Faculty Senate Meeting
19 January 2016

In Attendance: Scott Ardoin, Merrily Dunn, Bernadette Heckman, Roger Hill, Rebecca Lieberman Betz, Paula Schwanenflugel, Ellan Evans, Thomas Baker, Jori Hall, Andrew Gitlin, Ryan Smith, Julie Luft, Liz Phillips

Once member quorum was established, the faculty senate meeting began:
Ardoin commenced the meeting with Agenda Item 1:
a. Ardoin proposed that Scholarship Committee members be increased from four members to five. No concerns were raised by faculty on this change.
b. A faculty senate vote was called and the final vote was 11 yea, 0 nay.
c. Ardoin ended the discussion by noting that the FS Operating Manual will be revised to reflect the approved change for an increased number of members (i.e., 5 members) on the Scholarship Committee.

2.) Ardoin introduced Agenda Item 2 pertaining to COE Annual Evaluations:
d. Ardoin began the discussion by noting that all faculty will have the opportunity to list and document Service work in their Annual Evaluation report that each COE faculty member submits with their Elements. He also noted that the COE annual evaluation is a “draft proposal” and that the document should be circulated to all COE faculty for review and feedback. Ardoin then opened up the meeting for a discussion to obtain initial feedback from the faculty senate.
e. Concerns were raised regarding the potential implementation of the proposal in the spring. If implemented in the spring, this might not give faculty sufficient time to provide feedback and suggestions to the proposal.
f. Those who have been involved with discussion at the Provost-level reported that they are unsure of the timeline for the implementation of the proposal. Currently, the expectation is that it will be circulated to all COE faculty across departments and then reviewed with feedback to the Dean’s Office. However, due to the ambiguity regarding the timeline of this review process and the proposal’s implementation, it was recommended that the faculty senate take a proactive stance and inform their own department faculty that the annual evaluation proposal represents a developmental (i.e., “in progress”) document and not one that is “summative.” Accordingly, faculty should be empowered to provide feedback that has the potential to revise the proposal before implementation.
g. Discussion on the annual evaluation proposal also focused on the content related to the remediation plan that was recommended in the proposal to address unsatisfactory domains in the faculty member’s performance. Concerns were raised that such evaluations have the potential to usurp the significance of a 3rd year reviews and may result in yearly evaluations.
h. Questions were also raised regarding faculty appeal process to the annual evaluation decision and what that process would involve. It was also noted that COE does not have its own faculty appeal process. All appeals would
follow the university level appeal process procedures (link is now available in our COE website).

i. Finally, concerns were raised regarding the timeframe covered by any remediation plans related to the annual evaluations. Several faculty members expressed concern over the language on merit raises and the ineligible faculty for such raises if currently under a remediation plan. It was suggested that such language be removed from the proposal.

j. The important role of faculty senate to represent the faculty as a "union" was raised. It was acknowledged that without this representation, faculty would have no voice or protection in the college or university.

k. There was general agreement from the faculty that the proposal was largely focused on remediation related to unsatisfactory annual evaluations with relatively less information or guidelines on the annual evaluation process and standards. It was suggested that the remediation procedures and the annual evaluation content be presented as two separate documents and treated separately.

l. Additionally, it was noted that the document does a poor job of describing the evaluation process. It contains no guidelines or standards to promote fairness and equity within and across departments. It was recommended that department bylaws should contain these guidelines.

m. After much discussion, Ardoin requested that we move to the next agenda item in the interest of time. He suggested that we resume discussion of this annual evaluation proposal at the next faculty senate meeting. He also encouraged all faculty to distribute the proposal to their respective department faculty to initiate review and feedback.

3.) Ardoin updated faculty senate on Agenda Item #3:

a. He informed faculty senate that Janette Hill has distributed e-mail request to department heads for nomination to COE and university level committees.

b. The Dean evaluation will be made available to faculty for their completion in the next few weeks. Please look for the evaluation's distribution and encourage department faculty to complete the evaluation.

c. Also reminded faculty senate that election for faculty senate president elect will occur later this spring.

4.) Finally, Agenda Item #4 was covered regarding COE medical leave:

a. Heckman provide a brief review of the document’s purpose. The following feedback was provided by faculty:
   - FMLA and other similar links listed at the bottom of the medical leave proposal draft should be moved to the beginning of the document.
   - The document would benefit from the addition of subheadings and improved structure.
   - The document needs to be more explicit with statements indicating that the Dean’s Office will provide the necessary resources needed for the department under these extenuating circumstances and when requested by faculty. Perhaps specific examples should be provided when discussing resources from the Associate Dean’s office.
• Please bring document to your respective department faculty for review and feedback.

Announcements:
• Spring Faculty Senate Meetings will be held on Tuesdays at 10:00 – 11:30. Meeting dates are listed below.
  o February, 16
  o 3/15
  o 4/19 selection of new President Elect