

#10

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

April 14, 2016

3:30pm, Holmstedt 102

Final Draft

Members Present: C. Ball, P. Bro, L. Brown, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, J. Kinne, J. Kuhlman, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, J. Pommier, S. Stofferahn, L. Phillips, E. Hampton, E. Southard, K. Berlin, B. Bunnett, B. Corcoran, N. Goswami, I. Land, K. Lee, C. Paterson, H. Tapley, M. Schafer

Members Absent: J. Conant, M. Harmon, E. Gallatin, V. Sheets, A. Anderson

Ex-Officio Present: M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: D. Bradley

Guests: B. Simms

1) Memorial Resolutions

a) B. Simms: Vote: 25-0-0.

Dr. Linda Kay Damer, age 76, passed away on Friday, September 18, 2015, in Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. She is survived by her children, Diana Damer and her husband Dan Malinowski of Austin, Texas; Cynthia Damer and her husband Scott Daigle of Mt. Pleasant, Michigan; and John Damer and his wife Laura of Chicago, Illinois; six grandchildren, including Sela, Sofia, Roman, Dylan, Natalie, and Jolie; and a brother, Kenneth Welsh and his wife Helen of Florissant, Missouri. She also leaves behind her partner of many years, Bob Lowery, of Indianapolis, Indiana.

Linda was born in Springfield, Illinois, on December 5, 1938, the daughter of James Fred and Mary Jane (Thurmond) Welsh. She studied music education at William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri and received an MA in Music Education from Boston University. For twenty years she was a music teacher and choral director for public schools in Missouri, Massachusetts, Virginia, and North Carolina. In 1979 Linda earned her Education Degree in Music Education from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She was a professor in the Music Department at Indiana State University from 1979-2006. Through her enthusiasm and dedication, she inspired, trained and mentored hundreds of music educators. She was a tireless advocate for arts education in the public schools and held leadership positions in many state and national music

educator organizations. Her research and publications focused primarily upon the inclusion of disabled students in the music education classroom. An accomplished musician, she played the piano, organ, and violin among other instruments, serving as an organist and choir director for several churches. She was a member of the Music Educators National Conference, the Indiana Music Educators Association, the American Orff Schulwerk Association, the ISU University Club, the Pi Kappa Lambda Music Honor Society, and was the faculty advisor for Sigma Alpha Iota, a fraternity for collegiate women in music. She also served for a year as Interim Chair of the ISU Department of Music, was an advisor for many years, served on countless committees, and was Coordinator of Music Graduate Studies at ISU at the time of her retirement.

Linda was an avid traveler, visiting all 50 states and dozens of countries, including living and working for a year in Australia. Through her selfless, fun-loving personality and unparalleled generosity of spirit, Linda developed friendships across the University and the globe. Above all, she was a loving and caring mother to three children and grandmother to six grandchildren.

The School of Music acknowledges and appreciates Linda Damer's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives she touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Linda Damer's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to her students, the School of Music, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

b) B. Simms: Vote: 26-0-0

Dr. Robert Carrol Smith, 85, passed away on Wednesday, January 27, 2016, in Newport News, Virginia. He was predeceased by his brother Jack Smith, Jr. and his wife Norma; his sister Barbara Evans and her husband Paul; and his brother-in-law Floyd Bruce. He is survived by two sisters, Joyce Bruce, Sylvia Graham and her husband "Hop"; and many loving nieces and nephews who affectionately called him "Uncle Bob."

A native of Hampton, Virginia, Bob was born April 1, 1930. He joined the Indiana State University faculty in 1964 and retired in 1995 as a Professor of Music. He was a recipient of the Bachelor of Music degree from the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music in 1952, the Master of Music degree from Indiana University in 1962, and the Doctor of Music degree With Distinction from Indiana University in 1989. He was a masterful pianist who, during his ISU teaching career, performed nearly every year either as a soloist, chamber musician, or vocal accompanist. These performances included five solo performances with the Terre Haute Symphony Orchestra and a 1990 solo performance at the annual International Performance Workshop in Graz, Austria, along with other local and regional performances throughout the years.

