FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDA

March 12, 2002

3:30pm—Room 307 Ferguson

Role Call and Quorum Check (*Keith Woodbury*)

Announcement of the Capstone Event (Laura Seltzer)

Approval/Corrections to the Minutes for February 12 (*Keith Woodbury*)

Action Items

> Resolution Creating a System of Faculty Feedback for Effective University Leadership (see below)
>
> Resolution Creating an Ombudsperson (forthcoming)
>
> Resolution Proposing Salary Enhancement (forthcoming)
>
> Intellectual Property Rights Proposal (forthcoming)
>
> Recent Activities of the ASA—do we need a response?
>
> Is Spring Break 2003 too late?
>
> Do we want to Sponsor another Constitutional Reform Seminar?

President's Report (*Norm Baldwin*)

> Time allotment for Resolutions
>
> Information from the Provost and President
>
> > Changes to the EEO Statement
>
> The Senate won the Tax Reform Banner Signature contest

Vice President's Report (*Steve Miller*)

Secretary's Report (*Keith Woodbury*)

Reports from Senate Committees (5 minutes each)

> Financial Affairs (*Terry Royed and Keith Woodbury*)
>
> > Intellectual Property Rights Joint Committee update

Health insurance for graduate students Faculty Life (*Wythe Holt and Jerry Rosiek*)

> Maternity leave policy for the *Faculty Handbook*
>
> Picketing staff members
>
> Diversity concerns of the English Department

Academic Affairs (*Don Desmet and Beth Macauley*)

NCAA investigation concerns (is there a denial of endemic problems?)

Inconsistent tenure and promotion standards between departments and colleges

Planning and Operations (*Bill Keel and John Mason*)

Scheduling Issues: Tuesday due date for final exam grades

ACHE data presentation (instructional/non-instructional split; TA data)

Environmental Audit—should we do one?

Research and Service (*Bing Blewitt*)

Senate Operations (*Steve Miller and Harry Price*)

Grievance Document

Shared Governance: Interaction with the President's Executive Staff; Dean's representation (non-voting) on Steering Committee and Senate representation (non-voting) on Council of Deans; Graduate Student Association representation (i.e., non-voting, floor privileges) on the Faculty Senate; Implementation of "Shared Governance Document" principles

Student Affairs (*Alvin Winters*)

Reports from University Standing and Other Committees

Legislative Agenda Committee (*Margaret Garner*)

New Business

Old Business

Announcements

Our next monthly meeting with the Provost is **March 14 at 3:00 in room 254 Rose**

A Proposed System of Faculty Feedback

For effective UNIVERSITY leadership

(Developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs)

Whereas the University's *experts* in personnel administration agree that continuing the development of a system of faculty feedback for University leaders is sound contemporary management and consistent with principles of shared governance, and

Whereas research demonstrates that superiors do not receive systematic and objective

feedback when subordinates are unprotected, and

Whereas the proposal that follows helps leaders improve performance, reduces the bias in the unsystematic feedback that leaders currently receive, and provides more timely feedback than our system of performance evaluation that occurs only once every five years, and

Whereas for two consecutive years the Council of Deans has not accepted Faculty Senate proposals to create a system of faculty feedback that is more responsive to faculty than the current system, and

Whereas the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evaluation of Deans and Chairs conscientiously addressed all of the concerns and objections of the Council of Deans to the most recent proposed system of faculty feedback. These concerns include that the system would be an administrative burden, that leaders already receive substantial feedback, that faculty do not know what leaders do, and that performance evaluation is a painful and threatening experience, and

Whereas none of the efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee to accommodate the deans' and to meet with them individually resulted in Council-wide acceptance of the proposed system of feedback or a willingness to work toward a mutually acceptable system, and

Whereas rejecting the Senate's proposals to create a system of faculty feedback while requiring faculty to administer student evaluations is a demoralizing inconsistency, and

Whereas advocating for the faculty through overseeing a system of faculty feedback is an essential and appropriate role of the Faculty Senate when avenues for enhancing communication between the faculty and administration are rejected and limited, and

Whereas although the faculty recognize that a majority of University leaders are talented and hardworking individuals who are concerned about faculty, a system of faculty feedback will allow leaders to achieve a higher level of performance and responsiveness to faculty, thus allowing for a more productive and satisfied faculty,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate proposes the following system of faculty feedback for effective University leadership:

A PROPOSAL FOR A System of Faculty Feedback for EFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY LEADERShip

Faculty Senate Sponsored Feedback System. Given the benefits of a system of faculty feedback and the current inability of the Council of Deans to support a University-administered system, we propose that the Faculty Senate oversee a system of faculty feedback.

