

## Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

2/27/07: 11:00 am - 12:15 pm

Present: Laverne Nishihara (chair), Ed Fitzgerald, Sherry Rankin, Dan Doerger (recording)

Absent: TJ Rivard, David Frantz (ex-officio) was at a UFC

- I. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from 2/20/07 were approved with notice of a typographical error: “in tact” will appear as “intact” in section II.c. of the minutes
- II. Revisions to Policy on Lecturer Appointments at Indiana University East: Laverne informed the committee that the draft of the Policy on Lecturer Appointments was sent to the LLTCRC for review
- III. Review of the FAC’s role in the Division Chair/Dean Review Process
  - a. Academic Affairs inquired about the status of the original copies of the rating instrument once the review was completed. Were such documents kept or destroyed? After discussion, the committee decided that the documents should be destroyed upon successful completion of the review process to ensure anonymity of those who completed the instrument.
    - i. It was decided to add the following statement to the end of the section titled “How Should the Evaluation Process be Administered?” in the IUE Faculty Senate By-Laws (located in Section 5, Faculty Affairs Committee): “The original copies of the Faculty Affairs approved instrument shall be destroyed upon the successful completion of the peer review process.”
  - b. In Section 5 (Faculty Affairs Committee) of the IUE Faculty Senate By-Laws, under the heading “How Should the Evaluation Process be Administered”, it was decided that the sentence “Upon completion by faculty and staff, they should hand deliver their completed instrument to the peer evaluator for tabulation” be changed to “Upon completion by faculty and staff, they should deliver their completed instrument to the peer evaluator (or an appointed designee) for tabulation.”
  - c. Questions regarding the Actual Survey: Laverne is following up on the questions listed below:
    - i. Ed: Have the chairs been asked if the instrument yields information that is helpful to them?
    - ii. Dan: Each question asks for a ranking for expected and perceived behavior. The directions request comments for any item listed 1-2 or 6-7. Does this mean for both ranking types? Does this mean one does not have to write comments for items ranked 3-5?
    - iii. Dan: Why are there descriptors for #4 on some survey items and not others?
- IV. Conversion from Divisions to Schools
  - a. Review of Materials: Laverne guided the committee through the documents regarding this change. Conclusion: not all regional campuses go by the intent of the IU policies

- b. Ed noted that the constitution contains the flexibility necessary for a transition. The faculty would have the authority when decisions affect them.
- c. Laverne suggested that proposals coming forward from divisions requesting a change in status should include a statement about the “school’s” power as related to issues concerning the entire university (such as the academic calendar). It should also be stated clearly that Faculty Senate and the Senate Committees maintain authoritative power regarding issues affecting the entire campus.
- d. Ed suggested that a new section be added to the IUE Constitution similar to the commentary written in section 2.1 of the IU Constitution
- e. It was noted that the selection and evaluation process for Deans would need to be consistent across campus

V. Next meeting

- i. Tuesday March 13, 2007, 11:00 am- 12:15 pm. Campus Life Offices.