

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, November 20, 2013
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 306, WTC

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Boller, H.; Cardoza, A.; Classen, T.; Friend, P.; Graham, D.; Jellish, S.; Jurgensmeier SJ, C.; Kelly, B.; Knight, A.; Lash, N.; Macksey, S.; McNulty, J.; Miller, H.; Ramsey, G.; Rose, H.; Ruppman, T.; Ryan, J.; Schoenberger, A.; Udo, M.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:10pm by Gordon Ramsey. Invocation – Charles Jurgensmeier, SJ.
2. Approval of October minutes. Moved: Cardoza; Lash seconded. Motion passed 17-0-1.
3. Chair's Report
 - The University Senate has made a preliminary report on the new FAS; we will be incorporating it and other department and individual responses into our own response, which will be available before the next meeting.
4. SSOM/HSD: JMcN & GB
 - There has been some concern expressed by faculty of the Department of Pharmacology over a communication from the Dean to the effect that faculty members are prohibited from giving references and recommendations on behalf of colleagues; only the HR department can. GR: We will attempt to get some clarification of the issue from the HSD.
5. University Senate report (TC)
 - Our next meeting will be this coming Friday, November 22. We be considering the report to the full University Senate by the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee on the Faculty Workloads and Annual Evaluations Proposal. Our 7 general recommendations are as follows:
 1. University-level policy should direct each academic unit/department to develop systems and multiple mechanisms/measures so as to ensure that ***the weight given to student course evaluations in the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching not exceed 50%***.
 2. The FAS system should be revamped so that in each section (service, research, and teaching) the first item that faculty members furnish is a ***substantive narrative report of annual activity***.
 3. University-level policy should direct each academic unit/Department to establish procedures for ***peer input in the annual evaluation of faculty members teaching and research – inclusive of peer observations of teaching as appropriate***.

4. The annual *performance evaluation scale should be changed to a five point scale running from 5 to 1*. Three should be set as the normative the point, not as “satisfactory” but as “meets expectations,” with additional specification to be provided by each academic unit/department.
5. University-level policy should mandate substantial space be recorded for the *evaluation of work-in-process*.
6. University-level policy should specify that *the evaluating party shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation*.
7. The University shall require each academic unit/department to develop any remediation protocols *in strict conformity to the protocols established in the faculty handbook and outside the procedures specified in the annual evaluation policies and procedures presently under examination*.
 - Question: Do these recommendations apply to the HSD? GR: the proposal does not apply to SSOM. According to the Provost, SSOM will have their own evaluation system (FIS), different from the rest of HSD. Presumably this proposal, and therefore these recommendations, will apply to the rest of HSD. Comment: MNSN Dean is moving away from the FIS, which is tailored to SSOM and especially to its clinical faculty. Comment: the new BSI is complicating the issue even further, since its new criteria seem to conflict with those of the established FIS.
 - Question: As per recommendation 3: how often are the proposed peer teaching evaluations to be administered? Annually? TC: no, the recommendation only calls for some protocol for periodic peer review, the period to be established unit by unit.
 - Question: Does the FAS undermined the prerogatives of chairs? Have the chairs discussed this? GR: I am unaware of any discussion amongst the chairs; but it should be noted that a number of chairs were sources of their departmental responses to the FAS which we received from them.
 - Comment: TC: Deans Getz, Andress, and Heider have been invited to address the University Senate on concerns about the FAS.

6. Discussion of FAS Response Draft

- Concerns discussed:
 1. Undergraduate research seems not to be counted, or even mentioned, in the FAS proposal.

2. Many activities are lumped, unrecognized, under “teaching” without enumeration. We should make a recommendation to find a way to count these items, even if not in a course load equivalent count.
 3. Faculty are increasingly asked to undertake extra tasks (like TGIF, The Green Initiative Fund) which call for faculty supervision, but which receive no credit for evaluation.
 4. Question: what is the meaning of the statement in the draft that reads, “We urge that the attempt to create a uniform instrument for faculty evaluations be abandoned?” GR: the statement comes from one of the drafts of departmental responses to the FAS: perhaps it would be better to move it or strike it. Comment: a suggested revision might be, “Any FAS must recognize the substantial differences in academic activities and performance standards across schools and colleges and academic units of the University.”
 5. The FAS does not incentivize teaching, research, and service appropriately, and in fact actively dis-incentivizes many important activities. This might result in a “do the minimum” attitude on the part of faculty.
 6. On page 4 – “Impact of Evaluations” – the wording must not simply be to follow the Faculty Handbook; we should object to interpreting Faculty Handbook language in these terms: i.e., reading “serious failure” as “fails to meet FAS criteria,” when the Handbook phrase is clearly meant for egregious violations.
 7. Concerns about the possible abuse of review/termination process by administration.
 - A draft of our full response will be available the 1st week of December. We will vote on the final draft at our December meeting.
7. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Boller); second (Lash). Meeting adjourned 4:49pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary