

PCOE College Council

30 January 2017, 2:00 - 3:30 PM

Minutes - Summary

Members Present: Dean Judy Abbott, Deborah Buswell, Jay Thornton, Claudia Whitley, Sally Ann Swearingen, Ken Austin, George Willey, Lauren Burrow, Chay Runnels, Heather Munro, and Daniel McCleary

Not Present: N/A

1. Welcome & introductions

Dean Abbott welcomed the group, followed by short discussion of events at the East Texas Research Center (Rusk Papers; regents and Kay Bailey Hutchison on campus today)

2. Review of minutes/summary

An unspoken correction was submitted via email, and changes were made by Dean Abbott this morning. Summary was reviewed and Sally Ann Swearingen made the motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Claudia Whitley. The Council unanimously accepted as presented.

3. PCOE policies/practices

Began with review from Workgroup 2, followed by Workgroup 3, then Workgroup 1.

Workgroup 1 – Promotion & Academic Tenure Policy (Deborah, Jay, Sally Ann)

Jay Thornton presented the policy. At bottom of p. 1 in the tenure document, a change was underlined stating "faculty may go up early for tenure if..." This language will be changed to reflect more professional/academic wording. Faculty need precise guidelines and steps for the process (with dates). Early tenure (prior to the critical year stated in employee's contract) considerations need a formal deadline—Dean suggests prior to February 1. Ideally the results would be given to faculty by spring break.

The promotion policy will only use satisfactory/unsatisfactory, with no "exceeds" category. The same will be true for tenure policy. At the PCOE level, a faculty member must meet expectations in all three areas in order to be eligible for tenure (effective academic year 2017-2018). Faculty members are held to the *tenure* requirements in place at the time they were hired. This may be true for promotion, depending on when the application for promotion occurs.

Promotion criteria (IV) A. 2b. will be amended to include refereed exhibits, performances, or creative scholarly publications/works. Jay will look at SFASU policy to verify whether faculty must meet expectations in two of the three areas (teaching, service, scholarship) or in all three, and whether the requirement should be more stringent for those moving from associate to full professor than those moving from assistant to associate. Mention of changing "three" to "five" years in item IV criteria.

Workgroup 2 - Faculty Merit Pay Policy (Daniel, Lauren, Claudia)

Daniel McCleary spoke on of recommendations implemented based on the last review by the committee. Language addressing feedback/explanation of decisions to faculty members was inserted into the 2nd paragraph of the policy to provide more specific directions than are found in university requirements. The unit faculty is tasked with developing the merit pay policy. However, unit faculty may choose, as a unit, to have the unit head develop the policy. Also, the unit head will provide individual feedback to each faculty member regarding performance and a rationale for the particular recommendation for merit made to the dean and provost. If recommended for consideration, this policy will be forwarded to the leadership council. If the policy is changed or revised, it will come back to this committee.

Dean Abbott called for vote to accept. Jay Thornton made motion to accept, seconded by Chay Runnels. The committee voted unanimously in favor of accepting this policy.

Workgroup 3 - Performance Evaluation of Faculty Policy (Chay, George, Heather, Ken)

Ken Austin presented the policy, first addressing the paragraph immediately under the "Policy" heading. The word "usually" was added here to indicate variable evaluation schedules. Dean Abbott stated that performance evaluations are based on annual reports, which are submitted through mid-November. The PCOE may adjust due dates for FAR reports to be earlier than the university's (11/14) deadline. Ken stated that "mid fall semester" is ambiguous language, and a firm date can be announced at a later time – Dean agrees this is a nice placeholder statement.

Questions were raised regarding perceived discrepancy between item #6 and the 2nd paragraph on p. 2. Changed p. 2 to read 5 years, not 6. Removed language referring to "section 8" and "section 9," to be replaced with "see SFA policy manual, section 7.22." Dean Abbott questioned need for "exceeds expectations" language. She researched and verified that this was an addition made by this group. SFASU only evaluates as meets expectations (satisfactory) and does not meet expectations (unsatisfactory). Ken suggested striking "exceeds" from this post-tenure policy, to circumvent questions on how that would be rated.

On p. 4, the word "excellence" and the accompanying blurb will be removed from the policy definitions.

Collegiality was discussed at length, and the group was made aware that other major universities have taken out such language because "collegiality" is difficult to prove/quantify/evaluate/document. Dean Abbott states that this word must be included (as the policy committee would be the entity to make such a change), and that we should explore how other universities who **do** still use this language are addressing such concerns. It was also pointed out that research, teaching, and service are not defined either. The issue of collegiality will be imbedded and addressed in each of the three major areas rather than evaluated as a separate criterion. A sentence may be added to p. 3 item #5, "Collegiality will be considered...."

The group agreed that of the three major requirements, teaching should always be "satisfactory." Discussion was held to determine whether faculty members must score "satisfactory" in all three areas or in 2 of 3 (one of which must be Teaching) to receive an overall "satisfactory" rating. Individual units may decide whether to require 2/3 or 3/3 be deemed satisfactory. Dean expressed concerns about need for a "safe gap" to ensure that service or scholarship are not abandoned, but group voiced that annual evaluations still look at all three measures. We do not want units to become 'lopsided' or out-of-balance in these areas. Use of adjuncts is encouraged to prevent faculty overloads which take away from service and scholarship. Item #7 (p. 3) will be amended to say that satisfactory findings in 2 of 3 categories (teaching + one other) are required. Teaching must always receive a satisfactory rating; if scholarship and service are "satisfactory" but teaching is not, the overall rating will be "Unsatisfactory." A developmental plan (item #9) may be instated. If a faculty member earns overall "unsatisfactory" scores twice in three-year span, a developmental plan will be implemented.

Motion to accept this policy as discussed and revised (we will see it again) made by Sally Ann Swearingen, seconded by Claudia Whitley. The committee will vote/approve the final version electronically.

4. Name change update

Not addressed due to time constraints

5. Subcommittee updates

Not addressed due to time constraints

6. Issues from the faculty

Not addressed due to time constraints

Each department/unit must approve these policies and reply to Dean Abbott by spring break in order that these revisions may be applied in Fall 2017.

Dean Abbott voiced concerns about having a vote on policies at this time, and suggested an interim meeting for this group to discuss promotion, tenure, and periodic (post-tenure) review policies. The College Council will reconvene in one week on Monday, February 6 from 3:30-4:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.