In addition to being evaluated for rank advancement by department chair and Dean, non-tenure track individuals should be evaluated by Departmental and University LRT committees.
 - **Motion passed with one abstention.**

5. Motions/discussion under “Faculty Tenure”, Post-Tenure Review section, II. H.

- a) Discussion: Art Porter provided suggestions for wording changes under this section; unclear what documentation a tenured faculty member must submit for post-tenure review; criteria for post-tenure review need to be clarified.
- b) Motion (Helen Boswell): Accept Art Porter’s wording changes to Section H.5. (Copy of document with suggested changes provided by Art Porter)
 - Second (Kenny Laundra) followed by no discussion.
 - **Motion passed with one opposed and one abstention**

6. Plans for following meetings:

- Please come next week prepared to discuss the PES system of appraisal, found at the end of the document.
- We will finish discussion of the document within the next two meetings.
- In two weeks, please bring faculty concerns for David Rees to bring to the President of the University.

7. Motion to adjourn (Luciane Berg) and second (Jessica Tvordi)