Notes

1. Chapter Pres. T. Keene called meeting to order at 4:30 and called for introductions. Attending: Bill Baker, Debra Coffey, Tom Dolays, Mel Fein, Dot Graham, Tim Hedeen, George Hess, Carol Holbert, Amy Houston, Jackie Jones, Tom Keene, Karen Kuhel, Thierry Leger, Kathy Lishman, Nina Morgan, Meg Murray, Barbara Neuby, David Parker, Robert Paul, Carole Pierannunzi, Tom Pynn, Sarah Robbins, Susan Rouse, Alice Snyder, Rich Vengroff, Chris Ziegler, Ulf Zimmermann

2. T. Keene asked to hear about departmental/college progress on the creation of DFCs and CFCs—coming along well, with exceptions.

3. S. Robbins, from the President’s office, reported that the fundraising campaign was well under way (3rd year of a 4-year effort); crisis prevention (in wake of VA Tech) projects also moving along; the PBAC will begin to meet for next year’s budget & planning.

4. L. Lands reported on the 360-review of deans; other levels have not been reviewed, though evidently mandated by the BOR. S. Robbins observed that since faculty members are reviewed every year, why couldn’t there be more frequent reviews for administrators as well.

5. R. Vengroff noted that we’re doing that in HSS. The big issue is the fixed terms, whether renewable or not. Without these, reviews are less useful.

6. Re the three deans’ review: According to T. Keene, not only were the reviews pretty much mere formalities but the three deans actually received identical letters. One reason that the faculty received no further details as to these performance reviews was that the way the survey was conducted allowed anyone with access to the survey to comment on any of the three deans, whether in that dean’s college or not. From the deans’ perspectives that “invalidated” the survey results. C. Pierannunzi, who was responsible for the survey, commented that she saw no indication that deans were evaluated by those outside their colleges.

7. R. Paul noted that he had written and sent the memo voted on in the Faculty Senate regarding explanations of these review procedures to Provost Black.

8. C. Ziegler reported on efforts to adjust the Provost’s across-the-board requirement for service of “national significance” to the realities of the different disciplines, e.g., for faculty in education for whom the state level is the most significant (and such of us who specialize, for example, in local government affairs).
Respectfully submitted,
Ulf Zimmermann, Secretary