

A&S Council minutes

November 28 2012

Present: Joanna Mosser, Joe Lenz, David Courard-Hauri, Marc Busch, Chinh Dao, Tim Knepper, Leslie Marrs, Karla Kash, Joseph Schneider, Amy O'Shaughnessy, A&S Senator Michael Terrell, Art & Design chair Rob Craig

Joanna called the meeting to order at 3:38pm

Minutes from the October Council meeting were unanimously approved.

Dean's report:

Joe recently had the opportunity to visit SACI (Studio Art Centers Int'l) in Florence – a consortium of which Drake was a founding member. The school specializes in art conservation, archaeology, and studio art. Benjamin Gardner will be taking 10 students to do a summer term, using the resources at that location.

5 searches are underway in Arts & Sciences—in this week and next, there will be campus visits for LPS, Math Ed, Chem, and Rhetoric positions, with a likelihood of offers being extended before holiday break. Remaining search is in graphic design; will begin after the break due to disciplinary calendar.

The college is in the process of hiring a web coordinator/administrative assistant. Hopefully an offer before the holiday break, person will begin in January.

Consideration of proposed changes to faculty handbook:

Members will discuss only today, as the handbook specifies that there must be one meeting between discussions and voting upon handbook changes.

Changes relative to 5 categories:

1. *New Policy on Conflict of Interest*

There is a university policy governing faculty/student interactions, and the college policy is based upon this one.

How would this relationship be determined? Some instances are stated; others would not be known unless individuals disclose relationships (for example, between two faculty members).

Schneider—upon whom is the burden of decision? (ex: if I was being evaluated by you, and in another org outside of Drake, we have a bitter conflict, who decides whether this is fair, me or you?)

2. *Policy and Procedures Regarding Faculty Honors*

The Stalnaker selection is almost entirely at the discretion of the committee, while Centennial is determined by nomination from department and then by committee.

3. *Revision of Existing P&T Faculty Evaluation Practices*

3.1.61.a: *inclusion of summer and j-term course evals in P&T files*

A&S is the only college that excludes summer courses from having to be submitted. This inclusion is only for courses taught for Drake, including summer courses.

3.1.62: *adds "family members" and clarifies "outside reviewers"*

Schneider: By editors, do we really mean just book editors and not journal editors? It's possible to find language to make the distinction. Also of note: the stronger your work and the smaller your field, the more likely you are to be known.

Lenz: A journal editor does not rely on a contributor's success, so would be in a good position to speak about the work. It's troublesome to think about these reviewers being eliminated, as they're just the sort of separate eye to comment on the work in question.

Courard-Hauri: The P&T committee is aware that outside reviewers have some significant positive feeling about the work but the committee relies entirely on the assumption that letters are unbiased and not cherry-picked.

Busch: Is there a statute of limitations: if collaboration occurred long ago, is there cutoff?

Lenz: The ideal external reviewer would be someone completely disconnected from the candidate—a stranger. Some work happens in fields where the group of professionals is relatively small; there's a difference between being known and being connected.

Kash: finds "close acquaintances" a little murky.

To include: If there are special circumstances, this should be addressed in the file.

3.1.64: removing ability of recused member of P&T to participate in final vote.

Courard-Hauri: Since a tie vote is a negative recommendation, the recused member's vote could only sway the committee to a negative recommendation. (from 3-2 positive to 3-3 tie/negative)

4.8: tenured faculty re: peer observation

Post-tenure, the only evidence of teaching is supplied by student evaluation—this provides some corroboration or counter-balance to that.

Schneider: in our department, only one course is submitted for review. Does the college require a dept chair to see all evaluations for a tenured faculty member? Prefer student evaluations over a single course evaluation.

Courard-Hauri: for some, a part of the regular process, for others, just unnecessary work as everyone knows each other, and they're busy evaluating junior faculty. There's some benefit to visiting other classes.

Rob Craig: some faculty had concerns about this change. We need to question the extra work this would add on: evaluating every three years is not meaningful or continuous...not really actionable. Suggestion: require 3 peer reviews prior to promotion—happy to support a colleague who wants to go up for promotion, but do not see value in evaluating tenured faculty continuously, forever, if the associate professor has no intent to seek promotion to full professor.

Schneider: Also prefers the use of "review" instead of observation. This should be taken seriously (holistic: class visit, review syllabi, etc.) or not done. A single observation is minimal, busywork.

Knepper: is it the responsibility of the chair or of the faculty member to ensure that they are being evaluated appropriately? Chair's responsibility with respect to pre-tenure // committee's responsibility for promotion.

4. Revisions for continuous term faculty to participate in elections

Continuous appointment may be of any rank.

This change will rectify the A&S handbook with University policy

5. Corrections

Uncontroversial.

Joe thanked Council for the work this semester. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.