Dr. Young called the meeting to order at 5:05pm and expressed gratitude to Ms. Emily Pugh as the outgoing Faculty Council chair.

1) Approval of the minutes from June 28, 2010
   a. Council voted unanimously to approve the previous minutes.

2) Election of the vice-chair
   a) Dr. Jamie Reilly will be the new vice-chair.

3) Standing committee assignments 2010-11; election of committee chairs and student representatives
   a. The curriculum committee has a chair. The remaining committees are awaiting election of representatives.
   b. Chair nominations are due 8/2; student nominations due by 8/30.
   c. Departments may nominate students.
   d. Collaboration committee awaits formal approval on appointment of new officers.

4) Faculty incentive plans
   a. Pending PHHP audit, recommendations will be submitted to Dean Perri regarding awards.
   b. The incentive plan committee will review the data from last year and evaluate its fairness and recommend adjustments for next year’s plan.
   c. Faculty council voted to request a review of the de-identified data on awards as well.

5) Faculty recognition/rewards
   a. There needs to be greater clarity and transparency for the opportunity of recognition for non-tenure track faculty. This primarily involves opening a dialogue about perceived inequities in the culture and value of non-tenure track faculty.
   b. There is a suggestion to evaluate who is eligible for the incentive plan (tenure vs. non-tenure line) and make sure the relative proportions are even.
6) Peer review and student evaluation of small classes
   a. The committee has assembled a minimal college policy for peer review; individual departments can modify as needed from the minimal standards.
      i. Each faculty member will be reviewed every academic year in at least one course.
      ii. The department chair will select the reviewer and course.
      iii. The Peer Review Classroom Observation form must be reviewed by the faculty member who is eligible to provide a written response.
      iv. The review must be completed in time for the faculty member to have time to include the data in the faculty activity report.
      v. The review must be returned to department chair.
   b. The faculty council voted unanimously to present this minimal policy to the dean and recommend that he review this with the leadership council and then present to the faculty for comment.
   c. Evaluation of small classes: (including 1:1 clinic supervision, doctoral research). The issue regarding evaluation is student confidentiality and protection of anonymity in providing a candid review of their instructor. There were numerous possibilities raised:
      i. Batching the reviews for several years before returning to the instructor is not feasible for many reasons, particularly for faculty who need tenure.
      ii. One possibility is batching selectively and providing feedback to instructors who need corrective feedback (e.g., low teaching scores).
      iii. The committee would like the departments to evaluate several additional forms.
         1. These can be used to potentially evaluate individual research and clinic classes.
         2. One suggestion was to query the RSD students about their preference for evaluating instructors.
      iv. The committee on evaluation of small classes has considered many different options and concluded that the Faculty Council members should take the forms back to their individual departments for feedback.

7) Faculty senate report
   a. Senate re-convenes in August.

8) Dean’s meeting
   a. The budget callback will be 5% for the next FY; this will be addressed in the Faculty Meeting in September.

9) Faculty council meeting schedule for 2010-11
   a. Dr. Young has proposed a meeting schedule for the next year.
   b. The Faculty Council will not meet in December.
   c. The Faculty Council is required by the constitution to meet once per semester.
10) New business
   a. No new business was raised.

There being no further business, council adjourned 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jamie Reilly, Ph.D.