

Faculty Affairs Committee  
23 January 2013

Minutes 2012-13/MEETING #7  
**APPROVED JANUARY 30, 2013**

3:45-5:00  
HMSU 227

Present: Lindsey Eberman, Darlene Hantzis, Michael Harmon, Jolynn Kuhlman, John Pommier, Betty Phillips, Michelle Morahn (contingent faculty liaison)

Absent: Tim Hawkins (Senate Executive Committee liaison), Marsha Miller, Nancy Rogers (Academic Affairs liaison)

Future Agenda Items

January 30 -- Motion re non-tenure track faculty evaluation process; faculty profile data  
February 6 -- Review of Taskforce Reports (University College, Textbook)  
February 13 -- Report on Review of Constitutions (John & Lindsey-COT; Marsh and Michael-CNHHS; Betty & Jolynn--Library; Darlene will read all three)

Meeting Notes

Reports:

1. Tim Hawkins (Executive Committee liaison) -- absent
2. Michelle Morahn (Contingent Faculty liaison) -- suggested need for clarification/revision in evaluation process for Instructors and Lecturers as it describes consequence of candidate withdrawing from review process and appeal options
3. Nancy Rogers (Academic Affairs liaison) -- absent

Darlene Hantzis (Chair) -- (a) Met with Executive Committee January 8. EC approved FAC motion to revise 305.10 (hiring procedures, nontenure track faculty); EC tabled motion to revise 305.11 (evaluation procedures) with request for revisions and discussion with AA; meeting with Provost and AVP Powers scheduled January 29th; we'll discuss revisions in new business. (b) EC discussed FAC recommended revisions of biennial review process--not voted pending meeting between Virgil and AA, but EC raised no objections about FAC cautions and revisions. (c) Senate read the motion to revise the constitution, granting voting rights to Instructors, at the January meeting; the motion will be voted at February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. Members discussed ways in which FAC could participate in public discussion of the amendment if Senate votes to send the motion to the full faculty.

## Discussion

### Old Business

Linda Ferguson has sent Darlene faculty profile data; the report differs from the 2010 report and Darlene is working with Linda to make sure data include information that will support the possible charges to examine faculty attrition or the pathway to promotion; Darlene will post the data and an initial analysis in the next week or two.

### New Business

Review of Constitutional Changes. EC has asked that we forward our review of the three College constitutions that have been submitted to us as soon as we can. Members discussed best strategy to ensure a good review of each constitution and decided to organize into teams of two who will read one constitution and report their reviews at the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of FAC. Darlene will read all three constitutions. Each of the documents indicates changes made (FAC is not charged with reviewing the constitution in total, only recent changes). Teams: COT=John and Lindsey; CNHHS=Marsha and Michael; Library=Betty and Jolynn

Review of Summer Taskforce Reports. EC forwarded new charge to review and respond to two of the summer taskforce reports: textbooks and University College. EC asked that FAC pay particular attention to the development of a faculty governance body for the UC and to the need for handbook language (section 246) to address the UC. Members will read both reports and discuss possible recommendations during the February 13 meeting.

Review of Motion to Revise 305.11 (annual evaluation of nontenure track faculty). Discussion during EC identified several points for review: Process Calendar should be parallel to probationary faculty review calendar; is there a way to handle third year review of Instructors to provide a 4<sup>th</sup> year as is done for TT faculty?; Nontenure track faculty should shift to biennial review after 6 consecutive positive reviews (parallel to tenure-track faculty); does the language stipulating the consequence of a candidate's decision to withdrawn from review process unfairly impact nontenure track faculty who teach in multiple departments?; can language further clarify a difference between performance review and employment decision? Can notification of rehire date be established for Instructors? Lecturers?; Should FAC draft a template to be used in departments that do not establish their own criteria for the review of nontenure track faculty?

Members discussed the points raised by the EC.

Members generally thought it would make sense and be a simple matter to establish language that shifts Instructors to biennial review after 6 successful annual reviews. Need to clarify what "counts" as successful review; need to consider impact on the 7<sup>th</sup> year performance; need to account for the difference between a successful performance evaluation and a decision to rehire.

Members generally thought it made sense to adjust the language concerning withdrawal from the review process; recommendation to include reference to future hire by reviewing department.

Members generally thought it would make sense and be a simple matter to establish review dates for Instructors parallel to those for pre-tenure faculty (i.e. first year, second year, third year; for the purposes of identifying due dates, total consecutive years employed will be used rather than year of current contract; thus, an instructor in her second year of a second three-year contract will follow the due dates for 5<sup>th</sup> year review, etc.). The parallel calendar for full-time Lecturers would be similar (during the second consecutive year an individual, one-year contract, full-time Lecturers would follow the calendar dates for second year review of tenure-track faculty. It is likely we will recommend that part-time lecturers be asked to follow the same calendar annually (including a date in the fall for fall-only contracts and a date in the spring for fall-spring and spring-only contracts).

Members discussed the idea of giving a one-year contract (Lecturer) to Instructors who receive a negative performance evaluation in the third or subsequent year, which is parallel to the year given to pre-tenure faculty beginning in their third year. While the idea appears to create consistency and fairness, there are concerns that Instructors are evaluated almost solely on teaching performance and granting an additional year of teaching to a faculty member who has earned a negative evaluation is problematic (even though it could be directly parallel to what could happen to a pre-tenure faculty member). Additionally, the performance review of non-tenure track faculty cannot be conflated with the employment decision in the same way that it can for tenure-track faculty. When a pre-tenure track faculty member receives a positive annual evaluation s/he continues her/his appointment. When a non-tenure track faculty member receives a positive annual evaluation, s/he might continue or be rehired, but that decision relies on actual need or continued instruction and financial resources and will generally be made at a date later than the date on which the performance evaluation closes. Ms. Morahn observed that faculty hired as Lecturers recognize that their employment is contingent on multiple factors only one of which is the quality of their performance and the decision and timing of an offer of a subsequent contract are impacted. Instructor appointments seem to reduce contingency, but only within the period of the contract and they still recognize that the position may not be continued during the contract year if need or resources are wanting.

FAC discussed the absence of an appeal of the performance evaluation for Lecturers and in the final contract year for Instructors. An appeal of a performance evaluation could be included in the process, but the language would need to make clear that the appeal is not of the eventual decision to continue the contract or rehire the faculty member (hiring practices are appealed under existing provisions internal and external to the university).

FAC discussed the president's suggestion that a template specifying evaluation criteria be developed. Clearly departments and colleges need to develop, publish, and make

easily accessible the criteria by which Instructors and Lecturers will be reviewed. Several members noted that we should presume they will do so and recognize that it is possible that some departments may fail to do so, but it is unlikely colleges will do so. The policy could include additional language indicating common criteria.

Darlene will attempt to draft revisions of the policy as already revised by FAC before meeting with AA January 29<sup>th</sup>. FAC will move this work to completion at the January 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Meeting Adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Motion to Adjourn.  
Next Meeting