**DRAFT Committee on Faculty Affairs Minutes  
May 11, 2016**

**Present:** E. Borland (vice chair), J. Eberly, E. Friedman, O. Hernandez, D. Hirsh, W. Keep, J. Neves (chair), G. Pogue, D. Shaw, V. Tucci, T. Youngblood, I. Zake

**Excused:** M. Cathell

1. Minutes: The minutes of the April 27, 2016, meeting were approved.
2. Issues concerning the use of Vibe: Because of complaints about “access denied” and error messages, Ieva said that some improvements would be made to the software. There also will be an agreement with the union to allow read-only access, so applicants who receive these messages won’t worry that their applications were lost.
3. Issues regarding revisions of Disciplinary Standards: The committee agreed with the recommendations for the Art Education DS, including the removal of book reviews as scholarly activity. It was agreed that the Music DS still have major issues. Joao, Don and Val will meet with Dean Laughton and the Music chair to discuss them.
4. Update on the revised Sabbatical RFP: The Sabbatical Committee made the changes we recommended. Liz moved and Orlando seconded her motion to approve the revised RFP. The motion was approved unanimously.
5. Revised SOSA RFP: Joao said the SOSA Committee made the changes we recommended, and provided a memo detailing their actions. But Ieva said the committee was still struggling with the feedback issue – how much to give and to whom. Should they give feedback to every applicant? The committee agreed that feedback should be given only to unsuccessful applicants. It also was agreed that z-scores were not sufficient for this purpose, and that the SOSA Committee needed to supply more constructive criticism. Greg cautioned that this feedback should not imply that correcting the deficiencies would result in approval the next time. It was decided that Joao will meet with the SOSA Committee to discuss this difficult issue further.
6. Review of the PRD/RPD: The committee reviewed the outstanding issues as detailed on the agenda. In response to Bill’s suggestion at our prior meeting that we rethink the policy of requiring anonymous external reviewers, the committee agreed we should add a sentence to the RPD. It will note that a reviewer’s identity shall remain anonymous to the candidate, making it clearer that the promotions committee chair will know the identity of the reviewer. Orlando then moved, and Ellen seconded, a motion to approve the revised RPD. The motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Shaw