I. Present: Mike Boyle, Samantha Etzkorn, Lynne Golomb, Brad McDonald, Yver Melchor, Demetri Morgan, Kate Phillippo, Karen, Ritter, Amy Shuffelton, Wendy Threadgill, Meng-Jia Wu, Eunju Yoon (Voting members boldfaced), Siobhan Cafferty
Absent Voting Members: Susan Graham (proxy: Mike Boyle), Adam Kennedy (proxy: Dave Ensminger)

II. Call to order – Kate Phillippo

III. Approval of December 2017 Minutes
   a. D. Morgan: Motion for approval, M. Wu second, minutes approved

IV. Announcements
   a. K. Phillippo requested Awards Committee discussion be added to Consent Agenda. 
      i. D. Morgan: Motion for approval, L. Golomb second, discussion moved to Consent Agenda
      ii. Introduction of Y. Melchor (graduate student representative)

I. Consent Agenda
   a. Item from Curriculum Committee: Revised cover sheet/flow chart for curricular changes (documents posted to Sakai 1/18)
   b. All in favor of agenda as it stands

I. Reports
   a. Standing committee reports: None
   b. Report from Administration: S. Cafferty shared administration continues to work on fulfilling Marie Hatland’s tasks in her absence.
   c. Report from staff: W. Threadgill shared staff met to discuss and forward recommendations for Janell Hutcherson Service Award on to the Awards Committee.
   d. Report from students: B. McDonald shared students are planning for the Weekend of Excellence and reworking wording of the award and increasing award monies.

II. Old Business
a. FEC debrief of conversation about faculty evaluation (annual and research exceptional) with Interim Dean (FEC Tenured Faculty and Clinical Faculty Representatives)

i. Noah Sobe and Darren Pierre came to debrief on behalf of the FEC. They share the following:

All faculty roles prove hard to evaluate with clinical faculty roles being the most difficult as they are all distinctly different from each other. The FEC was hopefully successful in giving more inputs this year, however it remains difficult to evaluate teaching regardless of status since we don’t gather the appropriate data necessary to do so. For clinical faculty in particular, the FEC doesn’t have access to their job descriptions or the data with which to evaluate them. As a result, the FEC asked the Dean to evaluate clinical faculty when data was insufficient. They also shared both Chairs and the Dean need to be involved in the evaluation of clinical faculty, and when hired, the Dean should distinguish who will be responsible for their evaluations. As well, there was discussion with the Dean regarding training for faculty on their narratives, and the issue with lost data in reports.

A. Shuffelton added that the narrative mostly helped the FEC deduce which clinical faculty they could or could not evaluate, and to fill in the gaps when data was sparse. However, they were unable to tell how well faculty performed their jobs, with the absence of qualitative data being a reason why.

N. Sobe asked student representatives to go back to their peers and encourage them to participate in end of semester course evaluations. S. Etzkorn shared these evaluations continue to be diverted to spam folders, and this may be a reason for low response rates.

S. Cafferty asked for clarification on who walks new faculty through the FAS process and D. Morgan shared he only received input form the Dean in an individual meeting. S. Cafferty believes an FAS orientation should come from the Dean’s office.

N. Sobe suggested a possible route for the SOE is developing our own form in addition to FAS. This is done in other units within the University. Discussion with the group continued around the need to develop a formative assessment in addition to FAS that may work for the SOE.

A. Shuffelton motioned the AC tasks the resolution of these issues to the FEC and recommends they come up with an improved means of evaluation in conversation with relevant stakeholders within the SOE. D. Morgan second. Unanimously approved.

b. SOE Climate

i. Markeda Newell (Diversity Committee Chair) was unable attend. Discussion centered around celebrating the accomplishments of the community and how this is being done on our website, the need for a status update on the Dean’s Search, and the status of the Graduate School as these all greatly affect climate.

ii. L. Golomb motioned that AC request an update from the Dean on the state of the Dean’s search and the Graduate School. All in favor. Motion carries.

c. Protocol for designation of program chairpersons: Revisit program-area practices
i. K. Phillippo shared this hasn’t been firmed up by the Leadership Council, and she will get a report from them this afternoon.

ii. A. Shuffelton moved to postpone this discussion until we have more information from LC. D. Morgan second. Motion approved.

d. Review of AC Bylaws: Membership (Documents shared by S. Graham posted on Sakai; report by M. Boyle on AC’s requested meeting with clinical faculty posted to Sakai 1/1)

i. M. Boyle shared the document he submitted contained the collected notes of clinical faculty. They appreciated the time to come together and would like more opportunities to do this in the future. They did express continued feelings of marginalization and are interested in participating more on AC but not as token members. As well, they believe opportunities for recognition and advancement would be helpful. It was expressed that more opportunity exists in other Units within the University, however, clinical faculty at large are upset with the University’s current setup for them. It was highlighted this is a University wide issue. D. Morgan shared the Faculty Handbook states policy regarding clinical recognition is set by the School, however, when clinical faculty have brought up the possibility of advancement in the past, nothing was done.

ii. A. Shuffelton motioned the AC have a taskforce draft a promotion policy for clinical faculty. This should consist of 1 representative from the Dean’s office, 3 full-time clinical faculty members elected by all clinical faculty, and 1 full professor elected by all full professors.

iii. Proposed amendment: L. Golomb would like the Dean’s office representative be the Dean. (4) in favor, (6) opposed.

iv. Previous motion: D. Morgan second. All in favor. Motion approved.

v. There was discussion about Greeley Center membership to AC, and M. Boyle explained the center is funded through endowment. Membership on AC would create extra tasks for center colleagues and produce concerns with load and extra energy. As well, discussion was had about the possible need for additional at-large members added to AC membership.

vi. L. Golomb motioned to add 1 additional faculty at-large member to AC (specifying that at least 1 at-large member must be Non-Tenure Track). D. Morgan second. All in favor. Motion approved.

I. New Business

a. Program area use of adjunct faculty

i. Discussion focused on the high variability of adjunct use across programs, the question of whether or not the AC is delineating policy for adjunct hires, and concerns on how this conversation is missing our adjunct voices. S. Cafferty will be gathering more information regarding onboarding practices for adjuncts from other Units in the University.

ii. A. Shuffelton motioned to table this conversation. D. Morgan second. (1) opposed. Motion approved.

b. FEC vacancies, possible bylaw change
i. Members discussed clarification on student elections, and committee responsibility for handling short-term vacancies. It was decided the full SOE community needs to participate in this discussion.

ii. D. Morgan motioned the Dean include our service structure conversation (committee member election process) to the next SOE meeting agenda. A. Shuffelton second. All in favor. Motion approved.

Adjournment