

# COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

## FEBRUARY 17, 2005

### I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 17, 2005 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly and secretary Ms. Andrell Gautier was present. Rev. Leo Nicoll, S.J. led the invocation.

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The motion to approve the minutes of January 20, 2005 was accepted.

### III. ANNOUNCEMENT

*Nickel and Dimed* will begin production this weekend. Opening is Friday, February 18, 2005 and Saturday night, February 19, 2005 is FYE night. Drama and Speech is offering two tickets for the price of one for any staff member, faculty member or student during opening weekend. Dr. Maria Calzada has about ten tickets available for FYE night—these tickets are free to students.

Dr. Scully gave a few brief reports about happenings in the university that affect Arts and Sciences significantly:

#### **Integration of the Strategic Agenda**

The Dean distributed a copy containing a list of topics that were put together by the Chair of the Committee, the Dean of the College of Business Administration. The Dean said there are items in the Strategic Agenda that affect the College and are not on this list. Dr. Scully has been asked to submit those items which he believes need to be included but he also informed the College that everyone needs to give the Chair of the committee feedback on what might be missing from the list. He urged everyone to discuss this with their department. Dr. Scully said he was a bit concerned about the first item on the top of the list, *Identify and develop five academic units as Centers of Excellence by the beginning of academic year 2007-08*. In the Strategic Agenda it states that \$250,000 will be set aside for each one of those Centers of Excellence [= \$1,250,000] and while he supports the concept, there will have to be some serious decisions about the funding of these Centers. Dr. Scully said there was a lack of clarity about the concept of allocation for three years in order to enable the centers to develop self-sustaining programs—an idea that came before the Strategic Agenda Committee. These centers, he said, work best with units that generate their own dollars. In a conversation with the Provost, the Dean said that he wants to make sure that the rules for how this is developed are clear to everyone so that we are all on the same page. The Dean believes there needs to be a lot of dialogue on this. Dr. Mary Blue [a subcommittee member for SCAP] said that she is in support of the notion but also believed that original plan had the money coming from fundraising, rather than from a reallocation of existing funds. Dr. Scully is concerned that at this time there is no expectation or measure of national recognition. He believes SCAP or the College Assembly need to specify exactly what kind of national attention these centers are going to generate. Dr. Mark Fernandez added that had raised these issues at every town meeting and asked them to come back with a clear definition of the Centers of Excellence; most have turned a “deaf ear” to his request. Professor Georgia Gresham said she has expressed concern to the President about the short notice concerning town meetings and would like the College to express also that we need a sufficient amount of time to schedule and calendar these important events in order to be involved; the Dean said that he would pass this information along.

## The College Budget Proposal

Dr. Scully brought his proposal to the CPT for approval and it has now been sent forth to the Provost ([CPT Budget Justification for 2006-07.doc](#)). A copy of the proposal will also be sent to the Chairs.

## Common Curriculum Review

Everyone distributed copies of his memo concerning the motion previously put forward. He said that after a considerable amount of thought, he will not serve as Chair but he intends to be on the committee. He has recommended to the Provost specifically that a member of the faculty of Arts and Sciences to serve as Chair.

## IV. NEW BUSINESS

### A) Motion to review current Teaching Evaluation Forms

Dr. Lynn Koplitz asked that this item be placed on the agenda for discussion. She said that a few years ago this motion was approved using teaching evaluations as an evaluation instrument and since we now have years of data, it is time to come back and re-evaluate the instrument and discuss any changes that are necessary. Dean Scully said that these were put as motions but should have been SORC reports. In response to questions about how the evaluations were used, the Dean said that when he looks at the evaluations he sees four items as especially significant:

*The instructor communicated the subject matter effectively.  
Overall, the course was a valuable educational experience.  
The instructor stimulated critical, analytical, creative, and independent thinking.  
I would recommend this instructor to other students*

