1. **Attendance:** The following individuals were in attendance at the COE FS Fall Faculty Retreat. After an introduction of all individuals in attendance and attending to housekeeping issues including roster updates, the meeting began.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President(s)/Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Ellen Evans; Scott Adroin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td>Denise Spangler; COE Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHDS</td>
<td>Bernadette Heckman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Roger Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSE</td>
<td>Bethany Hamilton-Jones; Rebecca Lieberman-Betz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>Laine Bradshaw; Ashley Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETAP</td>
<td>Jim Garrett; Kathy Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINS</td>
<td>Thomas Baker; Chris Mojock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Andrew Gitlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLED</td>
<td>Misha Cahnmann-Taylor; Amy Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Julie Luft*; Ryan Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Indicates proxy for David Jackson (MSE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **COE-FS Committee Appointments:** We began with a conversation regarding sub-committee appointments and the following were appointed with Senate vote approval:
   A. Steering Committee: Jim Garrett, Janette Hill, Rebecca Lieberman-Betz (1 year)
   B. Recorder: Ryan Smith
   C. Parliamentarian: Roger Hill
   D. Administrator Feedback Committee: Scott suggested those who serve on the Steering committee also serve for this upcoming year

3. **College Standing and University Committees Update:** Scott Ardoin provided an overview and update of the various committees with the following generating discussion:
   A. Curriculum Committee:
      1. We are looking to change the curriculum committee because all but one person would be rotating off the committee at the same time (Spring 2017). As such, Scott proposed we try to elect a new group in December and those would serve one additional semester so the new committee members would have 2-3 current committee members to mentor them.
      2. Roger Hill stated that we should consider thinking about having a few individuals continue to serve because there is a history not only across years, but within years. Scott suggested we don't ask the senior members to leave; perhaps we have the stay on the committee and just don't give them voting rights.
      3. Next steps: Scott will be working with Laura and communicating with Department Heads to appoint individuals to fill these vacancies.
   B. Nominating Committee:
      1. Ellen needs to be replaced on this committee.
      2. Denise Spangler will be asked to assist with this task
C. University Council Committees
   1. Various individuals expressed concern regarding the process with which
      individuals are asked to serve and the different rules for each committee are
      confusing.
   2. It was suggested that we appoint individuals to serve on UC committees
      by going in order of department and also ask UC committee members to serve
      on a sub-committee.
   3. Next Steps: Ellen is meeting with Denise Spangler to discuss her role
      with Faculty Senate and how we can work productively together in the area of
      committee assignment.

4. Communications: Ellen began a discussion of communications with regard to archived
   files, interactive communications and the website. Major considerations were accessibility and
   transparency, historical documentation, safety and security. Options that were discussed were
   S: Drive, OneDrive, Basecamp, Google Drive and eLc.
   A. Archived Files:
      1. Will be placed in a designated S: Drive organized by year.
      2. Accessibility will be given to all Senators (or anyone else who requests
         access to the files).
      3. As suggested by Roger Hill, Read Only will protect the files.
   B. Working Documents: No decision was reached regarding working files. Thus, the
      conversation will continue into the October meeting to arrive at a consensus.
   C. Website: Time did not permit a conversation of this topic; thus it will roll into the
      October meeting. Ellen will meet with Jen Williams to formulate a plan.

5. Faculty Performance Initiative (FPI): As COE Associate Dean of Faculty and Staff
   Affairs, Denise Spangler joined the FS meeting to discuss the FPI.
   A. In December 2015, the Provost attempted to introduce a new Faculty
      Performance Initiative which was met with much resistance; therefore, it was pulled back
      to afford colleges time to gain input from impacted individuals and organize procedures.
   B. Denise discussed the COE committee that was formed to formulate the COE
      policy, and the following 3 main issues that were discussed which are captured on the
      working draft:
      1. No raises while on probation; changed
      2. Included within the P&T materials; changed, record stands by itself
      3. Plan is not appealable
   C. Both Denise and Ellen stressed that a key role for Faculty Senate members was
      to discuss this issue with their respective faculties and gain input either personally or
      through the COEfyi link provided by Denise to progress this policy for vote at the
      November FS meeting as the FPI will be implemented for the FAR 2016. Faculty also
      have the option not to give feedback. It was also highlighted that the FPI is not optional
      and is being mandated by central campus; rather the FS can assist the improvement of
      the process and the document.
   D. A discussion, both philosophical and pragmatic, commenced for the remainder of
      the meeting time with highlighted topics being the following:
      1. Why not part of Post-tenure review? FPI is every 2 years where post-
         tenure review is every 5 years. Post-tenure review doesn’t have major
         consequences as evidenced by the small number of individuals who do not pass
         post-tenure review. Post-tenure review is now being reviewed at the university
level and a white paper is being written. The FPI is more proactive regarding declining productivity.

2. What does tenure mean in the context of the FPI? Denise highlighted that there are two primary questions for tenure: 1) Is this person going to be productive? 2) Is there a continuing need for their services? Tenure should protect faculty member’s intellectual scholarship. Importantly, it was stressed that the FPI is designed to be proactive to prevent a major decline in productivity which would render a faculty member at risk during post-tenure review.

3. How do other aspirant institutions manage post-tenure review? Denise has a spreadsheet summarizing various approaches. Ellen added that is highly variable based on her experience with the Post-Tenure Review working committee at central campus this last year.

4. What triggers FPI review? Two consecutive years of poor performance (“does not meet expectations”) from the department review procedures and annual evaluation process.

5. It was noted that Career-Track faculty are not included in the FPI due to the nature of their contract.

6. Should COE-FS support or reject the FPI? Some Senators stated that perhaps we should not be a facilitator for the administration. It was further stated that although the FPI was being framed as helpful, it was felt by many that it was punitive and as such it was questioned if FS should support the policy.

6. **Meeting Adjourned:** The meeting was adjourned due to the time being 11:30am. Items that were rolled over to next meeting’s agenda include communications (active and website) and the FPI document. The next COE-FS meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 18th, 2016 at 10am in Aderhold G23.