The meeting began at 3pm.

**Meeting Focus:** Annual Evaluations

**Chairs/Directors Present:** Williams, Heyman, Brunk, Valero, Smith, Sowards, Tabuenca, Chacon, Cappell, Griffin, Basu, Genna, Alarid, Lee, and Bixler

**Chairs/Directors Invited but not Present:** Weber

**Dean’s Office Staff Present:** Herman and Zarate

1. **Announcement**
   - Crites reminded chairs & directors to schedule University Communications to take pictures of their unit’s faculty & staff.
   - Crites updated faculty that the College was on track to be under budget but that it was still too soon to be certain.
   - All departments that were approved for capital improvements were notified via e-mail recently.
   - The College is working on a policy for appeals in the post-tenure review process. This will be distributed in the coming weeks.
   - There is still funding for initiatives to increase UTEP Edge activities in courses. Chairs and directors were encouraged to let faculty know this.
   - Crites let chairs/directors know that Adair Margo would host a reception so they could interact with individuals on the College Advisory Board. This will be sometime in the spring and is an opportunity for chairs/directors to meet advisory board members who may be able to help in department/program initiatives.

2. **Improving the tenure & promotion (T&P) and third-year review process**
   Crites discussed a few areas in which the documentation for T&P packets could be improved in the future. To help with this, the College is working on a policy that would charge the College T&P Committee with reviewing the candidate’s packet and preceding evaluations to determine (1) whether all of the necessary information has been included and (2) assertions in evaluations that are supported by evidence. This policy is being drafted and will be distributed to chairs/directors in the next couple of weeks for review.

3. **Discussion: Annual Evaluations**
   Crites initiated the discussion by reporting that there was a lot of variability in the amount of feedback provided in the annual Professional Activities Report (PAR) review process. Some units provide more extensive feedback to faculty with suggestions of steps that the faculty should take in the coming year to increase productivity whereas other units provide no or minimal feedback. The importance of providing feedback was discussed and there was a general discussion of what might be done to help increase the amount of constructive feedback. Although the discussion was about the PAR process for all faculty, there was a focus on the importance of providing feedback for tenure-track faculty. The following were discussed:
• There is no limit to the length of the departmental and chair reviews (some chairs/directors were under the impression that a one-page form was required for the review).
• The difficulty of giving specific feedback in evaluations that might lead to other problems.
• Distinguishing between feedback that summarizes what an individual has accomplished and formative feedback that helps faculty to improve.
• Collecting/developing a list of “best practices” that could be shared among departments.
• Changing the PAR form to ask individuals to report goals. This is a way to help ensure constructive feedback because it may allow faculty in the departmental review committee to provide guidance when goals are established (e.g., how they align with the relevant unit’s objectives and T&P guidelines) and also provide a mechanism for offering suggestions for improvement if goals are not achieved. One chair indicated that they had attempted to do this, but it fizzled out.
• There was a brief discussion of the role the Dean should play in PAR reviews. It was noted that it is impossible for the Dean to thoroughly review the nearly 200 tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College. Would it be more useful for the Dean to thoroughly review some but not all faculty? One suggestion was that the Dean should focus on individuals in their second year to help provide guidance for T&P.

4. **Discussion: Department Goals and Chair Evaluations**

With time running-out, the idea of having departments set goals that could be reviewed yearly by the Dean was mentioned. One chair noted that there is no job description for a department chair and more clarity on duties/obligations might help.