AGENDA

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

November 6, 2018 3:30-5PM

UC 233

Members: Larry Arnold (chair), Youngsuk Chae, Richard Kang, Nancy Palm, Maria Pereira, Gretchen Robinson, Misty Stone

I. Call to Order

II. Adoption of the Agenda

III. Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2018

 See [Appendix A](#Minutes)

IV. Chair Report

V. Old Business

1. Revise faculty evaluation portions of the Faculty Handbook to incorporate departmental revision and approval of Disciplinary Statements.
2. Revise references to Promotion and Tenure Committee to conform with expansion of membership (Faculty Handbook, pp. 119-120
3. Electronic Portfolios

VI. New Business

VII. Announcement

1. Next Meeting: December 4, 2018 3:30-5:00 pm UC 233

VIII. Adjournment

MINUTES

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

October 2, 2018 3:30-5PM

UC 233

Members Present: Larry Arnold (chair), Youngsuk Chae, Richard Kang, Nancy Palm, Misty Stone, Gretchen Robinson

Members not Present: Maria Pereira

I. Call to Order at 3:30

II. Adoption of the Agenda at 3:31

III. Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2018 at 3:32

 See [Appendix A](#Minutes)

IV. Chair Report

1. FIAC did not meet
2. Larry received info from executive committee re. things we didn’t discuss at last meeting
	1. HR decided to change form for evaluation of librarians (who are included in our portion of the handbook), without going through FERS – need to discuss next meeting and Larry will bring up with FIAC
	2. Disciplinary statements – there will be confusion, how much of it can we clear up now that they have already been posted? Larry will confirm with FIAC exactly what our responsibility is

V. Old Business

1. Revise faculty evaluation portions of the Faculty Handbook to incorporate departmental revision and approval of Disciplinary Statements.
	1. Larry worked on p. 72 of handbook to incorporate the process of revising statements
	2. We would need to add a place within the disciplinary statements to record the vote approving the revisions by majority of faculty members in department
	3. We again discussed the process of each department in drafting and approving existing disciplinary statements and role that process will play in making developing process for making revisions
	4. Should language enforce a review every five years, or make revision an option?
		1. We all seem to agree that they must be reviewed every 5 years, even if changes are not made
		2. We will create a rough schedule to be followed every fifth year, delineating when chairs must solicit feedback from all general faculty members and when the revised disciplinary statements must be submitted to the Dean (the departmental vote will also be recorded)
2. Revise references to Promotion and Tenure Committee to conform with expansion of membership
	1. We will revisit this in the future where necessary
3. Electronic Portfolios
	1. We need to define how we want to move forward with this – flash drive, Canvas, task stream?
	2. Chair of AITC was going to bring up possibility of using Canvas, but that meeting was cancelled due to hurricane – Larry will revisit

VI. New Business

1. Discuss possibility of eliminating the portfolio requirement for emeritus nominees
	1. Not within our domain
	2. Nancy will find out from Mitu who handles that concern

VII. Announcements - none

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 4:56

Respectfully submitted

Nancy Palm Puchner

Recording Secretar