

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Evaluation Committee

Faculty Senate

---

1-16-2014

## Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, January 16, 2014

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_faceval](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, January 16, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Evaluation Committee*. Paper 37.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_faceval/37](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval/37)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Evaluation Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)**  
**16 January 14, 3:00-4:00pm NR204**

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)  
Sandra Weingart (Libraries)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business; Roosevelt)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Kit Mohr (Education)  
Emily Esplin (ASUSU VP)  
Brittney Garbrick (ASUSU Grad Studies)

Absent:

Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Raymond Veon (Arts)  
Daryn Frischknecht (ASUSU student advocate)

- 1) **Approved minutes from November 14, 2013 meeting**
- 2) **Reviewed Spring 2014 calendar**
- 3) **Discussed proposed revisions to Policy section 405.12, per request by Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

There was much discussion of the revised Policy section 405.12 Review of Faculty section of the Policy Manual, which was provided to us for comment by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. A.S. provided a history of the revision and the Task Force. There was recognition that tenure is a foundation of shared governance, and also acknowledgement that faculty review processes should be rigorous, clearly described in policy, and evenly applied across colleges. There was particularly extensive discussion about proposed linkage between annual reviews and more comprehensive reviews and also about the composition of the faculty committee conducting comprehensive reviews.

**The committee recommended retention of the current language in the Code rather than adoption of the proposed changes.** The committee recognized that minor changes to the language in this section of the Policy Manual were probably necessary, and could be addressed by appropriate Faculty Senate committees, but that wholesale process changes were not warranted. The committee felt that the current policy of annual reviews by department heads and a separate 5-year review process was a **sound process** but that it was **unevenly applied** across colleges and departments. The current policy allows annual reviews to be used as information by the review committee, but does not create a “trigger” for a comprehensive review. This appropriately limits the influence of department heads in decisions about sanctions, but should allow department head authority in decisions about merit pay. The committee felt that if annual reviews were triggers for more comprehensive reviews, then the comprehensive reviews could become both punitive and rare. The committee also felt that the existing requirements for the membership of the faculty

review committee (with respect to both departmental representation and rank) were appropriate. There was concern that if only full professors could serve on these committees (as proposed), then there would be a paucity of eligible members within departments.

The committee did suggest a change to the current language of the committee composition; namely that this committee should be primarily made up of faculty from the same department as the faculty member under review (e.g. 2/3). The committee felt that faculty within the same department would be best able to judge the performance of the faculty member under review, although minority representation outside the academic unit was also valuable.