Bob was also a highly respected teacher of piano. In 1979, he was chosen to receive the coveted Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award from Indiana State University. Five of his piano students won the ISU concerto competition, and a significant number progressed on to prestigious graduate programs, now holding faculty positions at major universities. He was regularly called upon to adjudicate pre-college and university piano festivals and competitions. While a faculty member at ISU, Bob contributed to the work of multiple committees and boards, both at the University and in the community. He was also instrumental in establishing the Delta Mu Chapter of Pi Kappa Lambda (the National Honor Society in Music) at ISU in 1977, and was the first President of that chapter. Bob spent his life enjoying art and music. He will always be remembered not only for his musical gifts, but also for his entertaining comments, wit, and concern for others.

The School of Music acknowledges and appreciates Robert Smith's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives he touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Robert Carrol Smith's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, the School of Music, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

c) C. MacDonald: Vote: 26-0-0

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Mr. Neil Williams, Professor of Anthropology at Indiana State University. Mr. Williams passed away on September 23, 2015. He taught at Indiana State University from September 11, 1964 until May 4, 1991. He retired after working 27 years at Indiana State University.

The Faculty Senate acknowledges Mr. Williams' dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives he touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Mr. Williams' family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, his department, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

d) C. MacDonald: Vote: 26-0-0

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Dr. Charles King, Professor Emeritus of Sociology of Indiana State University. Dr. King passed away on December 17, 2015. He taught at Indiana State University from August 28, 1972 until December 18, 1998. He retired after working over 26 years at Indiana State University. He was 86 years old.

He received a B.A. from Wayland Baptist University in 1953, a Master of Theology from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1959, a Master of Arts in Sociology from Texas Tech University in 1961, and a Ph.D. in Sociology from SUNY Buffalo in 1968.

He taught at SUNY Buffalo 1965-1968, at Texas Tech University 1968-1972, and Indiana State University until retirement in 1998. He continued to teach his favorite subject - Population Problems - until 2003. He served as Secretary of the Eugene V. Debs Foundation in Terre Haute, Indiana from 1985-2015. Charles had several professional memberships and since 1972 has been a member of Terre Haute United Methodist Temple.

Dr. King also served in the US Army Medical Corps and Chaplain Division 1954-1956, stationed in Berlin, Germany. While stationed there, he met Susanne Kratz, and they were married in 1959.

The Faculty Senate acknowledges Dr. Charles King's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives he touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. King's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, his department, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley: none.

b) Provost M. Licari: I want to make sure that everybody knows that we will have another campus town hall on April 27 at 3pm to review the progress made on the new Strategic Plan. At this time, we have the goal statements defined. By then the benchmarks will also be defined. I want to make sure everyone has the chance to review them, make comments, and brainstorm about the initiatives needed to implement them.

3) Chair Report: C. MacDonald

a) The end of the Faculty/Staff Campaign approaches. We only need a few more donors to reach the goal of 700. If you are interested, I have some forms available here.

- i) M. Licari: For those of you who have donated, thank you. The ice cream social will be next Wednesday on the Quad at 12:30. It's also Earth Day.
- 4) Support Staff Report: R. Torrence: none.
- 5) SGA Report: V. Cheeks: none.
- 6) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
  - a) We have finally confirmed that all faculty have use of the Student Recreation Center. I have met with the FEBC a few times and we have gained their support of my next charge to possibly provide a free or discounted parking pass for temporary faculty. I conducted a little research about other universities such as Notre Dame, and Arizona State University who offer temporary faculty at least one free parking pass.
- 7) Approval of March 31, 2016 Minutes
  - a) Approve as amended (D. Malooley, J. Pommier) Vote: 22-0-4.
- 8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
  - a) B. Bunnett: I would like to make a few observations about elections to Exec. I was unable to attend the meeting that occurred last Thursday, and if I say something incorrect please let me know. The candidates for chair and vice-chair ran unopposed. The two candidates for secretary had an opportunity to make a case for themselves. The candidates for the non-officer positions on Exec were self-nominated or nominated by others, but they weren't able to speak for themselves. I would like us to consider taking steps in future elections that would ensure we have two nominees for each officer position. I think we need to ensure that they can say something for themselves. We should also do this for regular candidates for Exec to give them a chance to explain why we should vote for them. Otherwise votes are based on name recognition or what we already know. This automatically puts candidates with less experience at a disadvantage. If we want experienced members and new members, then I would like to suggest modifying our election process. I would be willing to write up a proposal.
    - i) C. MacDonald: The position of chair is often difficult to fill, though at times we have had two people run for the position. It is also easier to become chair once you have experience on Exec.
    - ii) B. Bunnett: That is also the case with professional organizations, and yet they find a way.
    - iii) T. Hawkins: I don't have a problem with reconsidering our electoral process. As an immediate response, I would like to note that there is an ebb-and-flow to our elections. Exec regularly receives new members. In my experience I don't believe that body has ossified. We have been making a conscious effort to bring in new members.
    - iv) C. MacDonald: There have been times we have asked candidates to submit a short biography. There have also been cases where people have chosen not run against others they saw as qualified.
    - v) E. Hampton: I am interested in seeing what kinds of models we can use.

