Faculty Policy Committee Meeting

Minutes

10/19/10

Present: Thomas Norman, Kate Esposito, Jonathon Grasse, Mary Brooks, Carl Sneed, David Bradfield, Ken Ganezer, Dana Belu

Norman called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. He went over FPC 02-21 which was passed by the senate several years ago but not made into policy. Vogel and Martin are now reviewing it and it looks like it will be made into policy we are waiting to hear. There was discussion about the RTP process and Esposito said that in her college they always use the language “in your 7th year” maybe we need to review the policy. The language of the letters seems to be a problem. Sneed said that he is not sure we can change how letters are written. Bradfield recommended that the committee put forward a change in the way appointment letters are written. Be clear in saying in the appointment letter that assuming satisfactory progress is make tenure will be received on (date) or promotion will be received on (date).

Ganezer said that he is unclear what happens with the 6th year and does that information ever get looked at. Sneed said that it does not unless you request it. Ganezer said that we used to have a faculty affairs dean, but since then there have been constant changes in the faculty personnel office and then we had a professional person... Ken Portner.

Ganezer said that there can be a defacto non-reappointment all cases get reviewed by the URTP. Esposito said that the dean’s perspective is needed because they know the college guidelines. We need to know where we are and where we want to go.

Ganezer said that all departments are to have guidelines on teaching, scholarship and creativity. Sneed said that it is for early tenure only and there are university guidelines you should use. Ganezer said that service can be different by department. In physics service means committees or a reviewer of grant proposals.

Norman said that many departments have definitions of scholarship but they have not standards. Also, some RTP letters appear to have no critical evaluation at all.

We decided to meet next Tuesday from 1 to 3 p.m.

Jonathon Grasse-Online PTE’s Gus Martins office is doing system wide survey. Every campus is doing its own thing. 10 campuses have not responded. Some have no pilot programs. There is a feeling that online pte’s is inevitable. It will be a time saver, cost saver, There is the issue of low returns and the response is seen as temporary. This will change with the pop up technology and blackboard. Gus Martin is seeking a feasibility report. Full professors have been asked or told PTE process is on the line. We are unsure about the password protection and all details. Faculty concern for fairness, labor and contract issues. The #of responses per class. The possibility of a more negative evaluation. The self
marginal study would be engaged. Too low a response issue of this being a crossroads. If these changes result in a new parameter of evaluation probe of working or an agreement how this is applied.

Sneed said that the online PTE issue was suppose to be something the senate would vote on, but now it is being imposed, we should confront this at the senate. Gus Martin promised that we would have data on how it is working on the campus but we have seen no data.

Norman said that we need to get the data from Gus Martin before we go to the senate, the senate will need the data.