

Faculty Senate Special Session
Thursday, November 4, 2004, 3:00 p.m.
Business Building 101

Subject: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document

I. Call to order by President David Rees

In attendance: David Rees (President), Luciane Berg (President-elect), Seth Armstrong (Treasurer), Helen Boswell (Secretary), Doug Molash (Parliamentarian and proxy for Paul Ocampo), Kathy Black, Shawn Christiansen, Kim Craft, Robert Eves (also proxy for Ty Redd), Richard Eissinger, Kirk Fitzpatrick, Scott Hansen, Elise Leahy, Britton Mace, Carol Ann Modesitt (also proxy for Arlene Braithwaite), Art Porter, Bob Robertson, Kevin Robinson.

II. Discussion of document

A. Annual review.

1. Discussion: Possibility of instituting a policy where there would be a yearly report without documentation, plus a three-year formal review. Tenured faculty would be formally evaluated on a five-year schedule.

Annual letters may be written by department chairs for all tenure-track faculty according to existing policy. Forwarding report of activities to departmental LRT committee also would protect individuals. Full annual reviews are beneficial by keeping tenure-track individuals on track.

2. Motion (Carol Ann Modesitt): **A yearly report consisting of summary of activities without documentation will be instituted for all faculty members.**

Seconded (Scott Hansen) followed by discussion: Tenure-track faculty need to build up their files every year. However, this would simplify the evaluation process and minimize workload of department chairs.

Motion passed with 14 in favor and 5 opposed.

3. Motion (Robert Eves): **Annual activity reports will be reviewed by department chair and, for tenured-track faculty, the chair will write an evaluative letter.**

Seconded (Doug Molash) followed by no discussion.

Motion passed with 17 in favor, 2 opposed.

4. Motion (Robert Eves): **The chair's evaluative letter will go to Department LRT committee for review and the committee will provide evaluative feedback.**

Seconded (Carol Ann Modesitt) followed by no discussion.

Motion passed with 17 in favor, 2 opposed.

5. Motion (Kathy Black): Annual activity reports of tenured faculty will be reviewed by Department chair, who may discuss with the tenured faculty any item that is perceived to be a problem.

Seconded (Art Porter). Discussion: This would alert the tenured faculty member between five-year reviews; however, chairs have this responsibility anyhow.

Motion defeated with 10 in favor, 11 opposed.

6. Motion (Robert Eves): **Any evaluative materials that are prepared by department chair and LRT committee will be forwarded to the Dean.**

Seconded (Carol Ann Modesitt)

Motion passed with 16 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions.

7. Motion (Doug Molash): The dean may, after receiving the evaluative materials, through a letter of response and concern, communicate to a tenure-track faculty member what these concerns are.

Seconded (Art Porter) followed by discussion: Won't deans follow this action anyway? If deans write a short communicative letter, it will protect the faculty.

Motion defeated with 7 in favor, 11 opposed, 3 abstentions.

8. Motion (Kathy Black): The dean shall, after receiving the evaluative materials, indicate whether or not the dean concurs with the evaluative materials from the department chair.

Seconded (Richard Eissinger) followed by no discussion.

Motion defeated with 8 in favor, 11 opposed.

9. Motion (Scott Hansen): **If the dean concurs with the chair and committees evaluative materials, he/she will sign off on the evaluation.**

Seconded (Robert Eves)

Motion passed with 19 in favor, 2 opposed.

10. Motion (Carol Ann Modesitt): **If the department chair and dean disagree on whether to retain a faculty member, the tie-breaking decision will be made by the department LRT.**

Seconded (Kirk Fitzpatrick) followed by no discussion

Motion passed with 20 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention.

B. Three-year review.

As above, if the department chair and dean disagree on whether to retain a faculty member, the tie-breaking decision will be made by the department LRT.

C. Academic rank.

Titles for non-tenure track faculty.

Motion (Carol Ann Modesitt): **Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer will be titles for non-tenure track faculty.**

Seconded (Doug Molash)

Motion passed with 18 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.

D. Tenure – no issues to discuss.

E. Evaluation of Deans in their teaching roles

1. Discussion: Deans need to be held accountable for teaching in order to be considered faculty. Deans should be evaluated in the same three areas as other faculty. If department chair provides a negative evaluation, what protection will the department chair have?

2. Motion (Robert Eves): Include a statement that deans are not to be considered teaching faculty members and therefore should not be evaluated as teaching faculty.
Second (Helen Boswell)
Motion defeated with only 8 in favor.

F. Need to expedite process of policy review.

1. Executive council will review policies first and if the policies seem innocuous and do not seem to directly impact faculty, they will be sent out via e-mail to faculty senators with request for comments sent to Doug Molash. If no comments are received, a motion to approve the policy will be made during the next Faculty Senate meeting. If comments/concerns are made evident, they will be discussed at the meeting.
2. Significant policies affecting faculty may be sent to academic affairs and then come through Faculty Senate.
3. Policies to which we have limited expertise will be sent out to others with experience and knowledge on those policies, after which we will take their recommendations.

G. Faculty Senate will meet next on November 18, with Executive Council to meet on November 11.

H. Motion to adjourn (Doug Molash) with second (Helen Boswell).