

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
September 29, 2010**

Present: Robyn Blakeman, Sherry Cox, Todd Freeberg, Steve Thomas and Yang Zhong

Steve Thomas called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm in room 650, Hodges Library

Yang Zhong was selected as secretary for the meeting. Minutes from the meeting on March 29, 2010 were read and approved.

Action items considered

A. Questions about promotion to professor:

1. Do faculty members have the ability to self-nominate for or initiate the promotion process without department support?
2. Is there any restriction on the amount of times they can apply or the length of time between applications?

These two questions were posed to the committee by the Council of Deans last year. The committee's response was a resolution, presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Council on April 19, 2010, proposing to insert the following new paragraph between the two existing paragraphs of section 3.10 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

After serving at least the prescribed five years as an associate professor, a faculty member should consult with his or her department head before initiating promotion procedures. The final decision on proceeding rests with the faculty member. However, if a bid for promotion is unsuccessful, the faculty member must wait at least two years before applying again for promotion.

The Executive Council discussed the resolution and returned it to the committee with recommendations for revisions. After some discussion, taking the concerns expressed by the council into consideration, a motion was made to amend the resolution to insert the following paragraph between the two existing paragraphs of section 3.10 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

An associate professor should consult with his or her department head before initiating promotion procedures. The final decision of proceeding rests with the faculty member. However, if the faculty member is denied promotion after completion of the process described in the next paragraph, then he or she must forgo at least one full promotion cycle before again initiating promotion procedures.

The motion received a second and passed by voice vote.

B. Documents suggesting changes to the *Faculty Handbook* and *Manuel for Faculty Evaluation* regarding advising and mentoring.

Two documents have been received by the committee from the campus Task Force on Advising. The first document had been considered by the committee on March 29, 2010. The second document was received by S. Thomas during the summer and distributed in advance of this meeting.

In brief, the first document recommends revising the *Faculty Handbook* by (a) deleting a sentence from section 2.22 Teaching and adding a new paragraph in that same section on the importance of advising and mentoring students; and (b) adding “advisors and mentors” to the requirements at each rank in section 3.2, Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank. It also recommends revising the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* by (a) changing “teaching” to “teaching/advising” in various places, and (b) adding a statement in Part IV, B., 3. b, requiring the department head, as part of the promotion or tenure review, to conduct “an assessment of the candidate’s advising and mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students with input from students and peers, as appropriate.”

The second document recommends revising the *Faculty Handbook* by (a) amending the sentence in section 2.22 that the previous document recommended deleting; and, (b) adding to the present appendix 2 entitled “Teaching/Learning Guidelines” a new section on “Academic Advising and Mentoring.” This document also recommends amending the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* by changing the title of “Best Practices for Assessment and Review of Faculty Teaching” to “Best Practices for Assessment and Review of Faculty Teaching and Advising/Mentoring” and inserting a paragraph on Academic Advising Expertise and Assessment.

Discussion ensued on the recommendations presented in each of these documents. Concern was expressed about how to evaluate or measure faculty advising and mentoring activities. S. Thomas noted that this same concern was raised during discussions last year. S. Gardial had indicated that the Task Force on Advising – and, in particular, Ruth Darling – was working on methods that could be applied. Doubt was expressed whether changing “teaching” to “teaching/advising” throughout the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* was really necessary. Might it not be sufficient to include a statement to the effect that advising and mentoring are important aspects of teaching and that, wherever appropriate, these aspects should be included in any evaluation of teaching effectiveness? S. Thomas agreed to explore that possibility.

C. Outreach and Engagement

During the summer, S. Thomas was asked the status of an outstanding issue of old business. The following quotation is from last year’s committee report to the Executive Council, under section Unfinished Business from Earlier Years:

“Also during the 2007-08 academic year, Nan Gaylord and Sally McMillan – as members of the Policy Committee of the Chancellor’s Academic Outreach and Engagement Council – reported the following as a recommendation for a change to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* from that a meeting with then Provost Holub: “Provost Holub thought that the committee's recommendation

to include on p. 33, a new 2.b. which would state "any statements from administrators, community collaborators or peer reviews regarding engagement in outreach teaching" would be appropriate."

After some discussion, a motion made to amend the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, Part II, B. 2 (Documents Prepared by the Faculty Member), by inserting the following statement as point b and designating the present points "b" through "f" as "c" through "g."

"b. any statements from administrators, community collaborators or peer reviews regarding engagement in outreach teaching;"

The motion received a second and passed by voice vote.

D. Assessment Surveys for Deans and Department Heads

Committee members were asked to look over the surveys and the committee will discuss the feedbacks at its next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Yang Zhong