

# **Agenda of General Faculty meeting**

## **12:20 PM Tuesday, November 18, 2008**

### **Ballroom David Student Union**

President Wheeler called the meeting to order at 12:23.

#### **I. Certification of graduates**

Dr. Mazzarella (seconded by Dr. Mollick) move to certify the [December 2008 Graduates](#). Motion passes unanimously.

- II. President Wheeler asked for open discussion. The first issue that faculty discussed was the draft University Eval-4 criteria (available at <http://provost.cnu.edu/WebForms/DraftEval4.pdf>), particularly with respect to post-tenure review. President Wheeler said that the university eval-4 criteria will be used in post-tenure review. Some faculty, however, felt that post tenure review has a different purpose than probationary or promotion review, that the purpose of post tenure review is to determine if there is any reason to begin a process to dismiss a faculty member for cause. [**Note:** The Faculty Handbook states, in part, that the post-tenure "review process ... is designed to be a helpful process aimed at improvement." See below for more Handbook detail on scheduled and unscheduled reviews]. President Wheeler reminded faculty that there are two kinds of post tenure review, scheduled and unscheduled. The review for the university eval-4 process would apply to the scheduled 6 year review. Another faculty member was concerned about two issues: that there are no quantities/expectations specified for each category in the draft, and that documenting these criteria could result in even larger dossiers. One university eval-4 committee member felt that expectations for the categories should be part of the departmental Eval-4. Others agreed that faculty need guidelines for what to put in the dossier, and how to document the new criteria. Another faculty member was concerned about the calendar this year: post-tenure review occurs in January, but departments update their Eval-4 in March. If the university eval-4 is intended to be used as criteria in the absence of departmental guidelines, then post-tenure reviews will use the new university eval-4 criteria. Another faculty member felt that CNU should follow the advice of IDEA creators at Kansas State who recommend that evaluations, in whatever category, count no more than 30% in evaluating teaching quality.

Faculty also asked about Blackboard. Some faculty are frustrated with basic operations such as allowing students to turn assignments in late or entering

grades, which is time consuming because a postback is done for every single grade entry. Other faculty felt that the interface looks dated. But Ronnie Cohen, chair of ATAC (Academic Technology Advisory Committee), said that she has not heard of any problems, and IT Services conducted a training session last week, and no faculty came. There was no resolution, but Professor Cohen encouraged faculty to contact her or any member of ATAC with any concerns related to computing.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:51.

**Note about post-tenure review in the 2008-2009 University Handbook, XII.8.b.5.g on pages 110 and 111.** Scheduled post-tenure review is specified under (2): "All tenured faculty will undergo a scheduled performance review in the peer group format every sixth year during the spring semester evaluation cycle.... (b) The final judgment will be satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A satisfactory rating results in the scheduling of a new scheduled peer review in six years. A final judgment of unsatisfactory results in recommendations for improvement which the faculty member will address in the EVAL-6 to be submitted at the beginning of the next fall semester review cycle. Part f), above, specifies how continuing unsatisfactory evaluations can place faculty into an unscheduled review.

Part f on page 111 says: "a final judgment of unsatisfactory [in a scheduled review process] may lead to administrative sanctions, possibly including initiating the dismissal process."

Part g on page 110 says: "The unscheduled review process has the potential to lead to sanctions but it is designed to be a helpful process aimed at improvement and will focus on individual faculty and not institutional needs."