

Salve Regina University

## Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

---

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

---

2-3-2006

### Eval Adm Proposals - STA Comments to Faculty e-mail 2006 02 03

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly)

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Eval Adm Proposals - STA Comments to Faculty e-mail 2006 02 03" (2006). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 141.

[https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac\\_assembly/141](https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/141)

#### Rights Statement



In Copyright - Educational Use Permitted. URI: <http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC-EDU/1.0/>

This Item is protected by copyright and/or related rights. You are free to use this Item in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. In addition, no permission is required from the rights-holder(s) for educational uses. For other uses, you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s).

[Sent to the full-time faculty on Saturday, February 4, 2006; double-spaced; 14 pt]

**Sister M. Therese Antone**  
**Comments to Faculty**  
**February 3, 2006**

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.