Faculty Personnel Committee
Meeting Minutes • April 15, 2014

Members present: Jeff Erger, Tom Hilton, Tom Lockhart, Otrude Moyo, Geoff Peterson, Lisa Schiller, Sherrie Serros, Mike Wick

1. The meeting convened at 2:03 p.m. in Davies 211 by Chair Peterson
2. The minutes of the April 1, 2014 meetings were approved as distributed.
3. The committee continued discussing the DEP template. The document preface (thanks to Erger) will read:

   This DEP template is intended to organize and clarify departmental and program level DEPs and PEPs. It is not intended to alter the content of such DEP/PEPs, only the format in which they are constructed and presented. It is hoped that your department or program put your DEP or PEP into this format the next time it is updated.

   There are two main reasons for doing so. First, the administration must review all DEP/PEPs and approve all changes. By having all such documents follow a standard format, the time and effort to do so will be reduced. Second, as more and more “joint appointments” where different programs share a faculty member are being created, having a standard format will help DPCs and PPCs who need to take into consideration the criteria used by other departments. Having all plans in a similar format will make this a much easier task.

   In the following template, some items are required (for example, by state law). Where items are optional, this has been indicated in the text of the template.

4. All references to FASH to change to FASRP. The committee began with Performance Criteria and made changes, with Peterson recording those as we moved through line by line from the Oct. 2009 version.

   Line 82: emphasis will may vary over the tenured employment period.
   Line 85: other areas must may be offset
   Line 87: support a negative performance review
   Lines 95-96: criteria could may be specified by defined and ranked for a department
   Line 100: ...evaluation. Failure to satisfy a required criteria mandates a negative evaluation
   Lines 102-103: criteria is a direct... candidate determined by the professional judgment of the reviewing body.
   Lines 110-112: Demonstrated... satisfaction of This criterion will not affect the evaluation, unless the candidates contract or PDP explicitly lists successful satisfaction...
   Line 115: In addition, departmental terms, if any, are defined as follows. the responsibilities of the position should be clearly specified. This can be done using a matrix (as follows), or as part of an ongoing professional development process.
   Additionally, criteria may be evaluated individually or holistically.
5. The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sherrie Serros