Academic Assembly
October 9, 2017
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: Pat Buchsel, Felipe Castillo, Mark Cohan, Marc Cohen, Brooke Coleman, Miles Coleman, Carlos de Mello e Souza, Allison Gibbons, Arie Greenleaf, Leticia Guardiola-Saenz, Kathleen La Voy, Chuck Lawrence, Emily Lieb, Jessica Martinez, Agnieszka Miguel, Michael Ng, Katie Oliveras, Erik Olsen, Tracey Pepper, Frank Shih, Gregory Silverman, Julianne Slate, Colette Taylor, Kirsten Thompson, Danuta Wojnar

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I.   Review 10-2-17 Minutes
   A.   Approved with no oppositions and one abstention
II.   Updates on Administrator Assessment Project (*Julie Staggs and Deborah Brown from Korn Ferry Hay Group*)
   A.   Pilot Process
      1.   Background
         a.   Put together evaluation process in spring 2017, looking at how deans do their role
         b.   Examine the mindsets, attitudes, behaviors that drive their work in leadership roles, including technical expertise and academic goals
         c.   Decision to use written assessment administered to constituents in school/college of three deans being evaluated, with a focus on styles, climates, competencies
      2.   Campus process, in progress
         a.   Interview five to eight key people around the dean, as well as the dean and the provost
         b.   Bring all data together, produce a report, hold a feedback session with each dean and the provost to talk about what the dean heard from this process (what is going well, what areas need to be addressed)
         c.   Each dean is holding a faculty forum within their school/college to share what they heard and their plans to move forward
      3.   Next steps
         a.   Seek comment from survey participants and deans themselves about both process and timing as we move forward out of the pilot stage
         b.   Continue to refine process for the next three deans
         c.   Would like to move this to the Cabinet level as well, Cabinet is open to the process
   B.   AcA Discussion
      1.   Students were not included in the open forum within the school/college
      2.   The speed of the process was too rushed – will take more time in the upcoming process as it is refined
      3.   Tension around the language used in the process
         a.   Suggestion to provide upfront understanding of the words used
         b.   Focus on action-based language, actionable outcomes
         c.   Need definition of leadership styles are under this model
         d.   Focus on developmental, what is expected of a dean in the way they do their job?
      4.   How is information is shared back across the institution is a major consideration
         a.   Must be useful and appropriate for all parts of the campus

b. Report to provost, forum with school/college, up to each dean to share how much of the report is shared back to campus – shared in concentric circles, as appropriate

c. Difficult for AcA to focus on details because the instrument and development have not been shared

d. White paper and library of competencies (questions) can be shared with AcA

e. The reports themselves will not be shared with AcA

5. SU committee (including deans) chose specific questions from library available

a. Committee consisted of three faculty members, two deans, HR – are the areas important to faculty actually covered by the questions and instrument chosen

b. Faculty should be involved in the development of the instrument for deans in a self-guided academic institution

6. Questions did not take into account the different kinds of relationships within the college (for example, a chair to a dean, a faculty member to a dean)

a. Styles and climate were asked of direct reports, staff, chairs

b. Competencies questions were sent to every member of college

c. Response rates varied from 25-42 percent between colleges

d. Language is not higher ed specific, different focus on how the role is performed

e. Tried to remove language that may not apply as well to higher ed as to business, etc.

f. The questions and people surveyed were decided by the AcA subcommittee and the Office of the Provost

7. Issues with the instrument and process

a. Core Director was not questioned as part of the evaluation of CAS dean, incomplete at best

b. Every college is set up differently, nuance needs to be considered (for example, all faculty in COE report directly to dean)

c. Comment blurb may be much less likely to be filled in by people who are a direct report, but this is where you will get your best data - gives a very difficult choice to people

d. Response rate of 25-42 percent is shockingly low given the tenor on campus

e. Found the items to be obtuse and disconnected from experiences with the dean

f. Language seems jargon-y

g. Would have been helpful to invite faculty from the school/college being evaluated to help formulate the instrument from the beginning of the process

h. Needs to be better tailored to the higher education environment, felt very generic and could have been corporate or military

i. Delivery of survey did not give faculty a framework or context to know what they were answering

j. Need to determine response rate between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty

k. There is information in the response rate, but it is not certain – people could choose not to respond out of anger, people could respond en masse out of anger, etc.

l. Negotiation between dean and provost about who would be included in evaluation – this seems like cherry-picking only those who would give good feedback

8. Response to issues

a. Difficult for the person being evaluated if all of the feedback is qualitative – this instrument is based on research that can give actionable items for deans to work on

b. Part of the dean role is to be strategic in response to what is happening regionally, nationally, globally, balanced with the individual and group relationships

        c. Instrument is proprietary to the company, can be customized somewhat, is a financial consideration

        d. Perhaps collect granular data and then anonymize and lump together if needed

    9. Next steps

        a. Perhaps for these three schools, move them up to sooner than three years for the next review

        b. This contract went through gathering the data and the feedback process, once action items are in place, then the dean and Provost will put an accountability plan in place

        c. Each of the three deans have specific items and a plan in place

III. Vote on Motions

    A. MRC Migration to CAS

        1. Amendment proposed: "We support the incorporation of MRC into CAS with the understanding that tenure track positions will be created for MRC faculty in a manner and at a level consistent with current policies and practices within CAS."

        2. Call for executive session

            a. Approved with four oppositions

IV. Notes from Executive Session (*taken by Frank Shih*)

    A. MRC Migration Motion

        1. Tabled until next meeting

    B. Interdisciplinary Ethics Minor program proposal

        1. Approved with no oppositions or abstentions

    C. Committee Appointments

        1. University Rank and Tenure Committee

            a. Michael Trice nominated

            b. AcA members urged to review CV/bio on AcA Canvas Site

    D. Preview for Discussion with Chief Information Officer, October 16

        1. AcA members urged to ask constituents on issues they have