

Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

3/13/07: 11:00 am - 12:15 pm

Present: Laverne Nishihara (chair), David Frantz, Sherry Rankin, TJ Rivard, Dan Doerger (recording)

Absent: Ed Fitzgerald

- I. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from 2/27/07 were approved
- II. Revisions to Policy on Lecturer Appointments at Indiana University East
 - a. Laverne noted that she will add page numbers to the document
 - b. HFA suggested that a line be added to page 7. The sentence “Lecturers must demonstrate that they are EXCELLENT in teaching and at least SATISFACTORY in service in order to be appointed to a long-term contract” will be added to the end of the paragraph immediately following the list of review materials to include in the document. The committee agreed that the placement of this sentence in the document was appropriate.
 - c. Committee members voted unanimously to send the amended document to the Agenda Committee. Laverne noted that she would check with Ed Fitzgerald, who was not present, to ensure he did not have any significant misgivings about sending the document forward.
- III. Review of the FAC’s role in the Division Chair/Dean Review Process
 - a. Laverne reviewed the additions/changes to the Senate By-Laws as related to the role of the FAC in the Division Chair/Dean Review Process that were discussed at our last meeting.
 - b. Laverne shared comments from Kumara who has tabulated the data from the instrument used to evaluate Division Chairs/Deans. His conclusions:
 - i. Some people found the instrument confusing and often ignored the directions
 - ii. While some find the descriptors helpful, he favors eliminating them and including “strongly agree” or “strongly disagree”
 - iii. Different people fill out section XXV differently; perhaps we should only ask for the top three and bottom three, not top and bottom seven
 - iv. The instrument is long and simplification should be considered
 - v. There are few directions for tabulating the data
 - c. Laverne asked TJ if, as a Division Head, he found the results of the survey helpful. TJ noted that the comments were typically helpful but that the summary of the quantitative data was less helpful. Laverne suggested that we survey the chairs to see if they find the information useful. David suggested we do this by sending a few questions to AAC for dissemination to chairs.
 - d. It was suggested that perhaps we should consider either changing the format of the existing instrument or changing the instrument altogether. There were a variety of suggestions:

- i. TJ suggested removing the “Recruitment of Faculty” item from the list of items on which Chairs are evaluated citing the lack of funds and administrative support for chairs to perform such functions.
 - 1. Laverne noted that there are things chairs can do in this area that are not necessarily dependent on formal programs and/or funding. Since the Division Chair, not the chair of a search and screen committee, is partially responsible for hiring, there should be an expectation in this area
- ii. Per Kumara’s comment, it was discussed that fewer items should be listed in section XXV of the survey
- iii. It was suggested that a category about “Dealing with Student Issues” be added to the list since this is a major part of Division Heads’ responsibilities
- iv. It was suggested that an overall satisfaction category be added to get a holistic sense of faculty satisfaction
- v. It was noted that no categories consider the morale of the division being surveyed
- vi. It was suggested that at the bottom of page 2 of the instrument the sentences “Each item has a space for comments. If you mark 1-2 or 6-7, please comment” be deleted and replaced with “Please comment.”
- vii. Dan agreed with Kumara’s suggestion that the descriptors be deleted and replaced with “strongly agree/disagree.” The prompts would have to be rewritten to accommodate this change.
- e. David pointed out that there may be inconsistencies in the ways divisions interpret the terms “full-time” and “part-time” as related to faculty
- f. Laverne will speak to Markus about our concerns as well as the comments received by others

IV. Conversion from Divisions to Schools

- a. Review of Materials: Laverne summarized the committee’s discussion from 2/27/07 and concluded we have three options as related to the conversion
 - i. Add a statement to the IUE Constitution similar to the commentary written in section 2.1 of the IU Constitution
 - ii. Require that proposals coming forward from divisions requesting a change in status 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.
 - iii. Consider changes to “Colleges” vs. “Schools”
- b. Laverne suggested that we investigate the feasibility of items i-iii and eliminate any options that are in violation of current policies
- c. In regards to faculty authority, David suggested we check to see what other campuses are doing

V. Next meeting

- i. Tuesday March 27, 2007, 11:00 am- 12:15 pm. Campus Life Offices.