

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting of March 2, 2009**

Present: Joan Heminway (Chair); Roxanne Hovland; Norman Magden; Julia Malia; Molly Royse; Steve Thomas; Gary Ubben. Guest Sarah Gardial joined the meeting in progress.

The meeting was held in the Faculty Lounge of the College of Law and was called to order when a quorum was reached at approximately 2:30 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting on February 16, 2009 were approved unanimously, with no changes being noted.

Unfinished Business

Discussion focused on various documents that would be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at its meeting on March 9, 2009 with the intention of placing these issues on the agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting on March 23, 2009.

- Annual Faculty Review Report: Copies of the pilot and regular versions of these documents were reviewed. These forms were revised slightly to (1) change the statement that the faculty member's signature indicates participation in the review process and receipt of a copy of the review without implying agreement with the rating provided and (2) add a sentence about the right to submit a rebuttal statement in response and giving the timing requirement for this response.
- Faculty External Compensation and Consulting Annual Application and Approval Form: A fresh copy of this form was reviewed. This form was revised to remove references to "application" and "approval" (since the *Faculty Handbook* does not require pre-approval for consulting) and to indicate the form was a report of activities undertaken in the previous year or anticipated in the coming year. Reference to "Appendix 9 – General Policy: Conflict of Interest" was removed (since the *Handbook*, already referenced in that sentence, incorporates that Appendix), and that sentence was edited to replace "the provisions contained therein" with "the applicable provisions of this Chapter" (referring to Chapter 7 of the *Faculty Handbook*). Additional wording was added on both sides of the form to indicate that details of the employment would be provided to the extent that they did not violate the need for confidentiality of the client.
- Proposed Changes Regarding the Annual Review Process: This document, which had been reviewed in detail during the February meeting, was initially accepted as presented.
- Proposed Changes Regarding the Retention Review Process: In addition to a few typographical and grammatical changes, this document was revised to add a statement under the section outlining the review by the tenured faculty (section B.1.b. of Part I of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*) to indicate that statements should become part of the record of the tenured faculty's deliberations only if they are based on documented or substantiated information. "Rumors" or "hear-say" statements have no place in the report or in the deliberation during this meeting. J. Heminway noted that the "no rumor" should be applied to all meetings at which evaluations take place, whether the meeting is connected with retention review, promotion, tenure, or the annual review. Accordingly, a conforming change was made to the proposed changes to the *Manual for Faculty*

Evaluation on annual review processes (section B.4.a. of Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*).

- Draft Memorandum to the Faculty Senate Regarding the Proposed Annual Review and Retention Review Changes: With minor grammatical changes, the memorandum was approved.
- Proposed Draft Resolutions For Adoption at the March Faculty Senate Meeting: With minor formatting changes, the resolutions were approved. J. Heminway noted that the changes to the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* would need to be timed to take place together. It was agreed that, since *Handbook* changes require additional review, the effectiveness of changes to the *Manual* should be deferred and coordinated with the effectiveness of related changes to the *Handbook*.

A motion was made to approve these documents, as revised at this meeting, and to refer them as a group to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for consideration at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 23, 2009. The motion received a second and passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. Heminway and S. Gardial presented concerns regarding the procedure for the annual evaluation and re-appointment of department heads and the annual evaluation of deans. In some cases, rates of return of evaluative responses from faculty members have been extremely low. These low response rates raise two problems. How should a dean (in the case of a department head) or the Provost (in the case of a dean) view either strongly positive or strongly negative evaluations coming from only a small percentage of the faculty? Moreover, what type of data about the responding faculty member (tenured/tenure-track; years of service; etc.) should be collected and how should these data be summarized for the department head or dean to best categorize, but avoid identifying, the few responders? Across all departments and colleges, participation in the review process needs to be encouraged and improved. S. Gardial noted that Interim Provost Martin intends to engage in the department head and dean evaluation processes this spring, and she agreed to approach the Interim Provost about encouraging faculty senators, at a future Senate meeting, to participate in the evaluation process. J. Heminway suggested that Senate caucus chairs be strongly encouraged to contact the faculty members in their units to encourage participation.

With no further business to conduct at this time, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Thomas