- vi) D. Hantzis: I would like to have Senate candidates post statements.
  - vii) T. Hawkins: We have done that in the past.
  - viii) S. Lamb: That's an excellent idea.
  - ix) C. MacDonald: We would be happy if B. Bunnett drafted a proposal for us to consider
- 9) FAC item: Biennial Review
- a) C. MacDonald: I would like to take up as a block Items #1, 7, 9,10, 11, 12.
    - i) Motion to approve (D. Hantzis, C. Paterson) Vote: 26-0-0.
  - b) C. MacDonald: Is there any discussion on Item #2?
    - i) Motion to approve (C. Paterson, E. Hampton) Vote: 26-0-0.
  - c) C. MacDonald: Is there any discussion on Item #3?
    - i) Motion to approve (E. Southard, C. Paterson) Vote: 26-0-0.
    - ii) D. Hantzis: I do know that some faculty have asked why the criteria could be revised a year into the process. My view is because we don't have an option and cannot press "pause".
    - iii) J. Pommier: Is it clear what it means in the document?
    - iv) C. MacDonald: What the sentence actually says, yes. There must be a vote on the record.
    - v) R. Guell: The way that is phrased implies that it is when the department starts its evaluations—some day in September. It would be one year prior to that.
    - vi) S. Lamb: Remember we softened this a little bit when we had the practice BR. We had a full two years to establish criteria.
  - d) C. MacDonald: Is there any discussion on Item #4?
    - i) Motion to approve (E. Southard, C. Paterson) Vote: 26-0-0.
  - e) C. MacDonald: Is there any discussion on Item #5?
    - i) Motion to approve (C. Paterson, E. Southard) Vote: 26-0-0.
    - ii) D. Malooley: Is there a deadline?
    - iii) C. MacDonald: The one that is in place for a year. This is the subsequent piece.
  - f) C. MacDonald: Issue #6.
    - i) Motion to approve (C. Paterson, E. Southard) Vote: 23-2-1.
    - ii) S. Lamb: Did Exec make a modification to this regarding a rebuttal?
    - iii) C. MacDonald: No. we opted not to make any change to it.
    - iv) R. Guell: Okay. But if I were a chairperson, as I am now, and if I were malevolent, which I am not, and I wrote a letter based on that section of the Handbook, and there were a rebuttal, I could selectively pull only that letter from the file.
    - v) C. MacDonald: Multiple situations should prevent that. The actual file is available to committee members.
    - vi) R. Guell: The entire file is going to be carted into the meeting?
    - vii) C. MacDonald: That's how I'm reading it. The other aspect is the training piece. We've decided there is to be training on this.
    - viii) D. Hantzis: I do remember talking about a situation when only a portion of a record is produced. In my mind there was a subsequent response to this. If you have a response to a grievance, that's a process. I would hope our colleagues would ask for the rest of the story.
    - ix) C. MacDonald: This is also grounds for a letter of objection.