Feedback System Administered by a University-wide Committee Accountable to the Faculty Senate. To reduce demands on Senate members, who are often already overburdened, we propose that a committee comprised of faculty *outside* the Senate administer the survey and disseminate the results. Accountable to the Senate, this committee would be funded by the Senate and would use Senate resources (e.g., Linda Knowles, Senate office supplies). This committee would operate much like the Senate's Legislative Agenda Committee or the Ad Hoc SPI committee.

Composition and Charge of a Faculty Concerns Committee. We recommend that

the committee that administers the feedback survey be called the Faculty Concerns Committee or something closely related. Such a name will reduce the sense that we are restricting our focus to only giving feedback to deans and chairs. We recommend that this committee normally be comprised of around ten faculty members including around four from Arts and Sciences, one from Engineering, one from C&BA, and four from the other colleges. These ten shall include a liaison from the Faculty Senate. The non-Senate members shall serve three-year terms with one third of the members completing a term every year (i.e., one-third of the committee shall turn over every year). This committee shall administer the feedback instruments, disseminate the results, make modifications to the instruments as needed, and determine the committee's new members every year.

To help ensure successful implementation of the new system of feedback and a successful transition of responsibility to the Faculty Concerns Committee, members of the Ad Hoc Committee will serve as initial members of the Faculty Concerns Committee. To create the cycle of one-third membership turnover each year, initial members of the Faculty Concerns Committee will serve terms of one, two, or three years.

Frequency of Feedback. To ensure that the feedback system accomplishes the desired results, we propose that feedback instruments be administered no less than once every two years. A more precise frequency of administering instruments would be determined through what is learned in the process of developing and administering the initial instruments.

Feedback on Leaders *and* on the College and Department as a whole. To enhance the amount of useful information for University leaders and to reduce the perception that the Senate is adversarily targeting leaders, we propose that leadership feedback be a part of an instrument providing feedback on the operation of colleges and departments as a whole.

An Instrument Developed by the Ad Hoc Committee Experts. We propose that base, or core, feedback instruments be developed by the experts serving on the Ad Hoc Committee. This includes experts in public sector performance evaluation, private sector performance evaluation, and psychometrics. To allow for differences in job responsibilities, leaders will be allowed to add questions to the core instruments.

Administered On-line. Because the Senate does not have the administrative network to administer a hard copy of a survey and because a mail-out survey would be costly, we recommend that the instruments be administered on-line.

Dissemination of Results. For feedback to have maximum effectiveness, we propose that:

> 1. Except for one's first round of feedback, feedback should be shared with the individual leaders *and* their immediate supervisor. That is, we recommend reinstituting the accountability that did not exist in the previously passed system of private feedback. To allow leaders a forewarning of problems and the opportunity to address and correct problems without the stigmatizing judgments of their supervisors, feedback should not be shared with supervisors during one's first experience with the feedback system.
>
> Feedback on individual leaders should *not* be shared with the general faculty. Faculty should be given access to the aggregate data on leaders (e.g., the

aggregate statistics on deans and chairs).

Data from the research process used to develop the feedback instruments should be made accessible to the faculty.

Reconsideration of the Five-year Review. So that leaders do not experience excessive evaluation, the Faculty Senate shall evaluate whether the University should continue with the University-wide system of evaluating deans and chairs every five-years. This evaluation shall take place after leaders experience two complete cycles of the Senate's new feedback system. In the event that the Senate's system of feedback is effective and that the five-year review does not add to the quality of this feedback system, the Senate shall recommend discontinuing the five-year review of deans and chairs.