

Salve Regina University

Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

4-27-2016

Faculty Assembly Minutes, 4-27-16

Salve Regina University

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salve Regina University, "Faculty Assembly Minutes, 4-27-16" (2016). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 280.
https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/280

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).

MINUTES

Faculty Assembly
Wednesday, April 27, 2016
Bazarsky Auditorium

Quorum Count: **59**

I. Approval of Minutes of Faculty Assembly Meeting of April 13, 2016

The minutes pass.

II. Reflection: Drs. Jayme Hennessy and Carol Gibbons

III. Treasurer's Report: Dr. Emily Colbert Cairns \$1,251

IV. Scheduled Announcements:

- Dr. Chad Raymond, Davis Educational Foundation Grant update
- Ms. Annette Torrey, Center for Teaching & Learning, Changes to Canvas and Turnitin
- Mr. John Rok, Faculty Athletics Representative
- Dr. Mary Montminy-Danna, Collegium
- Drs. Amanda Minor and Thomas Arruda, Social Committee 5/10 Faculty Social

V: Committee Reports

- Dr. Peter Colosi, Adjunct Liaison Meeting: Briefing with detailed report to follow
- Dr. John Quinn, Core Review Committee, Assessment update: 101 & 102 have various measures: Assessment of Signature Assignment, student evaluations, additional questions added to evaluations, petite retreats for instructors, metacognitive essay. See PPT for details.

Question: Is there information about the distribution of themes across departments?

Answer: Louise Monast has all that information.

There were several questions/comments regarding assessment/data collection for the seminars, both about the 5-point scale and about how the SLOs are being normalized (against each other/against the test-out option?). What professors are reporting in their assessment and the very small percentage of students categorized as "sophisticated" according to the test out don't jibe. The usefulness of the data is being called into question given the differing assessment rubrics.

- Dr. Donald St. Jean, Evaluation Process Committee: EPC proposed changes to process.

The committee proposes a motion to expand EPC procedure into a four-step process (see PPT slide).

MINUTES

Motion: The Evaluation Process Committee moves that the Faculty Assembly approves the proposed changes to the procedure for the evaluation of the Provost and the Dean of Academics.

Question: Are we evaluating administrators every year?

Answer (Don St. Jean): We just focused on the process initially.

Comment: There doesn't seem to be a specific process here to sink your teeth into. For instance to say, "you were supposed to do this in x amount of time and either did or didn't."

Comment: If revising the process, why not specify what the process is instead of bringing an open-ended proposal? This just means next year's committee will have to bring another motion.

Comment: One problem is that the admins get to self-report/choose what feedback to share.

Question: Having constructive feedback is good. Will we be evaluating the president?

Answer (Don St. Jean): EPC discussed this but it's not right for us. At larger universities with unionized faculty we saw evaluations of the president. We didn't find that the case at smaller universities. Some would find this proposal has no teeth but at the very least it's an exchange of ideas. In the end, these evaluations are only advisory.

Question: Why are we dropping the IDEA survey? Is it so necessary to invent a "Salve" set of questions? Can you share the committee's deliberations on this?

Answer (Don St. Jean): EPC felt the survey was biased. The company's questions didn't seem to best serve us.

Comment: The IDEA survey was always closely read, especially for clusters of concerns, which is the managerial part of the Provost's and President's job. The only caution going forward is regarding the tone of the anonymous comments.

Comment: Can the committee withdraw this motion until it has more details?

It is moved to amend the motion to review admins yearly.

Motion: "This evaluation will be carried out yearly."

Yes (58%) No (37%) Abstain (5%)

Motion passes.

MINUTES

- Dr. Madeleine Esch: Curriculum Committee: Update on anticipated approved proposals. Withdrawing 102 test-out motion until the fall.

VI: Election of 2016-2017 Chair of the Executive Committee/Speaker of the Faculty Assembly: Lisa Zucharelli by vote of acclamation.

VII. Executive Session on FACSB: Dr. Jameson Chace

Adjournment: 5:05