

Faculty Issues Committee, Jan. 26, 2012

Absent: Candice Small and Teresa O'Bannon

Vincent was not present either – it was suggested that he may be on sabbatical but Kim has not been informed of this and no one has been assigned as a substitute.

The meeting began promptly at 3:30. The first order of business was approval of the minutes from the last meeting of 2011. The motion passed. Next the agenda for the present meeting was also approved. We then proceeded to the third item on the agenda: reconsideration of the motion previously submitted to the Senate regarding annual evaluation criteria.

Objections and concerns raised at the previous week's Senate meeting were summarized. These appeared to concern the issue of submitting evaluation criteria annually for approval, submitting it for the approval of the Dean and the Provost, and lack of clarity about the fact that this motion referred only to annual evaluations by Chairs and not to the tenure and promotion review process. As we proceeded to rehash these objections, trying to ascertain our reasons for including these elements and whether the solution would be to eliminate them or reword them, new issues were raised. In particular, an issue we had previously debated among ourselves is particularly troubling to some departments in ways we had not precisely considered. In particular, Mary indicated that her department was concerned about the role of the personnel committee in preparing evaluation criteria and their sense that the wording of our motion would weaken the involvement of the PC. Discussion about the roles of the PC and the Chair in determining evaluation criteria continued for some time, with some people questioning whether the solution might be to return to the passage currently in the FTR Handbook with a goal of either using the language as is and not submitting a new motion or trying to combine elements of the new motion with the existing language. In the course of this discussion, we also addressed the question of the Provost's role in approving evaluations; Joe and others felt that it might be beneficial to include the Provost in a meeting with the FIC. This suggestion was eventually dropped in light of the fact that the Provost does have a standing invitation to meet with the FS Executive Committee and Joe is a member of that committee. At one point, a motion was made to eliminate the one sentence about the annual approval and leave the motion in its current form. This motion was withdrawn before voting took place. By this time, it was nearly time to adjourn the meeting. A motion was now made to refer the original motion to a subcommittee to try to rewrite the motion, perhaps along the lines previously suggested re: including the material originally deleted from the Handbook, and to bring the revision back to the committee no later than two meetings from now. Roann volunteered to be the subcommittee for this task, the motion was approved, and the meeting adjourned shortly.