

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Thursday, September 23, 2004, 3:00 p.m.**  
**ELC 405**

In attendance: David Rees (President), Luciane Berg (President-elect), Seth Armstrong (Treasurer), Helen Boswell (Secretary), Doug Molash (Parliamentarian), Arlene Braithwaite (also acting as proxy for Ty Redd), Shawn Christiansen, Kim Craft (also acting as proxy for Kathy Black), Richard Eissinger, John Eye, Kirk Fitzpatrick, Artis Grady, Rick Lambson, Kenny Laundra, Elise Leahy (also acting as proxy for Jessica Tvordi), Britton Mace, Carol Ann Modesitt, Paul Ocampo, Art Porter, Rob Robertson, and Jeff Salehi. Visitors: Provost Abe Harraf and Pat Larson from the University Journal.

I. Call to order by President David Rees

II. Review and approval of minutes from August 23 meeting.

Motion to approve (Richard Eissinger), seconded (Luciane Berg), and approved unanimously.

III. Officer's Reports

A. President (David Rees)

Gave time to Provost Abe Harraf: Accreditation of Integrated Engineering Program is underway. Feedback so far is positive, but official word will not be received until July.

B. President-elect (Luciane Berg)

Board of Trustees has not had their meeting yet.

C. Treasurer (Seth Armstrong)

Financial report: \$13,245 is shown in account, with \$1,658 in expense account. So far, \$600 in new dues has been collected from faculty.

Will be inviting all faculty to join via both e-mail and letter. Last year, 53% of faculty contributed to dues. 100% of dues are currently going to student scholarships.

Discussion: Should faculty dues be kept solely in student scholarships, or should dues be split between student scholarships and faculty development, or other benefits (e.g., PE building privileges?)

IV. Committee reports: Discussion of LRT document

A. Review of document and changes made since last meeting

1. Discussion: under "Annual Evaluation of Faculty" section, II. F. 4: What to do if there is an impasse between a department chair and a dean as to whether to retain a non-tenure track faculty member. Current practice does not stipulate who makes the decision and currently, legal counsel reviews case by case.

2. Wording change: under “Annual Evaluation of Faculty” section, II. A. 2: change to say, “...committee of a representative faculty member of that department.”
3. Discussion: under “Faculty Tenure” section, II. H: need to discuss what is included in documentation for post-tenure review.
4. Wording change: under “Faculty Tenure” section, II. B. 3: change to say, “The terms and conditions... will be stated in writing at the time of appointment.”
5. Motion (Doug Molash): under “Faculty Tenure” section, II. D. table: change so that Faculty Senate would submit the roster for individuals to serve on the University LRT committee and this roster will be voted on/approved by the faculty of the College.  
Seconded (Carol Ann Modesitt) followed by discussion: faculty senate will determine eligibility and colleges will approve.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

6. Discussion: under “Academic Rank” section, II. C: tenure-track faculty members hired recently will follow new policy but others who were hired under old policy may have a choice between new policy and old policy to apply for new rank.
7. Motion (Doug Molash): under “Academic Rank” section, II. B. 2. a: change to say, “Initial appointments to the rank of assistant professor or to a higher academic rank require the terminal degree in the discipline, or an advanced degree and experience that is accepted by specialized national accrediting agencies...”  
Seconded (Seth Armstrong) followed by discussion: this may take care of exceptional cases in which an individual who does not have terminal degree may advance to tenure-track.

**Motion passed with two abstentions.**

8. Motion (Doug Molash): to accept sections A, B, and C, under policy 6.1 “Faculty Evaluation, Promotion & Tenure” as written with changes according to motions that passed today.  
Seconded (Kenny Laundra) followed by no discussion.

**Motion passed unanimously**

**B. Review of Appendix A: Faculty Planning and Evaluation System (PES)**

1. Comment: gender appropriate language should be used throughout the document
2. Discussion: planning process needs to be less cumbersome; there needs to be room for flexibility if plans have to change; there is not a need to divide plans out according to Fall, Spring and Summer; the process should be carried out with either the department chair or the tenure committee, not both, and there are currently great inconsistencies across campus; this policy may help to protect tenure-track faculty; annual reviews will only applied to non-tenured individuals and will consist of a listing of yearly goals and an assessment of whether that individual achieved those goals.
3. Motion (Doug Molash): move Evaluation Guidelines and Procedures above the Specific Line-Item Instructions

Seconded (Carol Ann) followed by discussion: guidelines would clarify the level of flexibility allowed by the process but guidelines were meant for evaluators; those being evaluated would still benefit from reading these guidelines.

Motion withdrawn (Doug Molash)

4. Other changes to make before further discussion:

- a) In Annual Planning and Report Form, goals should be set per each *Year* instead of each *Term*.
- b) Applications for three year reviews and rank advancement will consist of a faculty member's compilation of previous year's Faculty Annual Evaluation Forms and Overall Evaluation forms.

C. Discussion of Goals for next meeting

1. Please e-mail to Richard Eissinger a list of general guidelines as to what defines Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in a broad sense. Richard will collect these items and compile them for the next meeting.
2. We will be discussing the Post-tenure review policy and what will be included in these reviews.
3. We will be revisiting the Appendices and Forms and wrapping up our discussion next week.

D. Motion to adjourn (David Rees) and second (Kirk Fitzpatrick)