

Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

2-3-2006

AS Minutes 2006 02 03

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2006 02 03" (2006). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 36.
https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/36

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Assembly Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

SALVE REGINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Meeting of February 3, 2006

Jay Lacouture, Speaker of the Assembly, presided.

1. **Call to Order and Minutes.** The meeting was called to order at 1:10 PM. The minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2005 were approved.
2. **Announcement.** Applications for the Antone Excellence Award are due on March 1.
3. **Treasurer.** About \$2000 is in the Assembly's account. Fifty-six members have paid dues.
4. **Social Committee.** Barbara Shamblin spoke about other possible options for an End of the Year Party. A questionnaire was handed out with a list of some options.
5. **Duties of a Chair and Director – Motion.** Thomas Day presented the following motion:

That the Faculty Assembly endorse the document entitled
“Duties of a Department Chair and a Director of a Graduate
Program: a Proposal Prepared by the Joint Administration-
Faculty Commission on the Faculty Manual.”

The motion was seconded. During the debate a problem in the wording was noted: The Chair and the Director were supposed to “possess the terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.” This could not apply to department in which more than one discipline was taught. A change in the wording was proposed: “terminal degree in an appropriate discipline.” No objection was made to this rewording.

The motion passed: 39 YES 11 NO 7 ABSTAIN.

6. **Assessments/Evaluations of Administrators – Motion.** Barbara Sylvia presented a motion concerning the annual evaluation/assessment of administrators by the Full-Time Teaching Faculty. The motion was seconded. The text of the motion is appended to these minutes.

President's Comments. Sister Therese Antone addressed the Assembly:

During my administration, a program of annual review has been in place for all administrators and their staffs. As you know, I recently retained the services of a consultant to assist with assessment and ongoing professional development for administrators. I have assured you of my intention to involve the faculty in this. I assumed that this would be a factor taken into consideration during any discussions about faculty participation in the evaluation of academic administrators. In regards to this, I wish to bring other matters to your attention.

First I repeat what I wrote in February 2004, in a memorandum to the full-time teaching faculty regarding a proposal being put forth related to the evaluation of academic administrators: *“As you consider this matter, please be*

reminded that the primary purpose of periodic review of any department or member of the University community is to recognize and support good performance and to encourage ongoing personal development. Additionally, any official evaluation must be conducted on behalf of the appointing administrator who also is the person to receive the evaluation.”

When I met with the Executive Committee last August, I indicated that I did not consider the process of evaluation as initiated by the faculty in February 2004 to be collegial or in keeping with conduct expected of academic professionals. You should also know that I further emphasized that the public reading of any person’s evaluation is professionally unacceptable and inconsistent with our objective that the practice of mercy permeate the campus.

While I welcome some faculty involvement in the evaluation of academic administrators, the process that has been used by the faculty and what is being proposed as an amendment to the existing process are not acceptable. I consider the proposed amendment to the existing process to be insufficient.

What we need is time to develop a process that is fair and suitable in our culture. I remind you that I have initiated steps toward this. Our behavior around this issue should express our value system. The process, as it is, does nothing for the person and less for the institution. I welcome faculty involvement. However, to be acceptable, the evaluation process must be well done and reflect our campus culture.

The development of a valid process requires our active commitment to collaboration and collegiality and should be motivated by the goals and objectives of the University’s strategic plan. I trust that your actions will indicate just such commitment and motivation and am confident that we can institute a process of which all of you, as well as I, can be very proud. I suggest that you elect five members of the faculty to work with the consultant and me to develop a valid process.

I ask and thank you for your cooperation.

Robin Hoffmann offered an Amendment by Substitution to the motion on the floor. It was seconded. The text of the amendment is appended to these minutes.

After a lengthy debate on the appropriateness of the amendment and on the existing evaluation process, a motion to postpone discussion was made, seconded, and passed:
31 YES 26 NO.

7. **Interviews for Seniors.** Lisa Zuccarelli OP announced that seniors in the sciences were headed for interviews at this time of the year. She is organizing mock interviews to help students and would be very grateful for faculty volunteers who are willing to donate time to this process.

At 2:30 PM a motion was made to continue the meeting in Executive Session. It was seconded and passed by Unanimous Consent.

Appendix

Motion to Amend the Process for Designing the Instrument used for the Evaluation of Academic Administrators

Whereas: (1) the Faculty Assembly voted in 2004 to institute an annual evaluation of academic administrators; (2) the annual evaluation process provides both the individual administrator and the President with feedback helpful in moving the institution closer to the stated goal of being a “University of distinction;” (3) there has been some discussion relative to the desire of faculty to work more collaboratively with the administration; (4) the instrument can, and should, evolve to meet the ever-changing needs of the university faculty and their administration;

the following motion is placed before the Faculty Assembly:

That the Faculty Assembly continue its annual evaluation of academic administrators,

with one additional step incorporated at the start of this annual process: that being to seek input from the President and each administrator being evaluated relative to items on the instrument that may need further clarification and those items they may wish to see added,

with the final decision to modify or add items being left with the Faculty Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Assessment Committee.

Amendment by Substitution

The will of the Faculty Assembly is to hold in abeyance the annual administrative evaluations

and have faculty representatives work with President Antone to revise the evaluation form through dialog and collaboration between the Faculty Assembly and President Antone.

A vote of **YES**, means that the administrative evaluations will be held in abeyance this year and the faculty assembly will move forward in working with the President in revising the evaluation.