Professor Gresham questioned the timing of the administration of these evaluations and how they are used—especially the fact that the most recent evaluations are not available in time for departmental evaluations. She requested that we match our annual faculty evaluation process to the evaluations that we reference. The Dean said that he does not believe it can be done; Professor Gresham said if that is the case then we need to acknowledge it. Dr. Mark Fernandez said that we need to look at evaluations other than the student forms for salary compensation, tenure, and promotion, and focus mainly on how student evaluations are being used to improve teaching. Dr. Blue stated that these evaluations were approved on the condition that they not be used for salary purposes; it was also stated that in one year they would be reexamined. Dr. Blue suggested that a system be in place on how the evaluations are administered. Dr. Scully said that this would be worth a motion and he wants to come back to address how we use this in the evaluation of faculty. The Dean assured the faculty that when reviewing evaluations, he looks at all of the evaluations and not just a particular outlier. In addition, he added that over the past four years, his interactions with SORC have been very honest and open and he feels confident that the number of people involved in this process guards against one person making an arbitrary decision. Dr. Blue stated that we have never determined how the instrument is evaluated and what it purports to measure—she believes that scores are too high, and this could mean that it doesn't actually measure anything remotely having to do with teaching. A member of SORC stated that the evaluations are one of a set of things they review but more emphasis goes into the Chair's and Departmental Salary Committee's evaluations than the raw numbers. Dr. Dorn said that according to a number of assessment workshops she has attended, the belief is that assessment ought to be about student learning. She said that what students think about whether they have learned or not is meaningless because they may not know until several years down the road. Dr. T. Smith remarked that one of the recurring problems—the lag time

between administering the evaluation and receipt of the results—could be addressed by using a web-based instrument, but the logistics of doing it outside of class (how to assure participation, etc.) present some difficulties. He added that our current practice, with several colleges now submitting written forms for scanning, is pushing up against the limits of what Information Technology can handle in terms of volume and we need to rethink how to handle this. ***A motion to reconvene the Teaching Evaluation Committee to solicit comments from faculty and DSAC on the instrument and develop appropriate revisions, procedures for its administration and guidance in the use of its results*** After discussion ensued, the question was called and all were in favor.

**B) Motion to review the salary process used by SORC and by the Dean**

Dr. Lynn Koplitz asked that this item be placed on the agenda for discussion. Dr. Mark Fernandez said the ad hoc recommendation to look at the salary system that the College adopted is more than a SORC response and report. He hopes that we can develop a better mechanism and maybe reconvene the committee. Due to the length of discussion about teaching evaluations forms, the motion was deferred.

**C) Motion on New Strategic Planning Committee**

*The College of Arts and Sciences will create a new strategic planning committee charged with the task of reviewing and revising the A&S Strategic Plan and aligning it with the University Strategic Agenda. The Committee shall be composed of six representative (2 from each of the College's three divisions) elected by the faculty and six representatives (2 from each of the College's three divisions) appointed by the College Planning Team based on expertise.*

Dr. Blue questioned why an election is not held for all of its members. Dean Scully answered so that some faculty can be appointed based on expertise. Dr. Blue asked for a friendly amendment to state that “based on expertise” be mentioned in the motion; the Dean accepted. The Dean said that the creation of this committee is to make sure that our goals are in compliance with the university goals in order to get funding. It also states what the College feels is most important. Dr. Blue said it is unusual that there is an even number in a committee because you can come up with a tie, whereas with an uneven number you can't. A suggestion was made that maybe we can appoint one representative from the divisions instead of two. The Dean asked for suspension of this debate and asked that it remain on the table.

**D) Motion on Recognition of Contractual Right of the Faculty to Participation in Shared Governance**

*The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences requests recognition of the contractual right of the faculty to participation in shared governance by allowing us to determine the procedure for selecting our representatives at any level where faculty responsibility is present.*

A copy of the motion was distributed. Dr. Mary Blue addressed the Assembly and said that the *Faculty Handbook* and the *AAUP* both state very clearly that, “Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.” The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. Dr. Kate Adams says that she respects what Dr. Blue is doing. She believes, for example, the committee to review the Common Curriculum is one of the most important on campus and feels that a majority of people from Arts and Sciences should be represented on this committee, particularly those who teach in the Common Curriculum. The question was called but the Dean does not believe that we can vote at this time. A motion to suspend the rules and vote on this immediately was approved; one faculty was against the motion. The Dean said that what concerns him is that the rest of the faculty are not privy to this conversation. He also warned that this motion has a lot of power and it needs to be done with some good thinking and all of the faculty need to hear this conversation, which is extremely important.

The Dean said that this motion will stay on the table and if the faculty believes it needs to have a special meeting, notify him within the next two weeks.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.