

## Meeting of the Faculty Council

September 13, 2013, 10:00 a.m., Dean's Conference Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Pafford

In attendance: Chris Aanstoos, Pam Hunt, Tom Hunter, Mike Johnson, Soo Moon, Salvador Peralta, Alan Pope, Ashley Smallwood, and Brad Yates.

1. Call to order: 10:01 a.m.
2. Motion to approve minutes of 8-23-13 meeting; seconded; approved unanimously
3. ANNOUNCEMENTS
  - a. Chairs Meetings Update (Brad)
    - i. Response to recommendations submitted to Administrative Council
      - 1) Two items accepted
      - 2) Other items need language modification
    - ii. Chairs will meet with President at October meeting
  - b. Other items taken from the floor
    - i. October 18<sup>th</sup> is COSS Service Day – please announce to colleagues.

## NEW BUSINESS

4. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (Hunt, Pope, Smallwood)
  - a. Proposal: to approve course and program modifications (see FC web site) (Associate Dean Smallwood)
    - i. No course modifications/additions/deletions submitted
    - ii. No program modifications/additions/deletions submitted
  - b. Request the Academic Affairs Committee draft a short note to send every month to remind COSS faculty of deadline to submit course and program modifications/additions/deletions
  - c. Proposal: From COSS Graduate Studies Directors—**request a university policy change so that graduate students can pay a small fee (\$50) and use the library during the summer even if they are not registered in summer classes.**
    - i. **Recommendation A: The FC support the request for a university policy change so that graduate students can use the library during the summer free of charge even if they are not registered in summer classes.**
    - ii. **Recommendation B: The FC supports the creation of a pilot study so that graduate students can use the library during the 2014 summer free of charge even if they are not registered in summer classes. This pilot study would help to establish student use and cost impact, and would help decision-makers arrive at an informed decision on this issue.**
  - d. Update: Proposal: to identify potential **Student Success Measures** (e.g., salaries after graduation, jobs in the field, entrance to graduate school) in response to BOR directives (performance-based funding is the future), as charged by the Dean (B. Yates was to meet with the Dean, but schedule conflicts prohibited the meeting. The meeting will occur before the next Faculty Council meeting.)
    - i. **This issue was tabled pending meeting with Dean.**
    - ii. **A note for a future discussion is to be mindful that professional degrees should not drive the success measures**
5. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (Hunter, Moon, Peralta)
  - a. Proposal: submit initiatives to the Dean for consideration as COSS moves forward in executing its strategic plan.
    - i. **Faculty Council thanks Dean McCandless for supporting initiatives born out of Faculty Council, the elected-representatives of the faculty**
    - ii. **Recommendation: To meet with library representatives to discuss collaboration and support opportunities related to research methods courses taught in COSS across departments (Working title: Information Literacy Initiative)**
    - iii. **Recommendation: To explore collaboration opportunities with the newly formed Center for Teaching and Learning**
    - iv. **Recommendation: To emphasize interdisciplinary curricula as a priority in the implementation of the COSS strategic plan**

- b. Proposal: the Dean's Office is considering offering Faculty Fellowships for special initiatives in COSS (B. Yates was to meet with the Dean, but schedule conflicts prohibited the meeting. The meeting will occur before the next Faculty Council meeting.)
    - i. **This issue was tabled pending meeting with Dean.**
  - c. Proposed modifications to COSS *Bylaws* and *Policies and Procedures*. (See Appendix A)
    - i. **Recommendation: Faculty Council endorses designating introductory sections of discipline specific courses for majors-only.**
6. PLANNING COMMITTEE (Aanstoos, Johnson, Yates)
- a. Update: COSS Promotion & Tenure Advisory Committee: College-wide election for at-large member— Rob Sanders, Political Science & Planning elected
  - b. Update: COSS Promotion & Tenure Advisory Committee
    - i. Marjorie Snipes, Anthropology
    - ii. Mike Johnson, Criminology
    - iii. Soo Moon, Mass Communications
    - iv. Louis Howe, Political Science & Planning
    - v. Daniel Helminiak, Psychology
    - vi. Neema Noori, Sociology
    - vii. Rob Sanders, At-large, Political Science & Planning
  - c. Update: Committee Assignments as chosen by the Dean
    - i. **Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)** – Sooho Lee, Political Science & Planning
    - ii. **Tech Fee Committee** – Deon Kay, Mass Communications
    - iii. **XIDS subcommittee** – Greg Dixon, Political Science & Planning
    - iv. **Committee on International Studies** – Neema Noori, Sociology
  - d. Update: Proposal: Develop a Summer Budget Allocation Formula (due by January 2014; preferably much sooner) (B. Yates was to meet with the Dean, but schedule conflicts prohibited the meeting. The meeting will occur before the next Faculty Council meeting.)
    - i. **This issue was tabled until next FC meeting.**

