Anderson called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item:

Chair’s Report

Discussion:

- The revised template for unit codes has been approved by the Faculty Senate; still awaiting approval by the Chancellor
- That several unit codes are significantly out-of-date was announced at the Faculty Senate
- The Chancellor has approved with editorial changes the codes which the Unit Code Screening Committee approved in the spring (Schools of Education and Music, Departments of History, Political Science, and Sociology). Most of the editorial changes are correcting hyperlinks within the codes.
- We are waiting to hear from the Committee on Committees about being allowed to change to having standard meeting dates.

Agenda Item:

Discussion of issues concerning “unusual” codes

Discussion:

- The Unit Code Screening Committee has been asked to give input of how codes for “unusual” code units, anything outside of the typical department or school as a code unit, such as interdisciplinary programs.
- Johnson has agreed to serve on an ad hoc committee made up of representatives from the Faculty Governance, Educational Policies and Planning, and Unit Code Screening Committees.
- Anderson asked for input on issues that might need to be addressed for such codes; of special concern would be personnel issues, such as requirements for promotion and evaluation of faculty from both within and outside the code unit.
  - Ingalls noted that it is best not to try to put too much into code documents that can be referenced and found outside the code, especially materials that may be fluid, that may change once or more often before a code comes up for revision.
Consider what might be included best as appendices, though whether a change in an appendix would require a new review of a code would need to be considered.

- Be careful that evaluation documents, even if in an appendix rather than within the body of a code, are not easily changed, making certain that the expectations a person is hired under do not easily shift.
- As guidelines and policies for these sort of unusual code units are developed, be certain to allow for a variety of criteria and codes dependent on the different departments and schools that may be involved.
- Discuss the possibility of making a distinction between full review of a code and revision for small changes; revision for small changes should not exempt a unit from the five-year review requirement.
- Many of these issues can and should apply to all codes, not just those for considered “unusual” code units.

---

**Agenda Item:**

Discussion of ways to increase meeting efficiency

**Discussion:**

- Anderson suggested having each committee member specialize to make reviews more efficient; all members would still read and review the entire code being screened, but each will pay special attention to different elements of the code.
- The code can be projected during the discussion to make it easier for all to find and be certain about what exact line is being discussed at any time.
  - Committee members would still use the distributed paper copies with their line numbers for review and to mark up for questions and suggested changes.

**Action Taken:**

- The following assignments for specialization in review were made:
  - Hyperlinks: Bier
  - Definition of Faculty (including emeritus): Shields, Dumlao
  - Administrative Organization: Tulis, Ingalls
  - Unit Committees: Sigounas, Philyaw, Sutton
  - Other Sections: Anderson

Those not in attendance at this meeting will be assigned areas of specialization later.

---

**NEXT MEETING:** 6 October 2014, 3:00 pm, Rawl 129

**ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED:** Department of Geology Code

Meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Submitted by Tom Shields, Committee Secretary