- x) B. Corcoran: Is this the place where we would address a change of status in publication? Is this a place where the chair can add something to the process?
- xi) C. MacDonald: I don't think so.
- xii) M. Licari: This is not part of your personnel file.
- xiii) C. MacDonald: While you may be able to insert such changes in the promotion and tenure process, the biennium will have closed, and therefore no updates should be added.
- xiv) B. Bunnett: So, if a minor event occurs three or four times that does not reflect favorably on someone and then another minor event occurs that seems to establish a pattern, this is no longer minor.
- xv) C. MacDonald: If you are the chair of the department you should follow the established disciplinary steps that lead to a letter of admonishment in the personnel file.
- xvi) B. Bunnett: I can imagine that all kinds of things might happen, but I won't know at the time if it will lead to anything...
- xvii) C. MacDonald: If you don't know this at the time, then it should not be included. It must be a documented problem.
- xviii) R. Guell: It does not mean you have to confine your letter to the last straw. You can make your letter about the last and previous straws. That's when you put a letter of admonishment in the file. You can then use the existence of the letter in the BR.
- xix) B. Bunnett: Okay but I'm referring to events or actions that would never come to a letter of admonishment. They cannot be referred to then...?
- xx) R. Guell: If it is not part of university documents, it is not to be used in the BR.
- g) C. MacDonald: Let's turn to Issue #8.
  - i) Motion to approve (E. Southard, J. Pommier) Vote: 26-0-0
  - ii) S. Lamb: That indicates we don't use our own minds in evaluating the individual. We don't use our own perception—only what is provided by the individual.
  - iii) C. MacDonald: You can't use criteria other than what's written down.
  - iv) S. Lamb: When all is said and done, I'm comfortable with this, but what I see is that we continue to prepare documents for the worst-case scenario. At Exec we live with the worst-case scenarios. But, 95% of chairs behave in a reasonable fashion. I worry we are going along a legalistic path, preparing for the worst, and dealing with that which is not normal. The university is mature enough. It's bothersome.
  - v) D. Hantzis: I appreciate S. Lamb's observation and sympathize with it. I believe we rely on our colleagues to apply department criteria. I think that we do have room. But if decisions are made based on information we don't document or put in writing that person then does not have a chance to respond. It's not fair. What is fair is when we call ourselves to account. If we have genuine concern then we should follow the procedures. We are not good stewards of our profession.
  - vi) S. Lamb: I am empathetic with D. Hantzis' statements. I think successful chairs time and time again try to bring the best out of their colleagues. Successful chairs recognize problems. Sometimes it's impossible and documentation is required. We need to try our best to solve the problem before going to documentation. There must be give and take. You are dealing

- with a most unusual faculty member if s/he is not receptive. Again, I understand the need for this, but I am a little saddened.
- vii) E. Hampton: At this point, is the motion about the use of criteria?
  - viii) C. MacDonald: Same thing we discussed at Exec.
  - h) C. MacDonald: Let us consider Item #13.
    - i) Motion to approve: (J. Pommier, M. Schafer) Vote: 13-13-0
    - ii) C. MacDonald: FAC recommended that everyone involved should participate in training. After much discussion, the proposal was edited to committee members, department chairs, deans and college committee members. Other employees are encouraged.
    - iii) A. Kummerow: My only concern is what if this doesn't happen?
    - iv) C. MacDonald: I am writing the language myself. It will happen.
    - v) A. Kummerow: So if a chair does not participate, they cannot evaluate?
    - vi) C. Paterson: To further clarify that, it could be the department chairperson, not just the committee chairperson.
    - vii) E. Hampton: I am not in favor of the change that moved it away from all faculty. Do we need language that the chairperson takes ownership of the training? It's their responsibility to make sure the members are trained.
    - viii) C. Paterson: If there is a foreseeable situation where a committee member needs to recuse themselves from a review, we may want to strengthen this language. I only state that as a point of discussion.
    - ix) R. Guell: It's not that hard to imagine, because the committee chair will be evaluated by the committee. If the committee chooses to misbehave, they could claim a lack of training.
    - x) S. Lamb: There have been situations where I have needed to recuse myself, but committee members did consult me about process, without dealing with specifics. I think a responsible committee leader can perform that role. If general information is requested, then I don't see it as an issue.
    - xi) E. Hampton: This seems to argue that doing things correctly is too difficult if we leave out training. I don't like voting for something like that.
    - xii) B. Corcoran: All faculty members need to receive some kind of training. If they are not cognitive of the process, they might say or do something in a meeting that could color an evaluation. If it is out, then it is out. It's not the role of the committee chair to make that statement disappear.
    - xiii) D. Hantzis: I support the language, because it states that other faculty are encouraged to participate in the training. I understand E. Hampton and B. Corcoran's statements. I remember in Exec, D. Bradley said that the faculty hate being mandated to do anything. It can be derailed. Faculty will want this. During the pilot year they complained, because they didn't know what they were doing. Putting this in the rules is a good idea. We should not blanket the involvement of all faculty. It does say certain people must do it and everyone else is encouraged.
    - xiv) S. Lamb: In the COB with 38 faculty, 23 would have to go through training. You remember that we are to have instructors on these committees so that increases the numbers. I feel you are setting yourself up for failure rather easily.



