**Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes**

Thursday, October 17th

10:00 –11:30 AM

**Education 123**

**Present:** Zachary Zenko, Sumita Sarma, Elijah Enos, Sarana Roberts, Amber Stokes, Deborah Boschini, *Alternate: Ji Li*

**Absent:** Jackie Kegley, Tracey Salisbury

**Guest Attendee:** Lori Blodorn

**I. Call to Order:** 10:03 AM

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes:** Elijah Enos

**III. Approval of Minutes:** Amber moved to approve, all in favor.

**IV. Announcements:** None

**V. Approval of Agenda:** Unanimous approval.

**VI. Old Business:**

Discussed past resolutions regarding Sixth-Year Lecturer Review; have not yet had a chance to present to Executive Committee.

**Second Reading of Resolution 2425-05: Evaluation of University-Wide Faculty Directors.**

Academic Senate recommends that this resolution be expanded to include faculty members designated as coordinators as well.

Discussion on 2425-05 paused to allow for consultation with Human Resources on **Second Reading of Resolution 2425-01: Evaluation of Academic Administrators.**

First area of concern addressed: review of administrators who have already retired or departed their roles (including interim administrators). Concern was raised that placing administrators who have departed or are in temporary roles under review may be a waste of time and resources.

Second area of concern addressed: proposal that review committee will be charged with verifying administrators’ statements of self-study creates potential for administrators to be immediately presumed fraudulent. Need to account for administrator accomplishments was deemed important; Faculty Affairs Committee considered less confrontational language.

Issue was also raised that requiring administrators to complete a full review file (equivalent to faculty RTP files) may not be a feasible requirement, owing to how much it would cause administrator workload to increase. Counter-concern was raised that some administrators may use their self-study to take credit for things that were more directly done by the staff in their offices.

Issues were addressed that, for certain administrators, detailed reviews may be challenging to undertake by a campus committee due to the confidential nature of these administrators’ work. Discussion was undertaken as to how a review process can result in accountability while also retaining confidentiality of sensitive information.

Discussion was undertaken regarding administrator access, or lack thereof, to a full record of their academic review committee’s deliberations as opposed to simply receiving a final review letter. Need for committee privacy to protect against potential retaliation was emphasized. Issue was also raised that any review process should account for the right to administrator privacy as well, should their supervisor (e.g., the President) elect to dismiss them from their position as the result of a negative review.

**VII. New Business:**

Discussion continued with Human Resources regarding **Resolution 2425-XX: Faculty Role in the Review of the Cabinet.**

Distinction made between tools for job performance evaluation and tools for professional development improvement plans (360 Plans). Human Resources is currently working under President’s direction on establishing a process for cabinet evaluation; HR recommends that this resolution be tabled until after they have presented their own plan for this process.

Questions were raised about the robustness of HR’s proposed review process, the necessity of using external vendors, and the timeline by which a review can be completed that will account for faculty feedback. External vendor process is underway and nearly complete; Human Resources provided reassurance that any vendor used will be in the specialized field of higher education, and will utilize a comprehensive assessment that uses more than just numbers / quantitative data to review. Question was also raised about the cost and affordability of an external vendor.

Question was raised about how quickly a HR process will be implemented; Human Resources considered it likely that the process will be in place by December or January; as soon as the recommendation for a vendor has been moved forward to the President, it should be able to be implemented within a month. Human Resources expressed preference for utilizing an external vendor over an internal faculty-run committee, owing to the potential of a faculty-run committee to sway too heavily toward one specific bargaining unit on campus.

**VIII. Old Business Resumed:**

Briefly returned to discussion of Resolution 2425-01; concern was raised that the self-study for administrators is too vague in its scope, and whether it is fair to consider “commanding respect” as a qualification for an administrator’s job performance.

Returned to discussion of Resolution 2425-05; Elijah moved to move this resolution forward for second reading with the amendment that it now applies to coordinators as well as directors; Amber seconded; all in favor.

**IX. Adjourned:** 11:27 AM