## DEPARTMENT OF NURSING

Meeting Minutes
DATE: $11 / 4 / 2011$ GROUP: Faculty Development MEMBERS ATTENDING:, Michael Keim, Pamela Horvath, Sal Peralta, James DeVita , David Morgan Shirley Lankford, Rebecca Harrison, Myrna Gantner, Michael DeNie, Gary Schmidt (chair) Not in attendance: Lori Wilson, Adrian Austin

| Agenda | Discussion | Action |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meeting called to order |  | Called to order 2:00pm |
| Approval of Minutes 10/7/11 |  | Minutes approved unanimously |
| I. Ideas for a Faculty Advisory Group on LGBTQ issues- James De Vita | James-Found invisibility of concern. Faculty and staff come together and mentor a group. Make recommendations; get ideas for future curriculum ideas. Possible recruitment and retention of faculty. <br> Need to know how many faculty are involved. Need to make more public. <br> Should there be a recommendation to send to the senate to support LGBTQ. Should the group be informal and then more formalized. Maybe when the gender studies are more complete that this can be further delved into. |  |
| II. Document evaluation of Deans: Final revisions and vote | Document changed in this committee then sent to Chris Huff and then sent to the Deans. <br> Pg. 1 evaluation report was made consistent throughout the report <br> Pg.3. periodic eliminated. Specific timeline now provided. <br> Pg5confidentiality - participants will be protected from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law. <br> Pg6- confidentiality again. Review committees with the dean, provost and then the chair of the review committee will present to the faculty. Changed to demonstrate a commitment to intellectual integrity and the pursuit of knowledge. <br> The rules committee made suggestions of a 5 point not a 7 point likert scale. <br> Question brought up about emphasizing teaching, service and professional growth in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit | Minute grammar changes made to the document. <br> Change the likert scale to strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree etc. <br> Pg.4. D3 six faculty members one at which must be a department chair delete if a significant conflict of interest can be demonstrated. Both parties shall be allowed only one objection. <br> Pg. 8 In your opinion added and please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Provost. <br> Motion to approve, seconded no further discussion. Passed unanimously |


|  | raises. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III. Tenure and Promotion- discussion of feedback from faculty, Revisions | 1. Numeric rating scale for college committee <br> 2.conflict of interest language <br> 3. Non-tenured faculty serving on tenure committee <br> 4. Clarification about early promotion <br> 5. Can one be tenured without promotion to Associate Professor? <br> 6. add "peer teaching" to evaluation 103.056 <br> 7.what provost can require in a dossier <br> 8. add "school" wherever "college" or "department" is mentioned <br> 9. Evidentiary sources for teaching <br> 10. Can scholarly work be changed to scholarly and/or creative work? <br> 11. Count significant revisions to courses rather than just "new courses" as relevant for promotion <br> 12. 103.0302 4.2.9 Include pre-school and other agencies? <br> 13. Issue with no specification of minimum number of evidentiary sources <br> 14. Editorial corrections | 1.Consensus is to remove the rating scale <br> 2.Agree to now include the conflict of interest statement, <br> 3. In the event that a department does not have a departments should be invited. Alternatively, nontenured faculty may be invited to serve. <br> 4. 103.0402 time limitations are stated <br> 5. yes but prefer to do together <br> 6. already found in document <br> 7. not to be addressed <br> 8. to be changed in the document <br> 9. addressed and changes made <br> 10.addressed and changes made <br> 11. repeat- not addressed <br> 12.changesd to PK schools, university colleagues, or external agencies <br> 13. Every department can set its own number of evidentiary sources <br> 14. Gary to complete editorial corrections |
| IV. Plan for drafting SACS Compliance Certificates | cs3.7.1 competent Faculty <br> 3.7.4 academic Freedom <br> 3.7.3 Professional Development <br> 3.3.1 Research <br> 3.7.2Faculty Evaluation | Myrna Gantner, Shirley <br> Michael D and Sal <br> Pamela Horvath, Rebecca <br> David and Michael K <br> Gary Schmidt <br> Lori and Adrian to be contacted by Gary for committee work. |
| New Business | Faculty Grants ? Need confirmation that faculty grants to be discontinued? This is a concern to not support internal research. | Gary sent a message to the Provost already. No return message sent. Faculty grants were stopped spring 2011.This needs to a motion to the faculty Senate to have the VPAA to restore faculty grants. Significant outcomes came from faculty grants. Contact the department chairs to gather supportive evidence that |
| Meeting Adjourned |  | Meeting adjourned 4:45pm |
|  |  |  |



Respectfully submitted: P. Horvath, MSN, RN-BC

