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Minutes

1. We started by reviewing the committee’s charge in Faculty Code 402.12.7, actions of the committee in 2020–21 (largely deciding on awards and electing a chair), and significant past actions of the committee such as a survey on faculty and department head perceptions of IDEA evaluations and some materials on evaluating teaching.

2. After some discussion, it was decided that the FEC 2020–21 Annual Report will be fairly short, which reflects the work of the committee in that year. Tim C. will draft a report before our next meeting.

3. Significant discussion regarding the name and description of the Undergraduate Faculty Mentor of the Year Award. Originally Faculty Advisor of the Year; changed to “Faculty Mentor” because university is now primarily using professional (nonfaculty) advisors, but criteria [https://www.usu.edu/provost/university-honors/undergraduate-faculty-mentor-of-the-year](https://www.usu.edu/provost/university-honors/undergraduate-faculty-mentor-of-the-year) were not updated and still reference “advisees” and advising processes. After some discussion of whether the award is needed at all and the relationships with the Undergraduate Teacher of the Year and Undergraduate Research Mentor of the Year awards, the committee decided to move forward with revising the criteria (and possibly name) of the award. Criteria and wording that were suggested include mentorship, investment in student success, leadership in student clubs and organizations (including level of involvement), work with students that involves
professional and global engagement, and mentorship that contributes to the university’s diversity. Further discussion will be held at our next meeting.

4. Initial discussion of how faculty evaluation procedures and language can explicitly recognize faculty DEI work. The inclusion of “community engagement” in faculty code language about criteria for promotion may provide a model here. Further discussion will be held in future meetings.

5. Initial discussion of how to support evaluation of faculty teaching outside of IDEA ratings. Discussion focused on how peer evaluation is currently often insufficient, resulting in “cheerleading” letters and surface-level observations that do not reflect course structure, assignments, Canvas layout, etc. Further discussion will be held in future meetings.

6. Meeting closed with discussion of when future meetings might be held. Another poll will be used, focused on times that will be available on a regular basis.