

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 26, 2005
LINFIELD HALL 113
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Becker, Brown, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Jones, Larkin, Levy, Locke, C. McClure, Neeley, Ryker, Scott, Seymour, Taper, Taylor, Watson for Metz, Yoo

Members Absent: Bradley, Marlow, Johnson, Idzerda, Jackson, Lynes-Hayes, M. McClure, Pratt, Prawdzienski, E. Schmidt, Stringam, Stroup

Others: Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (Continued from October 19, 2005) – Chair Taylor

Chair Taylor presented a list of criteria that might be considered as the role of faculty input for Administrative Reviews. They included:

1. Identify the administrators covered by this policy: Academic administrators from the President down through Department Heads.
2. Cycle of review: No longer than two years for faculty's immediate supervisors (Department Heads and in some cases Associate Deans) and no longer than three years for all others.
 - a. FC members questioned whether the hiatus of two years for immediate supervisors and three years for all other administrators was too long. If performance issues arose before those times, it would be difficult to implement changes.
3. Faculty input must be solicited with anonymous questionnaires available to all relevant faculty members.
4. Faculty input will be seriously considered and have a significant impact on the performance evaluation of each administrator.
 - a. FC members believe their input may have had a range (as in Likert scale) of impact on administrators, but because the rate of return was so low for the 2003 review, outcomes were not noted.
5. Questions on the questionnaire will be determined by the administrator doing the review, the administrator under review and Faculty Council.
 - a. FC would rely almost exclusively on faculty from the unit/department administrator, unless particular issues were brought to Faculty Council's attention.
6. A summary of the criteria and the process used for the evaluation will be shared with stakeholders.
 - a. There may be legal implications by making evaluations public.
7. Administrators are strongly encouraged to share their evaluations with their shareholders.
8. It is suggested that a neutral, respected party (such as the campus' Ombuds) be allowed to examine documents gathered and review the process used to evaluate each administrator.

Counsel Leslie Taylor suggested that FC create a list that would include all areas the Administrative Review would encompass. Suggestions included:

1. Fair annual reviews
2. Fair and equitable salary determinations
3. Open decision making
4. Communication skills
5. Resource allocation and management
6. Support for teaching
7. Support for research/creative activity
8. Support for service
9. Support for outreach
10. Support for professional development
11. Leadership and motivation
12. Fund raising

13. Recruitment of Faculty
14. Recruitment of Students
15. Recruitment of Staff
16. Curriculum development

Some FC members did not see the relevance of this list. Additionally, they did not know if it would have any impact on the final creation of the Administrative Review. Further discussions will ensue.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary