

Faculty Senate Special Session
Thursday, September 9, 2004
ELC 405

Subject: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document

Present: David Rees, Luciane Berg, Helen Boswell, Doug Molash, Katherine Black, Arlene Braithwaite, Shawn Christiansen, Richard Eissinger, Robert Eves, Kirk Fitzpatrick, Artis Grady, Judy Higbee, Rick Lambson, Kenny Laundra, Scott Hansen, Art Porter, Ty Redd, Bob Robertson, Kevin Robinson, Jeff Salehi, Virginia Stitt, Jessica Tvordi, Don Massengale (proxy for Carol Modesitt), Michael Richards, and Pat Larson (from the University Journal)

1. Call to order by President David Rees and suggestion to make motions to make changes first, with discussion of motions limited to 10 minutes.
2. Motion (Robert Eves): References to the Faculty Planning and Evaluation System (PES) should be replaced with generic references to policy. The PES is a separate system that has yet to be evaluated
 - Seconded (Ty Redd) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
3. Motions/discussions under “Annual Evaluation of Faculty” section
 - a) Motion (Luciane Berg): Under II. A. 4., for collegiality, add the policy number (6.28) and phrase as “...to students and faculty colleagues.”
 - Seconded (Jessica Tvordi) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
 - b) Motion (Luciane Berg): Under II. C. 2. and II. D. 3., add where you would find the review schedule (appendix B)
 - Seconded (Doug Molash) followed by discussion: Need to distinguish references to review schedule vs. annual schedule. Entire review schedule includes references to different reviews (e.g., three-year review, rank advancement)
 - Change to motion (Luciane Berg): Reference appendix B in all places referencing review schedule and make terms referring to schedules consistent
 - Seconded (Doug Molash) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
 - c) Motion (Robert Eves): Under II. C. 1., restrict annual review to 1” including documentation. Too much documentation is required for the annual reviews.
 - Seconded (Scott Hansen) followed by discussion: Documentation is too cumbersome, especially student evaluations. Documentation could be requested if needed. Concern that variation among departments would not be accommodated by 1” limit.
 - Called to question (David Rees)
 - Motion defeated with only 6 votes in favor.

- d) Motion (Robert Eves): Under II. C. 1., state that the “Content and format will be determined by the Department LRT committee.”
- Seconded (Ty Redd) followed by discussion: Departments will determine what is important for documentation for annual reviews.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
4. Motion (Robert Eves): Include generic statements in three-year, rank advancement, and tenure areas of evaluation that these applications will consist of evaluations from previous yearly reviews and no documentation. These will include signed evaluation forms from reviews or other evaluation letters from department chairs as appropriate. Annual reviews will still require full documentation and would still be submitted at the time of three-year review, rank advancement, or tenure.
- Motion not seconded, but will be worked on by David Rees for next meeting.
5. Motions/discussions under “Annual Evaluation of Faculty” section, Post-tenure Review, section II. D. 4. b.
- a) Discussion: Concern over the negative spirit of the use of the word “separation.” Comparison to the Regent’s policy of post-tenure review occurring every 5 years and being developmental in nature instead of punitive. Nature of merit pay and that it may not necessarily be connected to annual reviews. Report of U of U’s policy on post-tenure review: each department has own terms and criteria; if someone receives a poor review, they may not get as much merit pay, take on more teaching, and/or form a developmental plan; separation is unheard of. Report of USU’s policy on post-tenure review: standards not same as standards of achieving tenure; developmental plans are instituted but no separation; gross incompetence is dealt with using other established policies.
- b) Motion (Art Porter): Remove the words, “for approval” at the end of the sentence, “This developmental plan will be included in the documentation forwarded to the dean...” and remove the entire last sentence. This will remove the threat of separation or reassignment and remove the responsibility of the dean for approving the plan.
- Seconded (Kirk Fitzpatrick) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed with 1 abstention, all others in favor.
- c) Motion (Art Porter): Change wording of first sentence to, “If the results of the review indicate the need for significant faculty development, the department chair may, in consultation with the faculty member, use the resources of the department to form a developmental plan.” This will change the statement to have more positive wording and allow tenured faculty to receive assistance when needed.
- Seconded (Jessica Tvordi) followed by discussion: Concern that the use of “may” does not establish need for tenured faculty to improve.
 - Called to question (Ty Redd)
 - Motion defeated with only 4 votes in favor.

- d) Motion (Don Massengale): Adopt the wording of the Regent's policy for what happens of the "faculty is found to not meet the standards..."
- Seconded (Kathy Black) followed by discussion: Concern that the phrasing is still too negative. Discussion of need to describe institutional support and faculty responsibility.
 - Called to question (Doug Molash)
 - Motion defeated with only 3 votes in favor.
- e) Motion (Jessica Tvordi): Use wording of Art Porter's second motion (see "c" above) and add statements regarding institutional support for the faculty member and faculty responsibility to take action to improve. This will replace the first two sentences of 4.b.
- Seconded (Doug Molash) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed with 1 vote opposed, 1 abstention, and all others in favor.
- f) Motion (Kenny Laundra): Eliminate annual review for tenured faculty and instead institute post-tenure reviews at 5-year interviews.
- Seconded (Ty Redd) followed by no discussion.
 - Motion passed with 1 vote opposed and all others in favor.
6. Motion (Ty Redd): Under "Annual Evaluation of Faculty" section, II. A. 2, Scholarly/Creative Activity, state as, "As approved by the Department chair and reviewed for comment by the dean of the college/school and provost."
- Seconded (Robert Eves) followed by discussion: Concern that the dean and provost may want more input in guidelines regarding scholarly/creative activity. Reminder that Faculty Senate's role is that of an advisory body.
 - Called to question (David Rees)
 - Motion passed with 1 abstention and all others in favor.
7. Comments from meeting to be collected by David Rees from Helen Boswell and Doug Molash with changes to be integrated and distributed early next week.
- Special sessions will continue Thursday, September 16, at 3 pm, in ELC 4th floor conference room
 - In addition to completing the policy, please focus on proposed forms and their continuity with rest of document.
8. Call to adjourn (Ty Redd) and second (Jessica Tvordi)
9. Officers remained to determine meeting time for executive council.