

Faculty Senate Special Session
Thursday, September 30, 2004, 3:00 p.m.
AD 313, Executive Council Meeting Room
Subject: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document

I. Call to order by President David Rees

In attendance: David Rees (President), Luciane Berg (President-elect; also proxy for Kenny Laundra), Seth Armstrong (Treasurer), Helen Boswell (Secretary), Doug Molash (Parliamentarian; also proxy for Paul Ocampo), Kathy Black, Arlene Braithwaite, Shawn Christiansen (also proxy for Artis Grady), Greg Colf (proxy for Rob Robertson), Kim Craft, Richard Eissinger, Robert Eves (also proxy for Ty Redd), John Eye, Kirk Fitzpatrick, Scott Hansen, Elise Leahy, Carol Ann Modesitt, Art Porter, Jeff Salehi.

II. Review and approval of minutes.

Motion (Arlene Braithwaite) to approve minutes from April 29 and special sessions.
Seconded (Carol Ann Modesitt)

Motion passed unanimously

III. Discussion of LRT document draft

A. Faculty Tenure Section, II. H. 1. a., Post-tenure Review, Items to be Evaluated, Teaching Effectiveness

1. Motion (Arlene Braithwaite): "A minimum of one standardized student evaluation instrument will be administered once a semester and included as documentation as a representative sample of courses taught."

Seconded (Richard Eissinger) followed by discussion: should student evaluations be given once a year or once a semester as a minimum; student evaluation system as a whole needs to be evaluated as to its worth.

Motion withdrawn.

2. Motion (Robert Eves): Tenured faculty will be evaluated the minimum of once a semester.

Seconded (Arlene Braithwaite) followed by no further discussion.

Motion passed with one opposed.

3. Motion (Robert Eves): Standardized student evaluation instrument will be used to evaluate tenured faculty.

Seconded (Elise Leahy) followed by no further discussion.

Motion passed with one opposed and one abstention.

4. Motion (Bob Eves): Evaluations will be from a representative sample of courses taught over the five year review period for tenured faculty.

Seconded (Elise Leahy) followed by no further discussion.

Motion passed with one opposed.

5. Motion (Bob Eves): Choice of evaluations to be administered for tenured faculty will be a random choice by the department secretary.
Seconded (Doug Molash) followed by discussion: this will help to facilitate the need to have a true representative sample; it will always be important for faculty to evaluate the results.
Motion defeated with only two in favor.
6. Motion (Arlene Braithwaite): Courses to be evaluated will be agreed upon by the tenured faculty member and the department chair.
Second (Doug Molash) followed by discussion: need to clarify how to select courses to facilitate an across-the-board evaluation.
Motion defeated with 8 in favor, 11 opposed, 1 abstention.
7. Motion (Kirk Fitzpatrick): Courses to be evaluated will be chosen by the tenured faculty member
Seconded (John Eye) followed by no further discussion.
Motion passed with 17 in favor, 3 opposed.

B. Faculty Tenure Section, II. H. 4. Post-tenure review.

1. Discussion: Provost recommends that results of post tenure review be forwarded to the college LRT committee for approval and ratification; would this protect the faculty and maintain consistency; might be better to forward to department LRT.
2. Motion (Greg Colf): Post tenure review will be submitted to department chair for review and comment and then forwarded to the department LRT committee for review and comment.
Seconded (Robert Eves) followed by discussion: it would be better to have chair review first, followed by the department LRT to be consistent with other reviews.
Motion passed unanimously
3. Motion (Kathy Black): Results of post-tenure review will be forwarded to college LRT committee for approval and ratification.
Seconded (Shawn Christiansen) followed by discussion: this would protect the department or university in any decision-making process; this would back up any decisions about need for faculty development.
Motion passed with 10 in favor.

C. Other changes to Faculty Tenure Section, 6. 1. D.

1. Post-tenure Schedule needs to be reworked.
2. II. H. 7. change wording to, "This plan, with supporting documentation, will be forwarded to the Dean."
3. Faculty Tenure Section, II. H. 8. change wording to, "In the event that several annual evaluations (as defined in II. H. 7)..."
4. Faculty Tenure Section, II. A. change wording to, "Tenure-track appointments, after the date of the implementation of this new policy, will only be given to those

members of the faculty who, at the time of such appointments meet the minimum requirements specified in policy 6.1.C.”

D. Academic Rank Section, 6.1.C. Reopened.

1. Motion (Robert Eves): Names for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty should not be the same.

Seconded (Kathy Black) followed by discussion: use of instructor, lecturer, or other terminology may be used.

Motion passed with two abstentions.

2. Motion (Doug Molash): Non-tenure track faculty will be called Instructor and Senior Instructor.

Seconded (Greg Colf) followed by no discussion.

Motion defeated with none in favor.

E. Motion (Helen Boswell): Forward the document, with changes as made today, to Dean’s council with a request that they include strike-outs and bolded changes.

Seconded (Arlene Braithwaite)

Motion passed with 13 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

F. IRB policy and graduate faculty policies will be forwarded to senators for comment.

G. Graduate handbook: Department chairs or representative from departments proposing, or who have in place, graduate programs will be asked to work on handbook.

H. Collection of faculty concerns to bring to President Bennion’s Advisory Council:

1. A plan to increase faculty salaries needs to be a number one priority.
2. Senior members of faculty are concerned that new faculty are being hired with higher salaries than they have – salary compression and inequities are major concerns that need to be resolved.
3. On-line and distance classes are not being compensated equitably and have no associated contract.
4. PE facility use by faculty and waiver of fees for use needs to be discussed.
5. Spring break needs to be during the basketball tournaments or should be coordinated with other schools so that employees have time with their families.
6. Spring break needs to be for faculty too, not just the students!
7. Inequitable teaching loads are being encouraged by the Provost due to release time being allocated to faculty conducting scholarship and grant writing.
8. Provost development fund money allows for release time during the semester but not summers; i.e., it does not allow for faculty salary for the summer for writing articles or funding research.
9. Need to consider objectivity in assigning merit pay.

I. Move to adjourn (Luciane Berg) and seconded (Doug Molash).

Next meeting will be October 21st. Executive Council will meet on October 14th.