- xv) C. Ball: I appreciate that training is beneficial, and I understand why it's required for some. We have committees all over campus, and they have been making decisions without training. I see no reason to mandate it. I think responsible members on the committee should accept the responsibility.
- xvi) R. Guell: I move to return to the original language that all faculty participates in training (R. Guell, C. Paterson) Vote: 14-11-1.
- i) C. MacDonald: Moving on to Item #14.
  - i) Motion to approve (D. Hantzis, J. Kuhlman) Vote: 26-0-0.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: It appears we will have a technological fix for this.
- j) C. MacDonald: On to Issue #15.
  - i) Motion to retain the unified version of the BR (M. Schafer, E. Southard) Vote: 16- 8- 1.
  - ii) R. Guell: I continue to maintain that compelling department committees and college committees to compare apples and oranges will cause this to return to Senate in two years. This goes back to the deal struck with this president that created job security, higher status, and a better salary level for instructors. I dispute the notion that every instructor is an assistant-professor wannabe. The progress of the Senate has been to value these people, and one of the things we can do make them de facto eligible for the \$1500 salary increase and not simply de jure.
  - iii) B. Bunnett: I thought I heard something to the effect that if we did have a unified process more money would be available.
  - iv) C. MacDonald: That was in the bifurcated process.
  - v) R. Guell: It would necessitate more money in the bifurcated process, because more instructors would consider it worthwhile to apply. When I estimated it in the Exec meeting I estimated \$20-25,000 extra and got an enthusiastic nod from the provost. I don't think that amount of money would be a problem. However, I think the President would like to keep it a unified process.
  - vi) M. Schafer: Our department handles this by being clear that you can't be evaluated by what you were not hired to do. I think that we've made them equals, regular faculty, so we should evaluate them as regular faculty with everyone else. If they are not required to do research, then we don't evaluate them in those parts.
  - vii) B. Corcoran: The second column on the right, this issue refers to specific text?
  - viii) C. MacDonald: Yes.
  - ix) B. Corcoran: When we're looking at 347-349, I have never understood the logic of that line. What does that actually mean?
  - x) L. Brown: It says you "may".
  - xi) C. MacDonald: The original had weights.
  - xii) B. Corcoran: To me this seems marginally better. You are still evaluating faculty in the domains.
  - xiii) C. MacDonald: This allows for people to be evaluated on what is the most important work at the moment.
  - xiv) D. Hantzis: The logic is faculty can say I want you to value my work as I do during this period. Faculty live different lives. This allows us some control.

