

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 19, 2005
LINFIELD HALL 113
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes**

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Dyer, Erickson, Jones, Larkin, Lynes-Hayes, C. McClure, M. McClure, Neeley, Ryker, Seymour, Stringam, Taper, Taylor, Yoo

Members Absent: Bradley, Brown, Croy, Levy, Marlow, Johnson, Idzerda, Jackson, Pratt, Prawdzienski, E. Schmidt, Scott, Stroup, Watson for Metz

Others: Fedock

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes of the September 28, 2005 and October 5, 2005 Faculty Council meetings were approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW – Chair Taylor

MSU Administrative Reviews have been in existence approximately 10 years. The response rate two years ago was so low that the results were not meaningful. Chair Taylor would like to implement a better system which culls a larger response and produces meaningful results. He conferred with his colleagues within the College of Business and Faculty Council, and composed a draft recommendation for the processes and outcomes of Administrative Reviews. The draft recommendation was also presented to President Gamble, and he believes Chair Taylor is progressing in the right direction and suggested the review be folded into the Three Sixty Review.

Given that, the draft recommendation suggests that because administrators may not be skilled in evaluating their administrative subordinates, formal training sessions may be designed and offered by experts in leadership review and evaluation. Next, the goals and potential process of administrative reviewers were discussed. They include:

1. **Provide accurate comments to administrators about faculty perceptions based on fair, accurate and representative information.** This concept is missing from the web-based survey we presently have.
2. **Provide input into decisions about administrators' behaviors and salaries.** Presently, the College of Business incorporates the Likert Scale (specific reference to numbered responses in a 1 through 5 format that reflects measurement of attitude) student evaluations (making up 5-10% of the variance) into an algebraic formula. Results directly impact salaries of the College of Business faculty.
3. **Follow a process that provides faculty assurance that their opinions have a significant impact on the evaluation and guidance of administrators.** Chair Taylor suggested that each administrator evaluate their administrator(s) every other year.

The following is offered as a potential process to accomplish these goals:

Each administrator will evaluate their immediate subordinate every other year and these reviews will be substantive and include information from all relevant stakeholders such as faculty, students, classifieds, professionals, and/or colleagues, fellow administrators. The goals for administrative reviews should be to improve performance. The review, at a minimum, will include the following:

1. **Analysis of the past two years' performance in relation to goals;**
2. **Identification of areas of exemplary performance satisfactory performance that could be improved in the next two years;**
3. **Clearly states measurable goals for future performance;**
4. **Articulation of measures to evaluate future performance;** what metrics should be used?

5. **Identification of skill and knowledge development opportunities to improve administrative performance (professional development opportunities); and,**
6. **A written summary of the first five steps of this process to be shared with stakeholders.** Chair Taylor believes this may be the most crucial component of the review. Faculty Council members believe anonymous reviews from faculty should be incorporated into this summary, whether positive or not.

In regards to faculty input into this process, the following is proposed:

1. **All efforts will be made to collect information from as many faculty under the administrator's purview. A census would be best, but if the information is based on a sample it will need to be representative or it risks being ignored.** A designated person in each department should follow up to make sure all faculty take the survey. This would be an integral part of receiving the survey. Chair Taylor suggested that a letter come from the administrator conducting the review of a subordinate, encouraging faculty to participate and stating that the number of responses would have an impact.
2. **It is imperative that inputs provided by faculty be 100% anonymous.** The majority of faculty members stated that they would prefer their input to be anonymous, but voiced concern that such input may not be considered, as Provost Dooley discounts anonymous participation. Member Taper suggested that faculty utilizing the web based survey should participate via permission (signing in). Specific individuals, however, would not be matched to their survey. Instead, groups of names, in numbers only, would be associated with the same number of responses in a pool.
3. **Questionnaires used to solicit faculty input will be developed by Faculty Council and the administrator conducting the review and the administrator under the review;**
4. **Faculty Council is willing to administer the questionnaires, collect the data and provide a ~~written report of the findings to the administrator conducting the review.~~** Faculty Council members stated that the written report may be a monumental undertaking. Faculty Council unanimously decided a "written report" should be dropped from the proposed process. Chair Taylor stated that the survey should be constructed on the web such that the data would be collected and reported in specific "data sets". The formal operational structure within the university dictates that the administrators should compile the data and make a report. Faculty Council would set the criteria and foundation for questionnaires.
5. **Choice of methods for soliciting input from other stakeholders is under the purview of the administrator conducting the review.**

It is recommended the Commissioner conduct similar reviews on the CEOs of each campus on a semiannual basis.

Member Erickson questioned whether Faculty Council had used the traditional web based survey to its potential and suggested it be revisited before being abandoned. Past Chair Jones reviewed the data points from the Administrative Survey held in 2003, and stated that the results were so sporadic and, in some cases, low or nonexistent that there was no value to it. Why did that happen? Faculty members thought it might have been due to apathy and that anonymous responses were not counted. They believe that if value was added to the process, it may boost response levels.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature
Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature
Gale R. Gough, Secretary