

**2013-2014 UNIVERSITY ARTP COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Approved: November 19, 2013

**Meeting #7
November 5, 2013**

Members Present: Dammel, Dillon, Dube, Gee, Jones, Hall, Mayes, Porter, Shaw, Turrill

Members Absent: La Rocco, Roberts

The Committee met at 3:05 p.m. in the Folsom Room, University Union, Dillon presiding.

Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2013 (#5, 2013-2014) were approved as published. Those minutes include the following statement: **Reconsideration of an evaluation statement may occur only through the process of having new material added to the file after the file closure date or as a result of the faculty member's requested meeting with the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee may consider the faculty member's statements made at such a meeting and may agree following its deliberations in the absence of the faculty member to change the evaluation statement, for example, to correct an omission in the original statement.**

The minutes of the meeting of October 15, 2013 (#6, 2013-2014) were corrected to change the numeral 3 to 2 for the second item of discussion.

Agenda: The agenda was approved as published.

1. Provost's proposals to amend UARTP policy

At the Committee's invitation Provost Gossett discussed his proposals to amend University ARTP policy by identifying at the Committee's request the problems that have occasioned his proposals and how those proposals will solve those problems in practice. His presentation included responses to Committee members' questions. Following the presentation the Committee decided to defer further consideration of the matter to the next meeting so that each member might consider carefully and discuss with colleagues the Provost's proposals.

2. Subcommittee reports, discussion and action

- a. Subcommittee I (Roberts, Jones, Mayes) The subcommittee is waiting for a response from Teacher Education to clarify language in its proposed change pertaining to electronic submission of student evaluations.*
- b. Subcommittee II (La Rocco, Dube) is waiting for a response from Education Leadership and Policy Studies to clarify language in its proposed change to electronic submission of student evaluations.* Proposed changes to the ARTP documents of the Departments of Anthropology and Art are pending in the units.

- c. Subcommittee III (Turrill, Dammell, Shaw) is considering proposed changes to the ARTP documents of the Departments of Family and Consumer Sciences, Biological Sciences and Philosophy. The subcommittee indicated that the Chair of Philosophy wishes to be present when the full committee considers the subcommittee's report.
- d. Subcommittee IV (Dillon, Hall, Gee): Proposed changes to the ARTP document of the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology have been returned to the unit for suggested revisions. Proposed changes to the ARTP document of the Department of Child Development* are pending in the unit.

*Note: The College of Education is in the process of preparing a new ARTP document to reflect its new organizational structure.

3. Dean's attendance at secondary committee meetings

Dillon invited the Committee's attention to copies of an email from Committee member Ed Dammell raising questions about attendance at secondary committee meetings by a dean. Dammell explained the occasion for the topic, indicating that in the ARTP document of the College of Engineering and Computer Science provides that the Dean of the College shall serve as an ex officio member of the secondary committee. The Committee discussed each question and came to the following conclusions: (1) On the question of whether the Dean must attend every meeting of the secondary committee, the College is seeking an interpretation of Section 9.01.S of University ARTP Policy. The Committee is of the opinion that the Dean must attend every meeting as otherwise required in University policy of every elected member of the secondary committee, unless the College ARTP document's language uses the word "may" relating to the Dean's attendance rather than the word "shall". (2) On the question of whether the Dean may participate in the deliberations of the secondary committee, there is no prohibition on such participation in University policy, while campus practice regarding the participation of ex officio members of the Senate and the Executive Committee (e.g., the Provost) suggests that the answer is yes. (3) On the question of whether the Dean may use what he or she has heard in the secondary committee deliberations when writing his or her evaluation of a candidate, the requirement in University ARTP Policy that the Dean make an independent evaluation suggests that the Dean in developing his or her evaluation may use from the secondary committee only what is contained in that committee's evaluative statement in the personnel action file.

Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m. It will reconvene on Tuesday, November 19, 2013.

These minutes were prepared by Marsha Dillon.

These minutes have not been approved. Any additions or corrections to these minutes will be reflected in the minutes of the next meeting.