

FACULTY POLICY COUNCIL
MARCH 2020
SUMMARIES OF EMAIL DISCUSSIONS IN LIEU OF MEETING MINUTES

MAJOR POINTS (see feedback details below)

- All participating FPC members indicated approval to proceed with this year's Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) recommended director evaluation survey draft.
 - Several FPC member comments below about the survey suggest FPC revisit it next year.
- LRPC recommended not sharing director evaluation results with faculty; no comments from most participating FPC members.
 - Washington and Joyce-Beaulieu have the same comments/concerns about sharing director evaluation results, as indicated below.
- All participating FPC members unanimously approved the COE Affiliate Faculty Status Guidelines.
 - Dawson raised four questions, as indicated below, to be addressed at a future date.

FEEDBACK ON DIRECTOR SURVEY

Atria – no changes suggested (alternate member)
Brown – no changes suggested
Castañeda – no changes suggested (alternate member)
Cheyney-Collante – no changes suggested
Dawson – yes, with suggestions below
Emery – yes, with comment below
Gonsalves – yes, with comment below
Jeter – no changes suggested
Joyce-Beaulieu – yes, with suggestions below
Kohnen – no changes suggested
Kramer – absent
Lombardino – absent
Lynch – absent
Schuermann – no changes suggested
Searby – yes, with comment below
Washington – yes, with suggestions below

COMMENTS ON DIRECTOR SURVEY

Dawson: I think we should move forward given the circumstances and the fact that the Dean vetted the items with the Directors. However, I think there are issues with the items because they ask about too many things at once (for example, one item asks about program development/strategic planning, resource generation, budget management, program evaluation and accreditation, and faculty and staff assignments, mentorship/professional development, and evaluations). I anticipate we may get this feedback from faculty who take the survey, but I think it is better to have a consistent strategy for faculty input about these evaluations than nothing, which is what we will have if we try to make changes to the items now. There is an open-ended item at the end too, which would allow faculty to elaborate if they wish.

Joyce-Beaulieu: Agreed with Kara. It seems like an easy fix, to subdivide these lengthy items into 3-4 questions each so once we do have the data, it is more meaningful to interpret and share back with Directors.

Washington: Agreed with Dawson and Joyce-Beaulieu.

Emery: Agreed that some questions cover too much.

Searby: Agreed with Emery.

Gonsalves: Agreed with Emery and Searby.

COMMENTS ON SHARING DIRECTOR EVALUATION RESULTS WITH FACULTY

Washington and Joyce-Beaulieu: In regards to the LRP committee perspective on the dissemination of Director results, we are reminded of how this first came to the FPC by faculty request for transparency and a feedback loop on the Directors' performance. The concerns were that: (a) the survey may not have been systematically administered each year; (b) their voices were not being heard and this is the only mechanism for that feedback; and (c) the Director's role is a college administration role and thus could benefit from feedback similar to the Associate Deans' and Dean's surveys. There was some precedent in prior years for sharing the broad administration role mean ratings (no comments and no info outside of the administrative role items) within the schools for faculty only. We felt that from our conversations with the Deans, they were open to this process of limited sharing related only to the Director role (not the individual's broader personnel performance in areas such as research, etc.).

Brown – supports LRP recommendation, no additional comments/feedback

Dawson – supports LRP recommendation, no additional comments/feedback

All other responding FPC members indicated that they had no comments/feedback about this issue.

Kramer – absent

Lombardino – absent

Lynch – absent

VOTE ON GUIDELINES FOR COE AFFILIATE FACULTY STATUS

Atria – yay (alternate)

Brown – yay

Castañeda – yay (alternate)

Cheney-Collante – yay

Dawson – yay, with the following questions for FAC:

- What percentage of votes is needed to pass for approval within the C/I?
- What if the vote is unfavorable? Who consults the “next level” that C/I leaders report to?
- More specifics on how approval or denial is determined?
- In a situation that “grandfathers in” existing informal affiliate faculty, what if there is a case where faculty feel that they did not have a voice because voting was bypassed?

Emery – yay

Gonsalves – yay

Jeter – yay

Joyce-Beaulieu – yay

Kohnen – yay

Kramer – absent

Lombardino – absent

Lynch – absent

Schuermann – yay

Searby – yay

(Washington – does not vote)