Submitted respectfully,

Salvador Peralta

**Appendix A**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED BY THE FACULTY COUNCIL**  
Submitted to Administrative Council September 4, 2013  
**Administrative Council Responses Noted**

**1. Participation in Evaluation of Department Chairs**

- a. Proposal for policy regarding membership on the faculty departmental review committee for the evaluation of department chairs
- b. Recommendation: Amend Article II.B.3.b. of the COSS Bylaws to say: The performance of each department chair shall be reviewed at intervals not to exceed four years by the members of the chair's department, a report of which will be submitted to the Dean.
  - i. Eligible members of the faculty departmental review committee include all full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty.
  - ii. Each faculty departmental review committee may consult with other members of the department (e.g., non-tenured faculty, part-time/adjunct faculty, and/or staff) per departmental guidelines.
- c. Administrative Council rejected language; supports language that speaks to 360 degree evaluation, which was recently approved at the Senate level (there is a form that suggests an all-around evaluation is required; this still does not speak to the membership of the review committee-the Handbook states: "The form of evaluation (written, oral, group, etc.) and the procedure to be used shall be determined by the departmental members, reviewed by the department chair, and approved by the dean.")

**Comment [C1]:** insert

**Comment [C2]:** insert

**Comment [C3]:** insert

**Comment [C4]:** In accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*, the faculty departmental review committee shall use the Personnel Evaluation Questionnaire (section 104.0302) to conduct a comprehensive performance review from among departmental, college, university and community constituents.

**2. Promotion & Tenure Advisory Committee composition**

- a. Proposal to codify changes in the COSS *Policies and Procedures* regarding the P&T committee composition
- b. Recommendation: Amend Section I.4.b.ii. of COSS *Policies and Procedures* to read: COMPOSITION: One faculty from each academic department of the College, elected by their department, and one faculty elected by the College at large. All members of the committee must be tenured faculty. Department chairs are not eligible to serve, nor are any faculty members whose application for tenure or promotion would come before the committee during their term of service. Members may not serve more than one term consecutively unless there are no other faculty in their department eligible to serve. All terms shall be two-year terms, except the initial election following the adoption of these rules in which terms will be staggered so that approximately one-half of the committee will be elected each subsequent year. If no member of the Promotion & Tenure Advisory Committee from the department of a candidate can be present at the meeting, or is eligible to serve on the committee, and the departmental representative is outside the discipline, then the department faculty may elect a spokesperson to be available to answer questions about that candidate at that portion of the meeting in which that candidate's dossier is evaluated. Such a spokesperson would participate only in that portion of the meeting at which their department's candidate(s) are being evaluated and would not be eligible to vote on the candidate(s). Administrative Council requested minor revisions to language; need to add a note about the departmental representative being out of discipline to invoke the spokesperson rule; fairly easy rewrite

**Comment [C5]:** insert

**3. Workload**

- a. Proposal to codify changes in the *Policies and Procedures* regarding workload for supersized courses
- b. Recommendation: Amend Section I.2.b.iv. teaching a tripled section (that is, one of at least 150 students) shall be counted as an additional six credits in the teaching load. Faculty teaching courses larger than 150 would not be granted any further credit toward teaching load.
- c. Administrative Council requested minor revisions to language regarding workload such as including a range of students (e.g., 150-300); also suggested not adding new language at all; several issues to tease out

**Comment [C6]:** Strike this language.

**4. 3<sup>rd</sup> year Review Policy**

- a. Faculty Council revisited the proposal to draft a 3<sup>rd</sup> year review policy for inclusion in the COSS *Policies and Procedures* (as charged by the Dean).
  - i. FC agreed language should refer back to *Faculty Handbook*.

