Attendees: Cecil Carter, Galen Papkov, Ashraf Badir, Long Nguyen, Tunde Szecsi, Christine Wright-Isak, Tony Barringer, Anjana Bhatt, Stuart Van Auken

Minutes:

- Meeting started at 10:00am in Howard Hall 221.
- Minutes from previous meeting were approved.
- Discussion of “overall” status (satisfactory vs. unsatisfactory) continued
  - Handout was provided that summarized most College’s interpretation
  - Engineering follows the FPED and the CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement), but does not use rigid rules for assigning an “overall” rating
  - Library Services follows the FPED and closely evaluates each member in 4 areas. An unsatisfactory rating in more than 2 areas or in their primary area plus one other area results in a rating of “overall unsatisfactory”.
- Some questions arose from the discussion:
  - What is the focus of our educational institution: teaching or gaming (i.e. publishing, attracting more students, etc)?
  - Should a clear, uniform policy be defined for all or most Colleges?
    * Since most Colleges require 75% of effort to be in Teaching, maybe the FPED should clearly state that an “overall unsatisfactory” rating will be given to individuals that are unsatisfactory in Teaching or Research & Service.
  - Should the PDP align with the FAR?
    * What is the purpose of the FAR?
    * How is it used by the State and the University?
- Much of the discussion revolved around the FAR. Faculty are required to complete the FAR and, in general, to assign a value of at least 75% to Teaching. Many members felt that this requirement skews the accuracy of the FAR its representation of how individual faculty use their time in regards to Teaching, Research, and Service. This misrepresentation may affect (1) the amount of funding provided by the State and (2) how the University supports individual faculty that work above and beyond the minimums per the FAR.
- Meeting adjourned at 11:30am