

Minutes for Regular Meeting of Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee

Thursday, November 21, 2002

3:30 PM, Room 251, Chavis University Center

Present: Dennis Edgell, Beth Maisonpierre, Kay McClanahan, Jesse Peters, John Reissner, Sara Simmons

Excused: Glen Burnette, Liz Normandy, Velinda Worix

Absent: Bill Gash, Neil Hawk

Guests: Holden Hansen, Students from Dr. Jordan's debate class

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 3:35 by Chair Maisonpierre. Minutes were taken by John Reissner.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the October 17 meeting were approved.
3. **Approval of Agenda:** The agenda, which had been e-mailed, was circulated, and approved by consensus. Holden Hansen asked that anyone not receiving distributed information bring the matter to his attention.
4. **Reports from Administrators:** None
5. **Reports from Subcommittees:**

a. Faculty Evaluations Review Committee: Chair Maisonpierre noted that due to a schedule conflict Worix could not deliver reports to the committee, and Jean Sexton, in her place, was unable to attend today on account of illness. The Review Committee continues its review of issues related to student evaluation of instruction.

b. Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee: Sarah Simmons reported the subcommittee's concern with parking enforcement at the beginning of the semester. What were the committees involved? They wished to operate in the context of existing committees. Reissner recalled there had been two administration committees appointed by the Chancellor, one for appeals the other for policy. The question of appropriate use of "travel allocations" from TLC was considered to be that which was previously approved as professional development by the TLC's Chair. Campus based tuition increases would be used in the following ways: to offset tuition increases (financial aid), for equity adjustments to faculty salary, "startup" funds for new faculty, and supplements for operating costs. The situation with regard to faculty lockers in the gym was had been determined to be improving. Under new business, the Subcommittee would examine policies applying to released and reassigned time. Would graduate course credit and Faculty Development credit be additive? Kate Locklear was investigating. Maisonpierre asked whether records were kept of credit due for past overloads, and whether common policies applied across campus on

compensation for past overloads. Simmons concluded with the note that the subcommittee was reviewing status of the Hubbard Leave Fund, and that the Subcommittee's next meeting was in January.

6. **Old Business:**

- a. **Awards Committee:** Holden Hansen presented a suggestion as Chairman of the Awards Committee, regarding the **"lost nominations" issue**. He sought the committee's view on providing extra awards. After some discussion it was moved and seconded that the number of faculty awards given for the 2002-2003 year remain the same as in previous years. Rationale included that there had been no prior limit of nominees, and that the "lost nominations" were on account of a measure expressly intended to increase the number of nominations, and that the prestige of the awards justified a more competitive pool. Hansen felt strongly that the individuals involved should all be notified of their status. The Committee concurred, that those involved should be notified as having been nominated, and given the opportunity to notify the awards committee if they wished to be considered. The proposal as it will be presented to the Senate on December 4 will read:

The Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee, by unanimous vote, proposes that the number of faculty awards given for the 2002-2003 year remain the same as in previous years.

Rationale:

- 1) Never before has there been a limit on the number of nominees. Since the pool of nominees for awards could be a greater or lesser number in any given year, any notion of "unfairness" to this year's nominees is arbitrary.
- 2) Nomination by checking a box on an evaluation form was created to increase the number of nominees for an award. In fact, the numbers of nominees may indeed rise over the next several years as the number of faculty and students rise.
- 3) Due to the prestige of the awards, a more competitive pool seems appropriate. The "odds" of getting an award should have little to do with the consideration of nominee credentials.
- 4) The projected ratio of awards to applicants is still 1:4.5 for the UNCP Teaching Awards, 1:6 for the Dial Service Award, and 1:4 for the Dial Research Award. The committee feels that these ratios are quite fair without an increase in the number of awards.

b. **Evaluation of Administrators:** The issue of evaluation of administrators was taken from the table. It was decided to attempt design of an office-centered instrument that would include a mission statement or job description(s) to characterize the office under evaluation. Committee members would bring first cuts to the next meeting, reviewing web sites and perhaps interviewing administration involved. The following offices were assigned: Academic Affairs - McClanahan and Peters, Business Affairs - Reissner, Enrollment Management – Edgell, Advancement – Simmons, and Student Affairs - Maisonpierre.

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm

John E. Reissner, Secretary in Rotation
Beth Maisonpierre, Chair, Faculty and Institutional Affairs