- ii. FC also agreed the importance of the department's prescription of what tenure-track faculty should include in their submission packet for 3<sup>rd</sup> year review.
- iii. FC further agreed that 3<sup>rd</sup> year review packets should be guided by departmental promotion and tenure policies.
- iv. A review of the *Faculty Handbook* finds this statement under section 102.0201.B.: "...This committee [*Pre-Tenure Review Committee*] shall thoroughly and comprehensively review the individual's achievements and performance in light of the department's promotion and tenure policies..."
- v. Thus, the Faculty Council recommends that the modification to the COSS *Policies and Procedures* for the prescription of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review be minimal given the clear language in the *Faculty Handbook*.
  - a) **Recommendation:** Modify section I.3.b. of the COSS *Policies and Procedures*
  - b) New language: "a third-year pre-tenure review of tenure-track faculty by their tenured department colleagues, department chair, and the College Dean.
- vi. **Recommendation:** Also, the Faculty Council encourages each department to post its own promotion and tenure policies with specific evidentiary sources required for teaching, professional growth and development, and service for reference.
- vii. **Administrative Council ACCEPTED recommendation for 3rd year review policy**

#### 5. Department Chair Evaluation

- a. Faculty Council revisited a proposal to codify changes in the COSS *Bylaws* regarding the periodic evaluation of department chairs and agreed on the following recommendation:
  - i. Section 104.0301 of the *Faculty Handbook* reads as follows: "Procedure. An evaluation of the department chair shall be conducted by the department at least **once every three years** (except that new department chairs shall not be evaluated their first year in office).
  - ii. **Recommendation:** Modify section II.B.3.b. of COSS *Bylaws* by changing four to three to be consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*: "The performance of each department chair shall be reviewed **at least once every three years** by the members of the chair's department, a report of which will be submitted to the Dean.
  - iii. **Administrative Council ACCEPTED recommendation for Department Chair Evaluation**

#### 6. Dean Evaluation

- a. Faculty Council revisited a proposal to codify changes in the COSS *Bylaws* regarding the periodic evaluation of the Dean
  - i. The first draft of the proposed modification to the current language in the *Bylaws* that dealt with procedures for electing the members to the Dean's review committee need to be rewritten to be in compliance with the *Faculty Handbook*.
  - ii. Based on the following from the *Faculty Handbook*
    - a) Section 104.0601.D.Composition of Review Committee:
      - 1) "The Review Committee will be composed of seven members."
      - 2) "A Review Committee Chair, who is a senior faculty member from outside the unit led by the Dean being evaluated. The Provost shall appoint the Review Committee Chair. The Chair of the Review Committee shall receive one course reassigned time."
      - 3) "Six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean, one of which must be a department chair. The faculty governance body from the unit led by the Dean under evaluation determines the manner in which the committee members shall be elected. In the case of a unit that does not have an elected faculty governance body, the faculty at large of the unit determine the manner in which the committee members shall be elected."
    - b) **Recommendation:** **Create sub-section II.A.1.c.i.** : "In addition to any performance evaluations by the Provost's office, **the first periodic evaluation of the Dean of the College shall cover a full three-year period and occur in the Dean's fourth year of appointment. Thereafter, the periodic evaluations shall cover a full four-year period and**

occur every five years. Members of the Review Committee shall be comprised of the Administrative Council, the Faculty Council, and the faculty at-large.”

- c) **Recommendation:** Create sub-section II.A.1.c.ii.: “Members of the Review Committee shall be comprised of at least one member of the Administrative Council and at least one member of the Faculty Council, elected within each governing body. The remaining four members of the committee, who may be members of the Administrative Council and/or Faculty Council, and the faculty at-large, shall be nominated by each department and elected by the Faculty Council. Eligible nominees shall be full-time faculty, regardless of rank.”
- d) Administrative Council requested minor revisions to language; supports language that speaks to 360 degree evaluation; issue raised about Staff role in evaluation; noted the guidelines here are for the Review Committee that handles the evaluation process

**Comment [C7]:** Change to: The Review Committee shall follow the procedures outlined in Section 104.0601E. of the *Faculty Handbook*.

**Comment [C8]:** insert