

Executive Committee Meeting Notes
Friday, February 6, 2015

Present: Esma Gel, Huan Liu (chair), Keith Holbert (secretary), Vikram Kodibgkar, Narayanan Neithalath, Lenore Dai, Shawn Jordan (by phone), Cy Kuo, Xiao Wang
Absent: Sule Ozev, David Allee, Al Chasey, Hanqing Jiang
Guest: Dean Paul Johnson

1. **Dean's Dissertation Award.** Dean Johnson shared the outcome of the conversation with the Leadership Team on this award process. Directors were okay with the overall process for this award. The selection will be made in January with awardees being recognized during the Spring Convocation ceremony each year. Nominees will be identified by directors of each school. One Ph.D. student from each program will be awarded. The directors requested a sample nomination packet. Sule Ozev is lead on this.
2. **Post-Tenure Review document.** Sub-committee reports on the PTR references continued for References 2, 3 and 5. (A report on Ref 1 was provided in last month's meeting.)

Ref 2 (ACD 506-11): Has no mention of the meeting between the faculty member and chair; and it only says what happens when a faculty member does not receive an acceptable post-tenure review. Overall, Ref 2 serves more as a bibliographical citation on the policy of PTR rather than a reference as to the actual process.

Ref 3 (Provost Post-Tenure Review Process): The following comments were received

- 1) Item 1.E: (page 2) The heading **Consequences of an Overall Unsatisfactory Performance in Two Areas** should be changed to **Consequences of an Overall Unsatisfactory Performance** to reduce confusion and maintain consistency with Ref3. Note that this proposed change brings the heading back closer to that in the original version.
- 2) Page 3 para 2 line 8 reads: **Each Plan must be developed jointly by the concerned faculty member, the unit chair or director, and at least one additional faculty member from the unit.** whereas Ref 3 says **"is formulated by the academic unit chair/director and the dean. The faculty member will have the opportunity to provide input"**(i.e., there is no mention of an additional faculty member in the ASU reference). It was recommended to change the sentence to : **Each Plan must be developed jointly by the unit chair or director and the dean with input from the concerned faculty member.**
- 3) Item 1.F page 3 reads: **An overall satisfactory rating with a single area of unsatisfactory performance leads to a Faculty Development Plan.** Recommendation made to change this to : **An overall satisfactory rating with a single area of unsatisfactory performance leads to an Academic Unit Development Plan.** for consistency with language in ref 3.
- 4) It seems like the FSE PTR document uses the terminology Faculty Development Plan while the Provost Office uses Academic Unit Development Plan, and hence, consistency in the language would be useful.

Ref 5 (FSE Promotion, Tenure and Retention Criteria): This document, which was substantially revised in 2011, can be inserted into the PTR document as a valid, current reference. Narayanan Neithalath will send a revised Appendix B to Keith Holbert for review.

3. **Dean's Lecture Speaker.** Esma Gel will continue collecting votes regarding the formal list of potential speakers. Once this document is finalized, it can be updated each Fall with a new set of votes and priorities. Annette Bowers will follow-up with Assistant Secretary Patricia Hoffman regarding potential dates for a seminar/campus visit sometime during Spring semester.
4. **Faculty Evaluation Process.** Dean Johnson tasked the Executive Committee with developing a more streamlined (less paperwork) and meaningful process for faculty evaluations. Specifically, the Dean and School directors seek our input about:
 1. The expectations of an annual review from a faculty perspective.
 2. The potential to streamline the process.
 3. The meaning of the scores and the weights used on the evaluation form.

Action Item: The Executive Committee will talk to their faculty to determine what aspects of an evaluation are important. Next month's discussion will begin with an understanding of what the various units do now in their evaluation process as a first step in identifying better practices from one unit to the next.

5. **Spring Academic Assembly.** Dean Johnson reminded the Executive Committee that we are responsible for the organizing the Spring meeting of the Academic Assembly.

Next Meeting: Friday, March 6, 2015; 12 NOON; BY 660