

# Executive Committee Special Meeting

## Meeting Minutes

### January 11, 2007

**Present:** Khosrow Fatemi, DeAnna Timmermann, Rebecca Hartman, Anna Maria Dill, Jana Parmele, Ted Atkinson, Carol Lauritzen, Tuen Fetz, Mary Koza, Kathryn Shorts, Rebecca Cross, Shakira Bandolin. **Absent:** Gerry Ramey, Charles Martin

The meeting was called to order at 2:05pm in Ackerman, Alumni Room by DeAnna Timmermann, Assembly Chairman.

#### ❖ **Triennial Review – President Fatemi:**

1. President Fatemi mentioned that a few months ago Assembly passed a revised version of the Triennial Review. He asked for comments on the following two issues: 1. The issue of confidentiality; by OAR the evaluations must be signed, and 2. The policy refers to “unit” and does not define unit membership. This leaves the policy vague and open for interpretation. The policy states a questionnaire will be sent to each unit reporting to the reviewee, but it does not limit the distribution of the questionnaires.

##### *Discussion on Distribution of Questionnaires: Recipients*

President Fatemi asked the Executive Committee, in terms of only the people he is evaluating: “Whether I should limit the questioners to [units] or whether I should expand the questionnaire recipients, the number, and include others”. It was mentioned that all members of units should have a chance to complete the questionnaires, and others as well, as appropriate to the position under review,. The Registrar was used as an example because, if only direct reports filled out the questionnaire, then only one would be completed. By getting additional input a more complete evaluation would be created. It was stated that the legal interpretation of the policy (one questionnaire per unit reporting) doesn’t reflect the intent of the policy, which was to have a broad list of reviewees. It was brought up that there could be legal issues if someone wanted to challenge the “one per unit”, if this is changed after the fact. Other concerns regarding the lack of anonymity of the questionnaires, such as people in subordinate positions not submitting an accurate questionnaire, were voiced. This however cannot be addressed in the policy because of the OAR against anonymity of reviews used in evaluations.

##### *Discussion on Distribution of Questionnaires: Procedures*

Discussion about how and who would be compiling the questionnaire information occurred. It was mentioned that the questionnaires could be distributed electronically and compiled by institutional research. Other suggestions were made to have the numeric part be a scantron or possibly have the questionnaire put on Webster. Some disagreed with this option since not everyone is on Webster. A suggestion was made that only Assembly members be able to receive questioners, some disagreed due to limited number of classified staff. A suggestion was made to use a stratified random sampling for distribution of the questionnaires and a discussion followed.

**Advisory Summary:** Executive Committee unanimously supports a broader distribution of questionnaires, rather than distribution to just direct reports. Committee members agree teaching faculty, administrative faculty, classified staff and students should have all input as appropriate to the position being reviewed. However, no agreement was made as how to enact the broad distribution of questionnaires. The policy should be re-written for clarification and go back to Assembly

#### ❖ **PCSW Letter – Request for Clarification and Request for Investigation**

1. A letter to the Executive Committee from the members of the President’s Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) was shared with members. While the Executive Committee will not have a regular meeting until February 1, 2007, it was felt that the issues brought up in the letter were important and should be reviewed at the present meeting. The letter asked the Executive Committee to address two issues. The first issue was to seek clarification of the use of the Assembly 5-minute access period. The second issue was to request an investigation by the Executive Committee into circumstances surrounding a recent Assembly Grievance Committee hearing. A discussion incurred regarding whether or not Executive Committee oversees the actions of the Grievance Committee.  
**ACTION:** It was decided that the 5-minute access would be clarified during the February 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. However, investigating Grievance Committee procedures are not in the charge of the Executive Committee. This is particularly true in this case, as the grievance is still in process at the Provost level. A letter will be sent to PCSW acknowledging the receipt of their letter and explaining that investigating other Assembly committee’s procedures does not fall under the Executive Committee’s charge as set by the Constitution.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jana Parmele  
Assembly Secretary