**Committee Name: Faculty Affairs Policy Committee**

**Meeting Date & Time: Friday, March 31, 2:00pm**

**Meeting Location: Arts & Sciences 116**

**Attendance**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Members “P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets** |
| P | Alex Blazer | P | Mary Jean Land |
| P | Robert Blumenthal | P | Barbara Roquemore |
| P | Louis Bourne | P | Patrick Simmons |
| R | Kell Carpenter | P | Christina Smith |
| P | Carrie Cook | P | Ashley Taylor |
| P | David Johnson | P | Tom Toney |
| P | Monica Ketchie |  |  |
| Guests: |
|  | *Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.* |  |   |
|  | \*Denotes new discussion on old business. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Agenda Topic (Committees should feel free to customize this template to make it as functional for them as possible. Other categories of topics might include Reports, Information Items, Unfinished Business, etc.) | Discussions & Conclusions  | Action or Recommendations | Follow-Up{including dates/responsible person, status (pending, ongoing, completed)} |
| **I. Call to order** |  | Meeting called to order at 2pm |  |
| **II. Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved |  |
| **III. Approval of Minutes** |  | Approved |  |
| **IV. Old Business/Review of****Actions/Recommendations** |  |  |  |
| 1. **Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group**
 | The committee decided that the pilot program not be mandatory, but be available for all full-time faculty, with a preference towards those who are pre-tenured. There was disagreement regarding whether the pilot program evaluators have expertise in the fields being observed as well as whether there should be one or two member review teams. | The Committee voted to postpone recommending the Pilot Program at this time in a vote of 6 to 3. | The Committee will decide what to do with the Pilot Program recommendation next academic year. |
| 1. **Student Opinion Survey Work Group**
 | The Committee did not have time to discuss the Work Group recommendation. |  | The Committee will decide what to do with the Student Opinion Survey recommendation next academic year. |
| 1. **T&P Task Force**
 | No report. |  |  |
| 1. **Evaluation of Administrators**
 | In the week after the Committee’s March 3 meeting, the Committee discussed the ideas presented by the Provost via email. The Committee is interested in working with the Provost’s Office to revise the Five-Year Administrative Review policy. The Committee has questions about preserving the in-house Review Team, and it fully supports streamlining the time table, updating the way evaluations are gathered, and making the process less burdensome. |  | The Committee will work with the Provost next year to revise the evaluation of administrators policies and procedures. |
|  |  |  |  |
| **V. New Business**Actions/Recommendations |  |  |  |
| 1. **Review of Standing Committee Scope**
 | Committee not concerned with changing scope or its language. |  |  |
| 1. **Probationary Credit Towards Tenure**
 | The committee feels that the current procedures for probationary credit are appropriate, no changes need to be made. |  |  |
| VI. Next Meeting |  | Friday, April 28 at 2:00pm in A&S 116 |  |
| VII. Adjournment |  | Meeting adjourned at ????? |  |

**Distribution(as determined in committee operating procedure – one possibility given):**

First; To Committee Membership for Review

Second: Posted to the Minutes Website