

COA Minutes 12/9/14:

Members present: Francesca Seaman, Jeff Gropp, Meryl Altman, Scott Spiegelberg, David Worthington, Michael Roberts, Larry Stimpert

Discussion of post-tenure review issues:

Specifically, we evaluated a new proposal brought by Larry that includes new wording to *Part D: Evaluation of Faculty Members in Tenured Positions* in the faculty handbook.

Questions arose on the phrasing of section 3 of the new proposal.

- 1) The use of the word "review" was challenged.
- 2) The length of the report (1-2 pages (original) vs 3-5 pages (new)).
- 3) The need (or not) to submit the proposal to COF or simply introduce the idea to them instead. Furthermore, if the proposal does go to COF, should it contain section 3 at all? The idea is to submit Part D without section 3 and use the sabbatical process as a way of having developmental types of conversations with faculty. That is, there wouldn't be a formal evaluation process for all faculty members, but those that sought sabbaticals would be required to include a reflective statement in their proposal.
- 4) The question was then raised, why not just accept Michael's original draft that had the optional reflective statement (whether part of the sabbatical process or not)? Larry expressed concern about bringing a voluntary proposal to the Board of Trustees, since they might reject it. This was followed with a question of whether the Board was even interested in this issue.
- 5) Larry is presenting the ideas (12/10/14) that we have discussed to COF to get their impression of the proposals.

Also, on the topic of sabbaticals: are sabbaticals a use it or lose it? Larry's response: No, if you don't use it, you get the call to submit your proposal the following year. There was some discussion about the problem this may create for departments if there is 'bunching' of sabbaticals in a same year as a result of someone delaying their sabbatical.

**** New topic ****

We moved on to the discussion about the change in faculty governance, specifically the President's proposal. In the last meeting, we had spent a lot of time discussing the new UPC committee. One member expressed concern over the details of the make-up of the committee. Larry noted that we shouldn't lose focus on the opportunity to make changes to the faculty governance. He added concerns about the use of division and committee composition.

Meryl mentioned the example of Oxford. They have a nominating committee that uses moral suasion and incentives when asking people to serve.

Larry introduced the topic of election for appointments. Which committees could have appointments rather than elections? Committee on Committees could appoint people. The question came down to how do we get people on committees? At the same time, there are drawbacks to forcing people to serve.

We will meet on Monday, with FGSC and President, to discuss the proposed changes to faculty governance.

