

Approved 8-0-0
13
1/22/2013

EC #

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
2012-2013

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
January 08, 2013
3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, J. Conant, T. Hawkins, E. Lorenzen, B. Kilp,
C. Olsen, T. Sawyer
Absent:
Ex Officio: President Bradley; Provost Maynard
Guests: D. Hantzis

- I. Administrative reports
President Bradley:
 - The President speaks before the House Ways and Means Committee on Wednesday.
 - The President requested the Faculty work deliberately and quickly on the Task Force reports so they can be presented to the Board in May.
 - The President indicated that the Search Committee for the Provost was moving smoothly and as scheduled.
- II. Chair report; V. Sheets:
 - Virgil requested the EC to set aside the following dates – February 4, 6, 19, and 25 @ 4:30 to interview the Provost candidates. There will be open sessions and faculty sessions with the candidates.
 - Virgil met with Council of Governance Chairs along with John and Tom. It was a very informative session.
- III. **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Executive Committee Minutes of December 4, 2012 (A. Anderson/B. Kilp; vote: 9-0-0)
- IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:
 - Provost Maynard indicated “Sedona” has been terminated for a variety of valid reasons. A Plan B will be developed for the two-year reviews by the end of the semester for next fall.
 - Ice on the sidewalks and in the parking lots, what can be done to clear a central path to the parking areas from the buildings.
- V. New Business:
 - a. Nominations for Nominating Committee (for Faculty member on CHE)

MOTION TO APPROVE Nominations for Nominating Committee

It was moved that John and Virgil get together and determine who would serve in this capacity for ISU. (A. Anderson/C. Olsen; Vote: 9-0-0)

b. Policy on Policies

MOTION TO APPROVE Policy on Policies (A. Anderson/B. Kilp; Vote: 9-0-0)

- There was some discussion regarding the definition of “primary” and “secondary”.
- There was some discussion regarding when an interim report would be due.

It was decided to change “will” to “may” in Section 226.2.4.1.

c. Revision to 305.10

MOTION TO APPROVE Revisions on 305.10 (J. Conant/A. Anderson; Vote: 9-0-

0)

Please note that the comments introducing the draft should read on page 1, “*Hiring Procedures for Regular Faculty Appointments*” addresses... Please strike “*does not actually*”.

Summary of Recommended revisions: fully implement the changes in faculty classifications adopted in August 2011 by striking references to “Special Purpose Faculty” and inserting appropriate references to Regular Non-Tenure Track faculty (i.e. Instructors); add the hiring process governing appointment of non-tenure track faculty (regular and temporary) to the Handbook, rather than relegating the process to the status of guidelines maintained by Academic Affairs to ensure transparency, consistency, and faculty review of the process.

This will serve to clean up some of the language in the handbook. Handbook organization is another matter.

d. Revision to 305.11

MOTION TO APPROVE Revisions to 305.11 (J. Conant/B. Kilp)

Recommended changes:

- a. Revise language to fully implement the faculty classification changes reflected in section 305.2 (Regular and Temporary Faculty) by striking references to “Special Purpose Faculty” and inserting appropriate references to Regular, non-tenure track Faculty (i.e. Instructors);
- b. Add annual review procedures for both classifications of non-tenure track faculty-regular and temporary-that include peer review, chair, and dean review and, in the case of regular non-tenure track faculty, an appeal option to a termination recommendation.

Departments need to make sure there are evaluative criteria in place and instructors are aware of the criteria.

A default set of criteria need to be established for departments that currently do not have their own criteria.

Expectations need to be presented at time of hire. These same expectations could be used as evaluative criteria.

MOTION TO TABLE

Send back to FAC for clarifications and FAC to return revised document by the February 12th EC meeting (T. Sawyer/T. Hawkins; Vote: 8-0-0)

Clarifications for -

- Dates for renewals
- Evaluation process within the department
- After six successful annual reviews, evaluations will become bi-annual
- Appeals process
- What happens upon termination ... revert to lecturer for one-year
- What are the criteria for evaluation?

IV. INFORMATIONAL

- FAC presented information regarding a revision of the bi-annual Performance Evaluation.

As the document is written, faculty members are to submit materials for a meaningful bi-annual review September 1, 2013. As is noted, faculty will be reviewed based on criteria a lot of them do not have yet because departments have not created their criteria across the university. *“That is not the definition of fair.”*

Is the dean responsible, chair responsible? Where is the responsible party?

Concern is there is still a lot of confusion.

We need a default set of evaluation criteria. Basically colleges and departments will be told this is your default set if you don't develop your own.

Appeals calendar outline was not included in the original document. This provides specific dates.

V. MOTION TO ADJOURN (B. Kilp/C. Olsen; vote: 8-0-0) 5:40 at p.m.