- xv) A. Kummerow: As an instructor I don't want to be separated out. I want to be treated as regular faculty. If I'm not judged or sorted out as a regular faculty, I'm not able to be a part of this discussion. I am willing to remain in the unified pool and take my chances.
- xvi) L. Phillips: My hesitation with this is that if you bifurcate the document you would have instructors evaluating instructors.
- xvii) C. MacDonald: The main argument that has been made is that it is more difficult to evaluate someone with one category versus someone with three or four.
- xviii) B. Corcoran: I still think it's unfair. I think it should be bifurcated, because you're going to get a committee that could privilege scholarship. People who are publishing something are going to advance while those who only teach are not.
- k) C. MacDonald: Let us turn to Issue #16:
  - i) Motion to approve (E. Southard, J. Kuhlman) Vote: 23-1-1.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: This is here to address relevancy of domains. You don't get evaluated on things not in your contract.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: I think this is an important addition. I have learned that every instructor likely needs an MOU that clarifies his or her assignment. Too many people have been doing effectively volunteer work for the university. Contracts are not sufficiently transparent, because we have a lot of discretionary words. I was a little stunned to be reading files in which faculty were being told that it was the understanding of the department that they were expected to do this or that.
  - iv) M. Schafer: For clarification, say we have two or more instructors who are excellent in teaching. But we have to choose one. If one does service/scholarship, we can't make that a factor?
  - v) C. MacDonald: If they are not assigned those duties, that is correct.
  - vi) J. Kuhlman: Contracts say "any duties as assigned by the chair". So, when a chair comes to an instructor and says we want you to work on this grant and the employee says okay, does that become a part of their assigned duties? Could it be evaluated?
  - vii) C. MacDonald: It should be part of an equivalent of five courses.
  - viii) J. Kuhlman: So they would have to have release time.
  - ix) S. Lamb: According to R. Guell, this was most controversial among instructors. They were not happy with the question of "volunteering" without rewards. In my experience contract faculty want to be able to demonstrate their talents. They enjoy showing their skills and being appreciated.
  - x) C. Paterson: I tend to agree. I think what will happen is that we are going to expose a bigger problem. I don't think there's a clean vote either way it goes.
  - xi) C. MacDonald: D. Hantzis has spoken eloquently about the hazards of self-exploitation. R. Guell has spoken as well. We don't want to create another category of "tenure-track" faculty with equivalent expectations that we simply pay less.
  - xii) S. Lamb: We have instructors serving right now. If I told E. Gallatin he couldn't serve he would have words.
  - xiii) D. Hantzis: We write MOUs to allow for that. If it's not part of their pay structure, it's not a job it's a gift. Write it down.

- l) C. MacDonald: To Item #17:
  - i) Motion to approve (S. Lamb, M. Schafer) Vote: 17-5-1.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: You may remember the last time we discussed this that FAC proposed giving faculty the ability to assess their chair. After lengthy discussion in Exec, this raised larger issues. We need to look at this issue in more depth before we change it.
  - iii) S. Lamb: Leaving it as it is means the department must assess the work done by the chair. We should have read what was initially there before we began examining it. The expectations for chairs are laid out in the Handbook.
  - iv) E. Hampton: I disagree. We have a situation where we have no criteria for evaluating administrative assignments. This sets up a situation for a bad evaluation. Considering what we've passed today, it is inconsistent to evaluate without criteria.
  - v) D. Hantzis: We would have to mandate that criteria be established a year in advance.
  - vi) R. Guell: It does not say that the committee is going to evaluate the chairperson as well. It says they will consider it overall. They are going to read the dean's statement. It doesn't say they are going to independently evaluate them.
  - vii) S. Lamb: I agree. Is there another paragraph that deals with this?
  - viii) D. Malooley: Line 189:
  - ix) R. Guell: Department management was included by FAC.
  - x) D. Hantzis: We added it in after the pilot because faculty requested it.
  - xi) S. Lamb: I think E. Hampton's criticism is apt but I don't think it applies to chairs. I think E. Hampton has been in other administrative assignments. People, what I'm arguing for is chairs being recognized as faculty. They should be answerable to faculty, and they should receive feedback from faculty.
  - xii) C. MacDonald: How I read this is that the first several lines do indeed say that the supervisor writes a letter which then goes to the committee.
  - xiii) S. Lamb: So you're comfortable with what's on the board?
  - xiv) C. Paterson: This presumes that the department chairperson is in fact the same department. There are examples of people who serve as a department chair in a different department.
  - xv) C. MacDonald: We address this in another section.
  - xvi) D. Hantzis: I do believe that if I have what the university says is an administrative position my peers should be able to evaluate my work quality. We do need to move the statement that J. Conant wrote to the correct section, because it applies to "E" only.
  - xvii) R. Guell: In bringing in the comments of faculty across the campus as chair of FAC, there were relatively few items that created as much heat as the disagreement over whether department committees should or shall evaluate the administrative duties of the chair. Leaving ambiguous language intact is dangerous.
  - xviii) Motion to reinsert the language "including department management" (R. Guell, C. Paterson) Vote: 16-6-1
- m) C. MacDonald: Let us turn to Item #18:
  - i) Motion to approve and move language to Section 3. Department Review and Evaluation, letter E. (R. Guell, J. Kuhlman) Vote: 17-2-0
- n) Motion to approve entire document (R. Guell, S. Lamb) Vote: 17-2-0

10) Adjournment: 5:20 pm