

Dear Howard,

The following is a summary of the work done by the Review Committee during 2017-18 academic year.

**Decisions made:**

1. The committee completed the following reviews:
  - 1 Tenure
  - 2 Tenure and Promotion to Associate
  - 3 Term
  - 9 Interim
  - 4 Promotion for Professor
  - 7 Chair
  - 4 Program Director
2. The committee standardized a template for the Appendix B for newly hired faculty members and for current faculty members who wish to change their Appendix B.
3. The committee revised the instructions on the student opinion surveys.
4. The committee passed a Lesser sanction policy through the faculty (FROLS...Faculty Review of Lesser Sanctions).

**Pending Issues/Recommendations:**

1. Review of staff, administrators, and part time faculty who teach. The committee would like to make sure all members of the community are reviewed if they teach courses for credit. The committee discussed ways this should be done and suggests revisiting this issue during the next year. The committee ultimately believed we should have some quality control over anyone who teaches at this university.
2. The committee is very concerned about the biases within student opinion surveys and encourages future committees to revisit the role and impact of bias in our student surveys. The committee agreed that the surveys need to be changed, but also discussed whether they could/should be replaced in the future. We had lengthy debates that we hope will continue on the future committee and extend to the wider university community. We are also hopeful that some decisions can be made regarding these surveys in the upcoming academic year.
3. The committee was concerned about the president's description of our work with his end of the year personnel review email to the faculty. More specifically, the president mischaracterized the agreement between the president and the committee. We were very divided on how to correct the mischaracterization and ultimately decided that we should not inform the larger community of the issue in

order to protect the confidentiality of the review process. The committee would like this communicated to the BOT and also believe it is important for the president to accurately reflect our work in his future correspondence. We take great pride in being transparent. While we do not expect the president to tell the community how we ruled in personnel cases, we do expect him to be accurate when discussing our work. It might be helpful for the president to send campus correspondence to the committee for review prior to writing to the campus about our work in the future.

Clarissa Peterson, Chair 2017-2018