

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda**

Monday, November 22, 2021, Noon Pacific Time

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the October 25 minutes
3. Announcements
4. Updates from ASUPS, Staff Senate, and Liaisons
5. Discussion with the Governance Review Working Group (Elise Richman and Chris Kendall lead)
6. Discussion of 3<sup>rd</sup> year associate review process\* (Sarah Moore lead)
7. Discussion of the foreign language requirement rubric. (Robin Jacobson and Julia Looper lead)
8. Adjournment

*\*See below for additional context regarding the discussion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year associate review between the PSC and the FAC.*

### **Discussion of Third-Year Associate Professor reviews**

There has been some question as to whether or not the head-officer only option for third-year associate professor reviews is adequate. Last year's PSC and FAC took up this question and wrote the following in their final reports. The question in front of Senate, as I understand it, is to determine a process by which this question may be resolved.

The following text is useful background material for our consideration.

#### **From PSC final report**

The PSC appointed a three-person sub-committee to examine Senate charges #2 and 3. The PSC discussed the sub-committee's report at a Fall 2020 meeting. Unable to reach a consensus in the fall, the PSC returned to the sub-committee's report during a spring 2021 meeting. At the end of that meeting, the PSC agreed to the following:

1. The current process for third-year associate evaluations (head officer only) is not sufficient;
2. The committee could not reach a consensus on recommending a code change that would require third-year associate evaluations to be full department reviews. Five committee members believed such a change would be beneficial while four members opined that "streamlined" evaluations that invite other department faculty to participate would be sufficient; and
3. The committee recommends that the Senate seek additional input from the FAC on this issue. The Senate can then either (a) submit FAC feedback to the PSC and ask the 2021-22 PSC to reconsider issue or (b) use the PSC and FAC feedback to reach an independent judgment re. recommending a code change to the entire faculty.

#### **From FAC year-end report**

##### Head-Officer-Only Third-Year Associate Reviews and Streamlined Reviews.

The Advancement Committee notes that the move to a streamlined review for the Third-Year Associate Reviews has had a prejudicial effect on some evaluatees by depriving them of useful feedback from the FAC about their progress in meeting the standards required for promotion to Professor. By receiving feedback only from their departmental head-officer, evaluatees do not necessarily receive accurate advice, particularly about their progress based on the standard of "distinguished service." The FAC recommends that the Faculty and/or the Professional Standards Committee revisit the utility of the streamlined Third-Year Associate Reviews and consider revoking this option or, at a minimum, explicitly warning evaluatees about these implications.

Additionally, the FAC has discovered discrepancies within the Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria (the "buff document") in terms of procedures governing streamlined reviews at both the Third-Year Associate review and Professor/Instructor ranks. With regard to the former, the FAC notes that

while Professors and Instructors using the streamlined evaluation procedures must put together a file which is made available to departmental colleagues and the FAC (see p. 27 of the Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria), Third-Year Associate Professors ostensibly need not put together a file (see p. 25), if they are following the evaluation procedure for 1st and 2nd year Assistant Professors.

Given the concerns expressed in the previous paragraph, the FAC recommends that the Professional Standards Committee revisit whether Third-Year Associates should be exempt from assembling a file.