Minutes of Faculty Assembly - April 12

The faculty assembly with 52 members present was called to order by the Chairman, Jim Nievahner, who made the following announcements:

1) Two complimentary tickets per faculty member are available

for "UnderMilkwood".

2) According to the Constitution, the library staff are members of the Faculty Assembly and may be represented on all standing committees.

The first order of business concerned the dates of Spring Break for the '73-'74 school year. A student poll indicated the following:

24 votes for early March

115 votes for late March

108 votes for early April

Spring Break is presently scheduled for March 11-15. It was announced that Administrative Council desired feedback from the faculty concerning the dates for Spring Break.

After discussion, a motion was made by Thad Lindsey, seconded by Tom Tierney that Spring Break would be after the 10th week of classes (the last week in Narch in 1974). The motion carried Nargaret Cantrell, chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, told the assembly that her committee had been required by Administrative Council to reconsider their recommendation for the procedure for evaluating administrators, since there was objections to the procedure.

The Academic Affairs Committee met and has approved the following which they will accept in order from least desirable to most desirable. PLEASE NOTE THE VOTE WHICH RECORDS ALL EXCEPT ONE MEMBER WHO HAS NOT ATTENDED ALL YEAR.

VOTE

SUGGESTED PROCEDURE

- 6 for, 4 against 1. If it comes to that, we will accept chairman evaluations going to vice president, rather than not have the evaluation done this year.
- 10 for

 2. If it comes to that, we will accept chairman evaluations going to vice president with a summary given to the vice president and each member of the department.
- 6 for, 4 against 3. Chairman evaluations will follow the prescribed procedure suggested by Neal Jowaises. (below)
- i. Within one week from the time these forms are distributed the members of the department will meet, without their chairman, and select one of their group as tabulator. Immediately following this selection each faculty member will give to the tabulator the completed avaluation form.

2. Within one week from this meeting, the tabulator will distribute the tabulated results to each faculty member and the chairman, simultaneously.

3. SIt is recommended that the chairman call a departmental faculty meet-

ing, solely for the purpose of discussing the tabulated results.

4. Within 3 working days of the distribution of the tabulated results, all copies, excepting the chairman and the tabulator will be returned to the

tabulator for destruction, with indication of preference as to whether or not to send the tabulated results to the Academic Vice President.

5. The chairman also has this option of sending or not sending his copy of the tabulated results to the Academic Vice President.

I would like the faculty assembly to vote the same way.

That is, would you prefer 1, to not having them? How many would accept this.

Then, would you prefer 2, to not having them? How many would accept this?

Then, would you prefer 3, to not having them? How many would accept this?

Then - which is your first choice?

A letter from Al Pinelo, Chairman of the Subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee charged with the evaluation of administrators, was read.

To The Faculty Assembly:

I regret that previous commitments are keeping me away from a meeting dealing with chairmen evaluations. Since I had assumed the matter was settled weeks ago, I could not anticipate the present problem. However, having worked rather consistently with these evaluations for the entire year, I want to express my opinion on this matter.

I do not feel that the change on the evaluation procedure made by Administrative Council substantially affects the integrity of the evaluation. In the original proposal we had given each department the option of either sending their forms to the Academic Vice President or tabulating them departmentally. The chairmen object very streneously to what they considered to be an encounter group where their merits would be the object of discussion and collective judgement.

I advise the Assembly to go along with the Chairmen for the following reasons:

- a. They are agreeing to have themselves evaluated according to a criteria and format devised by the faculty with no alteration of the criteria whatsoever. They raised no objection to the timing of the first evaluations, nor did they object to the frequency of the evaluations. Since they accepted the idea of the evaluation with only one objection, it is proper for the faculty to show willingness to compromise, and tolerance for the views of those who are going to be evaluated.
- b. The faculty has not requested that students meet in a group evaluation of their teachers. Student evaluations of faculty are conducted individually with the results known to the Administration and the individual faculty member only. If we are to be fair and demand that Chairman evaluations be made into a collective exercise, it would be consistent then for a corresponding change in faculty evaluations.

Following discussion, the members voted with the following results.

- 34 YES 14 NO 1. If it comes to that, I will accept chairman evaluations going to vice president rather than not have the evaluation done this year.
- 45 YES 2 NO 2. If it comes to that, I will accept chairman evaluations going to vice president with a summary given to the vice president, chairman, and each member of the department.
- 31 YES 15 NO 3. If it comes to that, I will accept chairman evaluations following the prescribed procedure suggested by Neal Jowaises.

If you had your first choice among the above three procedures which one do you prefer: Circle your first choice.

(9) 1. Chairman evaluations go to vice president.

(13) 2. Chairman evaluations go to vice president but department members, and chairman also get a copy.

(12) 3. Chairman evaluations follow the procedure described by Neal Jowaises.

It was announced that election of officers for '73-'74 would be held at 12:10 p.m. in the auditorium of Nunn Hall, 23 April. Absentee ballotts may be picked up from Irene Brownfield or Mrs. Crane (Chase) April 18-19-20 or 23 and returned to either one before noon 23 April.

The following notion was made by Thad Lindsey and seconded by Margery Rouse.

- 1. The Faculty Regent shall report in person to the Faculty Assembly periodically or at any time the Assembly requests such a report.
- 2. Should the Faculty Regent be unable to represent the Faculty at any meeting of the Regents, he shall be represented by the Chairman of the Assembly. Should the chairman be unable to attend, the vice-chairman of the Assembly shall represent him. Should none of the above be present, the Faculty Affairs Committee shall represent the Assembly.

Motion carried.

Nick Melnick in referring to a tabled motion concerning a Faculty Senate made a motion that an Ad Hoc Committee be appointed to begin work on a Constitution for a Faculty Senate. This was seconded by Mike Colligan.

It was pointed out that Mike Hur's original motion called for a fourman committee to report following 30 working days after the committee was found. The date for reporting would be 29 August.

The following persons were nominated to be on the Ad Hoc Committee:

Mike Endres Mike Hur Jim Ramage Nick Melnick Linda Dolive Mike Colligan These names will also be on the ballot at the 23 April election.

The meeting was declared adjourned by the Chairman.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Sutherland Acting Secretary