

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
2012-2013

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
January 22, 2013
3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

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

I. Administrative reports
Provost Maynard:

- President in Naples, FL for Foundation Board meeting.
- ML King dinner was well done again this year.
- Flu notice sent out to faculty and students.
- Second class of Physician Assistant students went through white coat ceremony Sunday.

II. Chair report
V. Sheets: No report

III. **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Executive Committee Minutes of January 8, 2013 (B. Kilp/A. Anderson; vote: 8-0-0)

IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:

- *In light of the campus shooting in Texas today, are we training everyone on a plan if there is an active shooter on campus?* Response: *We have had these conversations at the Deans level, but the discussions probably haven't gotten down to everyone.* Response: *Every building is supposed to have an emergency response plan. Bill Mercier and his team have well thought out plans in dealing with this.*
- *Do we yet have fall to spring retention data?* Response: *It is on the agenda for next week.*
- There was a request to discuss a delay of the effective date for faculty two-year review until the fall 2014 and that the 2013-14 academic year be used as another pilot.

V. New Business:

- a. Proposal for Automation and Control Engineering Technology Minor

MOTION TO APPROVE Automation and Control Engineering Technology
Minor (K. Bolinger/A. Anderson; vote: 8-0-0)

- b. Identification of a Volunteer for ITSAC [an IT advisory sub-committee]

Dr. Sheets asked EC members to think of possible volunteers for the committee and bring recommendations to January 29, 2013 meeting.

- c. Biennial Evaluation Procedures

This document attempts to address concerns/issues brought up by FAC and also representatives from Academic Affairs and Senate Executive
Committee. Discussion concerning the FAC and AA/EC changes.

Page 3, Process point 2-*Why is grade distributions in there?*

I need Comment: *I know as a chair, that distribution would inform me if there are issues to talk to the faculty about.*

argument Comment: *I don't think you can look at a grade distribution and make an about a person being a great teacher or being a poor teacher.*

colleagues. Comment: *There has to be a process. We have to have some trust in our*

Comment: This is only one piece of evidence in each department.

page *How long is the required information to be? Response: One page data sheet, 3 report, then up to 5 pages of attachments. Up to 9 pages max.*

functioning Concerning the entire process/document: *No one is 100% happy with the entire document. But the problem is that historically, we had a few non-departments allowed to continue that way for a long time.*

MOTION TO REVISE the Faculty Performance Evaluation (biennial review)
Process in response to the charge to propose an appeals process and any other changes resulting from the review of the pilot run during 2010-11 for the biennial faculty review process [See FAC motion as presented to CAAC] (T. Hawkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 8-0-0)

- IV. **MOTION TO ADJOURN** (B. Kilp/A.Anderson; vote: 8-0-0) at 5:25 p.m.