

## MINUTES

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting  
Monday February 6, 2006, 2-3pm  
University Center, room 217

Members Present: Beauvais Lyons (Chair), Basil Antar, Jennifer Beals, Muammer Cetingok, George Dodds, Les Essif, Bart Rohrbach, John Wodarski, Joanne Deeken.

Absent: Ed Jepson.

Invited Guest: Susan Martin

1. Approval of the Minutes of November 21, 2005, approved with the following addition to the first paragraph under #2: Muammer Cetingok suggested to Susan Martin that the incoming faculty be informed about the faculty evaluation process in its most current form as part of their orientation meeting every year.

2. Policy for Future Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation  
Beauvais distributed a copy of language that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee approved at its January meeting for inclusion in the next draft of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Introduction, at the end of paragraph one: "Revisions to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee each spring." Les Essif expressed concern if an individual member of the Faculty Senate could propose revisions to the Manual. Beauvais said that any member of the Faculty Senate was empowered to do so. Additionally, he stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee would work with any concerned faculty to ensure the Manual was fair and consistent.

### 3. Department Head Evaluations

Beauvais distributed a draft of the Heads Evaluation that was used in a pilot study in the Spring of 2004, and which was modified slightly last year. He described the formation of a Task Force in 2003-2004 that developed the form after collecting administrative evaluation forms from several colleges. Muammer and John felt the evaluation form needed to be used to evaluate Associate Deans in small colleges who have responsibilities normally assigned to department heads. Bart advocated that there be a uniform evaluation tool throughout campus. Beauvais indicated that the Faculty Handbook gave units the option of forming their own evaluation tools, however, it was still possible for a common form to be encouraged. In response to a suggestion that the "importance" column be removed, Joann asserted that this could be very useful in helping deans to identify discrepancies between faculty expectations and the performance of a department head. Beauvais indicated that faculty response to the evaluation forms is often as low as 10-20 %. Some reasons suggested by the committee included (1) faculty perception that the evaluation will not make a difference, (2)

concern over a discrepancy between the responses and the summary assessment, (3) lack of faculty confidentiality, (4) the time it takes to fill out the form – especially due to open-ended questions. There was some disagreement regarding if it was best to implement the evaluations by paper or on the web, or both. Beauvais indicated for this year he expected the evaluation would be limited to paper. Specific suggestions for improving the form included (A) making sure that the summary assessment drafted by the dean includes the response rate and numerical scores (high, low and average) to each question (B) the form should indicate that it may be used for Associate Deans with responsibilities normally assigned to Department Heads (c) open-ended questions should be identified as optional, and (D) summary assessments should be compiled in a timely manner for distribution to the faculty.

#### 4. Department Head Manual

An electronic copy of the revised manual was sent to the committee on Friday preceding the meeting. Beauvais and Les commended Susan on the manual in general, and noted several suggestions, including placing more emphasis on the role of heads in upholding department bylaws and the need to correct (p. 17) “Request to Make and Offer” so that it complies with the policy outlined in the Faculty Handbook (3.1.3). Susan confirmed that she has received an electronic copy of the suggestions, and will work to incorporate them.

#### 5. General Discussion

Beauvais will have a meeting with Susan Martin on Feb. 7<sup>th</sup> regarding the incorporation of the Best Practices (A, B, C, and D) documents into the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. There was some discussion of the importance of helping departments revise their bylaws to include procedures to comply with the implementation of peer reviews for faculty going through the promotion and tenure process next year. Les stated that the criteria developed by the Teaching Council for the Chancellor’s Teaching Awards last year might be useful. It was also mentioned that Anne Mayhew has an extensive document on teaching that may prove to be useful. Beauvais said that while he will contact India Lane, Chair of the Teaching Council regarding this matter, he stressed the role of the Faculty Affairs Committee is to ensure bylaws compliance. He stated that it would be most useful to provide examples of department bylaws with regard to peer review of teaching. He hopes to bring this forward at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Due to conflicts, the April 3<sup>rd</sup> Faculty Affairs Meeting will be cancelled.

5. Adjournment: 3:10pm