

Department of English & Philosophy Meeting Minutes for October 3, 2006

Attending:

English

Jennifer Adkison
Brian Attebery
Jennifer Attebery
Keith Comer
Mark Dodd
Terry Engebretsen
Hal Hellwig
Alan Johnson
Kathleen King
Tom Klein

Dawn Lattin
Brian Norman
Roger Schmidt
Lynn Shutters
Leif Sorensen
Susan Swetnam
Curt Whitaker
Jessica Winston
Brent Wolter

Philosophy

Melissa Norton
Jim Skidmore
Russell Wahl
Jonathan Westphal

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

Announcements

P&P has had to produce a Department SWAT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) report for the Dean's office, which will form part of the report for the College of Arts & Sciences. Terry will be circulating the SWAT report to various committees to develop a strategic plan for the Department.

Lisa has some of the web biographies for faculty posted. The plan is to update these once a semester; keep the chair and Lisa informed of changes you would like posted. Jennifer Adkison would like to compliment her on the work so far. Jennifer Adkison and Lisa will be working to get our Department newsletter online in the near future. Jennifer Adkison is still taking information from faculty for posting in the newsletter.

Reports from (Standing) Committees

Graduate:	Meeting of graduate faculty to follow.
Research & Prof. Development:	A "What's New in Your Field" is tentatively planned for Oct. 20th (Philosophy side).
English Undergraduate:	Recruitment will be a particular focus of the committee this year.
Philosophy Undergraduate:	Meeting to follow.
Composition:	Syllabi review of comp courses completed. English 308 guidelines review is ongoing.
Faculty Senate:	Main issue: two-year chairs for the Faculty Senate.

Terry needs copies of minutes from the committee chairs.

New Business

Discussion of

“Our Shared Concerns”

Jessica noted some of the background for this document with respect to shared concerns about teaching and with respect to research. Terry noted that this should be considered a document describing what the Department currently does, not where it is headed. Moved and seconded (Jennifer Attebery; Brian Norman) that the Department adopt the “Shared Concerns” part of this document and post it to the Department website. Tom Klein recommended that professional writing be combined with creative writing. Jennifer Attebery accepted Tom and Brian N.’s recommendation that we combine professional and creative writing. Jessica will revise that section. Roger asked about the potential audience for this document on the web. Terry said that the audience was both prospective students and the Department faculty as it considered future directions. Roger felt that the current version would be confusing to potential undergraduates and failed to recognize contributions of various faculty. Jonathan asked whether aesthetic criticism was sufficiently covered in this statement. Jennifer Attebery decided to withdraw her motion and requested that P&P revise this document further before bringing it before the Department. Hal noted that “shared concerns” was perhaps too negative for opening this document; perhaps “shared interests” would be more helpful. Curt asked what happened to the working group from last spring that had worked on the issue of department identity, and whether any of that language would find its way into this document. Jennifer Attebery asked what had happened to the earlier language concerning interdisciplinary focus. P&P will consider whether and/or how these concerns can be worked into the revised document. Once revised, the document will be sent out via email to the faculty, and then placed on ballots for a vote.

Graduate Faculty Research Expectations

Terry discussed the background and changes to the draft now under discussion. Russell recommend that the first point begin, “Publishing peer-reviewed work...” to sustain parallelism in the structure. Brian N. moved that “1.” be made a separate paragraph, with numbering beginning with the current #2, with a list of 1-8 (vice 1-9). Amendment approved by voice vote. Susan said that another factor that should be included here is a dissemination of research to general/public audiences (not just at conferences). Susan recommended that a new bullet under #4 include a line about dissemination of research to public

audiences. Moved by Susan, seconded by Jennifer Attebery. Approved by voice vote.

Jennifer Attebery asked that "9" be moved up so the "last three" language reflect the current "6-7-8"; also, whether most faculty could be reasonably be expected to accomplish three of the new 1-8 points during a five-year period. Tom asked what the central purpose of this document would be. Terry said that this was designed to meet the College requirement for more specific tenure and promotion guidelines (the department-specific guidelines). Jennifer Adkison asked if the current 5c should not be a separate number; Jennifer Adkison moved that grant writing be assigned as a separate category; Tom Klein seconded. Approved by voice vote; one opposed. J

Jennifer Attebery requested a parenthetical statement following the list noting that participation may include more than one instance in each category. Jennifer Attebery also noted that the satisfactory and superior paragraphs should both include parallel language about "had accepted for publication." Jessica said that "substantial" should be added to the write-up for "superior" as well; also, the "satisfactory" category should include language to the effect of "contributions to the field." Terry said that P&P regarded "peer-reviewed" as evidence of being a contribution to the field. Jonathan recommended that, in place of "department," this document use "English faculty" to prevent confusion between guidelines for English faculty and those for Philosophy faculty.

Roger asked if this document addressed creative writing satisfactorily. Jennifer Attebery some discussion of this should be added to the points concerning publication; Leif suggested, "substantial publication in venues equivalent to peer-reviewed" forums. Jennifer Attebery moved, Jessica seconded, that the Research statement be corrected and sent to the Department for a vote. Approved by voice vote, one vote against. This will be sent to the Department for a vote within the next week.

Terry recommended that we leave the teaching and service statements for the next meeting. The teaching criteria need to be examined, in particular.

Brian Attebery moved, Jennifer Attebery seconded that the Service guidelines be sent to the faculty for a vote. Jessica asked that "effective" be added to the language on committee service; Brian accepted the amendment. Motion defeated. Service will be discussed further at the next Department meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.