MINUTES OF FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
19 November 2010 (11-12:30 PM) 

In Attendance: Chubbuck, Sharon; Factor, Kim; Frenn, Marilyn; Haglund, Kristin; Hanson, Lisa C.; Ibaneznoe, Javier; Jentz, John; Spargo, R. Clifton; Su, John; Voelker, Mary; Whittenberger, Lynn  
Absent: Egdorf, Kerry; Lee, Felissa; Pustejovsky, John  
Guests: Hanlon, Ann; Papanek, Paula  

1. Old business.  
Minutes from the previous meeting (29 October 2010) were approved unanimously.  

The evaluation form prepared by K. Haglund for the upcoming University forum was discussed. A majority of members present determined that an entirely electronic survey (through SurveyMonkey) would be superior to a paper-only survey or a hybrid combining options for paper and electronic responses. Recognizing that an electronic-only survey might elicit fewer responses than other forms, members noted that the primary purpose for the survey was to enable attendees an additional opportunity to offer questions and responses beyond the timeframe available.  

M. Frenn provided a status report on the motion to include the Chair and Vice-Chair of University Academic Senate on the University Leadership Council, Deans’ Council Meetings, and the trustee meetings. The Provost has indicated that further groundwork would be necessary before moving forward on such a motion, and Frenn announced that she will be meeting with the Provost on Monday.  

Frenn provided a status report on the motion to the University Academic Senate to amend statutes regarding vacancies for elected positions. The motion was announced at the most recent Senate meeting, and will be discussed at its December meeting.  

2. New business.  
Members engaged in a very wide-ranging and spirited discussion on how to fulfill the charge given the Faculty Council to "implement 360 evaluation (e.g. faculty, peer-Dean, alum evaluation of deans) of administrators." Some of the most salient questions and points would include:  

- how should the term "administrator" be understood? The consensus of members was that this referred to administrators above the department chair level. The consensus was also that "administrator" would include not only faculty administrators but also administrators of non-faculty units.  
- What assessment instruments currently exist? Two primary instruments were noted: 1) the law school sends questionnaires to alumni; 2) a three-year cycle Dean review policy. The consensus of members was that the latter was useful but not, in of itself, fulfilling the Faculty Council charge because it is not currently 360° in nature.  
- What would be the purpose of implementing a 360° evaluation? In an effort to clarify the charge given to this year's Faculty Council, members distinguished between assessment focused on development (in which case, the assessed individual owns the data) and...
assessment focused on *evaluation* (in which case, the supervisor of the assessed individual owns the data).

- Members strongly urge that a 360° evaluation must be understood as a performance review. While it might certainly contain elements of both development and evaluation, it cannot be understood to be viable without a clear sense of its evaluative nature.

- What would be the role of alumni in a 360° evaluation? What would be the role of undergraduates?
  - Members recognize the need for 360° evaluation to have clear written policies to determine who is asked to participate and to clarify in advance how any data collected will be used.
  - Members likewise asserted the importance of clearly establishing in written policies potential consequences of evaluations. Members recognize that for nonfaculty administrators, this may be novel and not entirely welcome. Members also recognize that it will not necessarily be up to faculty to determine consequences.

- How can a 360° evaluation be created such that all stakeholders will feel able to speak candidly?
  - Members strongly urge that a 360° evaluation not be implemented wholesale but rather invite deans to engage in a pilot program.

- Should the current three-year cycle review be expanded or should an entirely new structure be created. Members recognize that if a new structure is created, then it will require additional duties on the parts of faculty. One suggestion was to use existing structures, such as a faculty review committee. Any persons on a 360° evaluation committee would need to be chosen for their commitment to fairness and confidentiality. The question of who would sit on such a committee was addressed, and one suggestion called for including a representative of the executive committee of each college.
  - Members indicated a strong need for further research before determining a useful paradigm. In particular, it would be helpful to gain further knowledge regarding models of 360° evaluation at other colleges and universities.
  - Lynn Whittenberger volunteered to summarize different models if she were given access to them. Frenn indicated that she would seek them out.

In the course of this discussion, an entirely separate, but related, issue was raised regarding the difficulty of finding information about shared governance and other faculty committees. Members suggested that it would be helpful to increase the number of links on various University websites to the webpage of University Academic Senate; it would be helpful to have links to individual committees; it would be useful if a broader range of search terms on the University website would point to committees involved in shared governance.

Frenn urged members to reach out to constituencies personally to attend the upcoming forum.

3. **Adjournment**: 12:30 PM

**Prepared and submitted by**: John J Su, Department of English