

# Executive Committee

## Meeting Minutes\*

### November 21, 2006

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

The meeting was called to order at 4:00pm in Hoke 301 by DeAnna Timmermann, Assembly Chairman.

DeAnna Timmermann mentioned that the meeting minutes from October 31, 2006 and the meeting minutes from the Special Executive Committee Meeting on November 14, 2006 were not ready for approval due to the Assembly Secretary being ill. The minutes will be passed along for approval upon completion.

#### ❖ **New Business:**

1. **None Proposed**

#### ❖ **Old Business:**

1. **Triennial Review Process:** Clarification – Chuck Bleak

- DeAnna stated that Chuck Bleak wished to clarify some aspects of the Triennial Review. Chuck presented a timeline which was a restatement of the one that was in policy. The timeline comes directly out of the policy and lays out how the process will flow from month to month. However, his timeline starts the process in November rather than January. Chuck asked about policy section 4, which says that human resources will start the review process, but the timeline indicates the Executive Committee does that as well. DeAnna clarified the process by stating the Executive Committee contacted HR at the beginning of fall quarter to ask for a list of whom would be reviewed in the coming academic year, Carol Kroll then sent out a memo to those being reviewed and their supervisors in October. DeAnna thought there might be an issue with whom would be getting the surveys, but Chuck said the only issue was with who decided who got the surveys. Chuck thought it was pretty clear in the policy that whoever was being reviewed would pick those people. DeAnna thought all people who worked under that individual would be allowed to complete the survey and the supervisor had the option to add others to that policy. Someone mentioned their interpretation was that only people under the supervisor could be asked to complete the survey but others could be asked for information. This becomes an interesting component due to the many layers. It was interpreted that the reviewee and the supervisor would work it out and agree upon the list. The discussion went on to how many people would be a good number to evaluate a person. Chuck interpreted it as 6; Carol thought this was too many and perhaps micro managing. The policy does state that the supervisor has the option to add additional people so there is a little flexibility. The reviewee submits his or her list of people that will be evaluating them to the supervisor as well as to Chuck. Chuck clarified that he is the person that sends out the surveys and that is why he receives the list. The general survey goes out to however many direct reports there are; the 6 receive a more in depth evaluative process. People still disagreed with having the number of people providing the in-depth evaluation be six. Anna Maria explained that she likes this type of process and Student Affairs currently uses a similar version where one might be evaluated by staff, colleagues and students etc. She feels that these reviews are very constructive and active. Chuck clarified that the triennial review happens in addition to the annual review. A question was asked about Human Resources participation. Human Resources just keeps the record of what happens. There was more discussion on the number of people being asked to evaluate. It was agreed that there should be no set number; names will be provided and agreed upon by the supervisor and reviewee.

2. **Handbook Changes: The Process**

- DeAnna Timmermann stated that she had sent out a document that was the EOU Faculty/Staff Handbook updates document created by Kris Olson, Lara Moore and Sara Witte. Provost responsibility areas were identified as well as individuals that actually have the hands on responsibility for each section. DeAnna and Sarah Witte would like to see Executive Committee contact other committees that have been identified and ask those individuals to update their section of the Handbook and then bring forward those changes as necessary. Parts of the Handbook are very out of date, but updating it may be a difficult process because there may be policy changes made by committees that have not been brought forward to Assembly. DeAnna would prefer to ask committees to send a copy of the original document as it stands now and a copy of the changes being made to the Executive Committee. If these are just cosmetic changes, they can be brought forward to Assembly as an information item. If changes are more than just cosmetic, then they would need to be brought before Assembly. It was mentioned that it seems Executive Committee has taken on the role of

dealing with the Handbook and it is not our charge. Someone else agreed and stated he believed it was the administration's role. It was added that the Executive Committee has never dealt with the Handbook prior to this year. DeAnna's concern is about information that may be placed in the Handbook as new policy without discussion, and she believes policy discussion needs to happen at Assembly. More discussion followed. John stated that not everybody is in agreement but that is what they are working towards. He thinks it is good this issue came to Executive Committee but there are going to be some differences of opinion. There are some things that get to the Provost from the Colleges without ever getting to Assembly or that have been negotiated sitting down with the Union that also don't go through Assembly. It was pointed out that policy in the contract has been mutually ratified, but if a policy is not in the contract then it should be ratified by all constituency groups rather than just one group or the other. Discussion continued. DeAnna wondered, "If we don't take it on, then who does?" It was said that the Executive Committee should do the things in its job description and not take on additional tasks. Taking this charge would bring up additional responsibilities, such as following through with updating policy changes approved by the Assembly. The Executive Committee job description was read and commented on. The Provost added that to have a successful Handbook, someone needs to collaborate and work with people, listen to them, get input and decide who has the final word. How to proceed? Do we take this on or send it back to Lara and Kris and have them contact people on their own? It was suggested that "somebody" go back through the minutes and any changes that came to Assembly need to be immediately addressed. It was mentioned that this used to be done regularly via the Provost's office and maybe it should go back to Kris Olson. The Provost mentioned that we don't exactly have an "approval" process so it is not clear who at the University can tell you the answers to these questions but it is being worked on. It was brought up that the first thing needed to be done is how to change the Handbook and then proceed as to whom is responsible and initiates the process. Ted suggested that the Faculty/Staff Handbook be addressed at a different time when we have more information and more input as to whose responsibility it is and if the Executive Committee has any charge in this area. DeAnna would like to solve this problem. Rebecca suggested a committee be formed to bring these issues to the table. DeAnna was under the impression that through accreditation, this was to be fixed by March 15<sup>th</sup>. Provost Miller said that he would be meeting with the Deans as to how the process will be started. Possibly by next Executive Committee they will be ready to present their case. More discussion followed. The issue was tabled until January.

❖ **Review Draft Campus Assembly Agenda**

DeAnna Timmermann asked all committee members to review the agenda for assembly and if they have any concerns or questions to please email those items to her. She stated that EPCC would be adding several items but she did not know what those were at this point. An Institutional Faculty Senate representative will need to be elected since Steve Tanner's term is up. The Quorum Amendment will be an action item and will be voted on after this upcoming Assembly. ASEOU requested a 5 minute access to respond to Jeff Johnson's statements from the last Assembly. In addition, PCSW will be making a report and the Provost needs additional time to talk about the Strategic Plan.

❖ **For the Good of the Order:**

None

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jana Parmele  
Assembly Secretary

\*The minutes were prepared via dictation only therefore there might have been some information that could not be heard clearly therefore not included. Jana Parmele, Assembly Secretary will keep the tape from this meeting should anyone need to access it.