

Faculty Council Minutes for Thursday, February 19, 2009

Venue: 221 Chambers Bldg **Time:** 2:30 – 4:30 PM

1. Approval of the Minutes from January 22, 2009.
2. Announcements by the Chair
 - 2.1. Thank you to all who were able to attend the University Senate visit on Feb. 2nd. A summary of the meeting will be circulated later this semester.
 - 2.2. Election Updates – Jonna Kulikowich re-elected to University Senate (Rose Zbiek, first alternate); 7 nominations for College P&T; 1 nomination for Graduate Council
 - 2.3. The deadline for faculty, staff, and student awards is Feb. 27th.
 - 2.4. Date Saver – April 16th meeting **changed to April 23rd** due to AERA.
3. Special Guest Dr. Bowen, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs – Discussion of HR 40 and the role of peer review in the fifth-year extended review process. Dr. Bowen shared the process used by the Department of Agricultural Science. According to their fifth-year extended review process, there are three options associated with the initial review by the Department Head: (1) progress is determined to be unacceptable, the faculty member agrees, and an improvement plan is developed; (2) progress is determined to be unacceptable, the faculty member disagrees, and the P&T committee reviews the case; or (3) the review is acceptable, but the faculty member disagrees with particular statements in the written review, and the P&T committee reviews the case. FC discussed the relationship between this process and tenure withdrawal (HR 70). Dr. Bowen stated that it is rare for a fifth-year review to result in the HR 70 process. FC expressed satisfaction with the current process and questioned the need for change. Dr. Bowen noted that his biggest concern, and that of Faculty Senate, was not that each department had the same process, but that fifth-year reviews were being conducted. FC members indicated that they might support peer review as an option for faculty members when there is disagreement with the evaluation of the Department Head, but not as an absolute process for each case. FC members asked for clarification about whether this proposed change would be an option or mandatory for departments and, if it is determined to be optional, the Chair of FC agreed to discuss potential revisions to the original 9/16/08 memo with the Dean. These revisions would reflect that this would be an option for departments, not a mandated policy change.
4. Fixed-Term Promotion Guidelines (HR 21) – Discussion of feedback from faculty on proposed guidelines v. 4. Faculty Senate asked colleges to review/create guidelines for promotion of FT faculty. There were some concerns expressed about the third criterion under qualifications: “professional engagement related to teaching, research, and/or advising, if relevant.” A member of the College, who was concerned about the inclusion of a research criterion proposed the following change to the language, “Contributions to the program/unit/department as a whole in terms of curriculum development, collaborative involvement with tenure line and fixed-term faculty, administrative, and organizational functions if relevant.” Another member of the College expressed concern about the

requirement for a Ph.D. (or an equivalent). This is a concern for some degrees, such as the MFA, which is the terminal degree in that particular field. FC members recommend adding language that reflects inclusion of any terminal degree. Some members of the College also expressed concern over the use of the term “professor” rather than “instructor.” Associate Dean Edmonson commented that according to her understanding, the decision was made to make the positions more appealing to doctoral level candidates. Other questions included clarification about the flexibility in which materials are required. FC members recommended that there should be two tiers of materials submitted. One category should include materials that are required by all applicants and a second category that is specific to the function of their position. Other key questions discussed included: (a) composition of the department committee – members and number; (b) the process for moving forward without the support of the Department Head; and (c) opportunities for resubmission in the case of a negative decision. Some members of the College also expressed concern over the process used to develop this proposal and wondered if there would be value in having some faculty and fixed-term faculty review the proposal thoroughly and provide feedback to FC. FC agreed and Carla will take the next steps.

5. Comments by Associate Dean, Jackie Edmondson, who represented Dean Monk at the meeting. Topics and instructors for First Year Seminars were distributed. Associate Dean Edmonson is discussing the College’s Strategic Plan with the Provost. The proposal for the Governor’s budget was better than expected, however, there is concern that the budget will not be approved. As a result, the university is responding conservatively. The Deans were asked to plan for a 2% permanent recycling to administration. No current searches will be cancelled, however, no new searches are being approved. The Dean remains supportive of the Center for Educational and Developmental Sciences led by Drs. Murphy and Farmer and the Innovation Studio.
6. Reports From Standing Committees
 - 6.1. Committee on Graduate Studies and Research Policy [JoLynn Carney, Chair; Deb Smith, Vice Chair; Members: Dana Mitra (EPS), Fred Schied (LPS), Bonnie Meyer (ESPSE)]
 - 6.2. Committee on Curricular Affairs (Linda Mason, Chair; Nona Prestine, Vice Chair)
 - 6.3. Committee on Faculty, Staff and Student Concerns (Frank Rusch, Chair; Lisa Lattuca, Vice Chair)
 - 6.4. Committee on Academic Integrity (Simon Hooper, Chair)
7. News from Faculty Senate –The Committee on Committees and Rules has created a new committee that is considering global programs. A taskforce has also been created to consider intellectual property issues.
8. Communications to the Council

9. Unfinished business – Dean Monk is committed to shared governance. He does also appreciate the need for open exchange of ideas among faculty and FC members. As a group, FC needs to get innovative about how to create spaces for the open exchange of ideas.

10. New business

11. Forensic business – FC recommends a forensic session for understanding the hiring process for fixed-term faculty. Some members of FC expressed concerns about the amount of involvement by faculty members in hiring decisions (versus Department Head appointing). FC will revisit this issue during the next meeting.

12. Comments and recommendations for the good of the College