1. Approval of Agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Eileen Raymond, seconded by Rick Bates. Motion carried.

2. Approval of Minutes – 2/4/04

A motion to approve the minutes as written was made by Eileen Raymond, seconded by Peter Brouwer. Motion carried.

3. Report from School Moderator

Linda Seramur reported the dean has been working with Leadership Council on the campus draft revisioning document. All faculty should have received this document; it is also available on the web. The Visioning Committee has requested feedback; she suggested this could be taken up as a department item and recommendations be forwarded to the dean.

Lynn Hall asked faculty to please mark their calendars for Saturday, April 24, 8-11 p.m. A fundraiser has been scheduled to honor Tom O’Shaughnessy and will include a band, food, and dancing. Anyone interested in helping should contact Lynn Hall, Linda Seramur, Anjali, Misra, Rick Bates or the dean.

Linda announced the School of Education Alumni Advisory Board will hold their Spring Tea on Friday, April 23 at 3 p.m. Both the fundraiser and tea will be held in the Literacy Center. The College Foundation Board will also meet on this weekend.

4. Reports from Standing Committees

   Academic Affairs – no report available

   Scholarship – Edd Schneider reported their next meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 23.

5. Report from the Dean.

The dean reported Visioning Refocusing document feedback may be sent to him and he will bring it to the committee.

6. Old Business

   Personnel Committee—Motion to Approve SOE/PS Personnel Policies
Linda Seramur stated under Roberts Rules of Order, voting procedures for the document needed to be determined. She noted it could be voted on by a written campus ballot as some faculty were unable to attend the meeting. Faculty not there would not have an opportunity to see any amendments that come forth at the meeting. There is a provision to conduct voting in it that way on important documents. The vote will require a simply majority only..

Eileen Raymond made a motion to make amendments by vote at this meeting to be followed by a campus mail ballot, seconded by Tim Schwob. Motion carried.

Kathy Valentine asked if there was a timeline as to when they needed to get this done.

Peter Brouwer stated there was not a firm deadline, however, noted a number of personnel actions were coming up and it would be helpful to be clear under which policies people are operating. It would make the process cleaner.

Linda Seramur stated the committee was hoping to have the document completed today in this meeting and ready to go for a mail ballot.

Eileen Raymond called the question. Linda referred to the draft document 2/11/04. She stated the Committee took feedback from open discussion of the last meeting and made revisions as the consensus lead them to believe. Linda stated when the committee brings forth a document, a second is not required. She encouraged faculty to be very focused and noted Peter Brouwer would help answer questions; Tony Betrus would put amendments directly into the document. She did not feel it was necessary to re-talk each page. Eileen Raymond suggested we go page by page.

Peter Brouwer noted it would be necessary to change by-laws if anything were changed on page 1.

Eileen Raymond noted in the Evidence Section, confidentiality seems to be a huge issue. Eileen made an amendment to delete the word “and” before “in accordance with the SOE/PS Personnel Policies….” and“At all times…” insert “in a confidential manner.” A motion was made by Eileen, seconded by Ron Bretsch. Motion carried.

A question was raised if this includes confidential behavior; it was suggested this be further emphasized as people seem to be very concerned about this.

Eileen stated parties that are involved in the process would have to know; it seems to say those parties are going to be behaving in a confidential manner.

Peter Brouwer felt the wording was all right and applied to the people involved.

Tim Schwob stated the document says by September 15 of who is coming up for review. It becomes public anyway.
Peter Brouwer noted some people feel personnel actions should not be public.

Eileen Raymond stated all personnel actions are not for tenure and some are for leaves.

Fred Biengho believes clarity is important. Believes we are dealing two issues.

Kathy Valentine suggested defining the reviewing process. Peter believes it is speaking to the people involved in the process. Public knowledge is another issue.

Kathy Valentine stated as long as confidentiality is in there she believes they are covered.

Linda Seramur asked for a motion to add “in a confidential manner.” Motion carried.

Tim Schwob made a motion it should read “personnel actions” instead of reappointment process.

Bob Vadas suggested removing the work “the.”

Eileen Raymnd asked for clarification of page 6 (formatting error).

Items 2& 3 Master of Subject Material and Scholarly Activity were left together as one item. The Personnel Committee felt this was all right.

Tim Schwob noted a concern about the format. Is the Dean comfortable with this format. Linda stated the Dean has no indicated anything otherwise. There is so much overlap in these categories.

Under university service, Eileen stated service to the school is not on the list. A motion was made by Ron Bretsch to insert “The School of Education & Professional Studies including accreditation preparation”, seconded by Peter Brouwer. Motion carried.

Under Professional Staff section, Eileen made a motion all people do not report to a department chair. Add “ or Dean as appropriate.” There was no second to this motion.

It was noted Mike Sovay, Lucille Waterson, and Becky Duprey will come under the personnel action. A concern was expressed if the situation could be different in the future.

Eileen Raymond removed her motion.

A motion to extend the meeting to 1 p.m. was made by Rick Bates, seconded by Mike Sovay. Motion carried.

Under the department personnel section, Tim stated a concern what would constitute a formal recommendation. It was determined this was an editing issue.
Under the Dean’s section, Eileen Raymond stated she has talked with Arts & Sciences people. Though about how they have been planning to do electronically.

Eileen Raymond made a motion to modify by saying the Dean will be evaluated….by the faculty for the purpose of assisting the Dean and identify goals of the school and which will facilitate the aggregation…” Eileen made a motion, seconded by Ron, for purpose of discussion.

Make change is to focus on the purpose of this evaluation. For him and his supervisor could develop a plan for professional development.

Eileen Raymond stated the idea that faculty need to be involved in the process other than suggestions seems inappropriate. The need to share anything back with the faculty seems counterproductive, This would allow the SOE/PS to enter into the beginning of the process. Linda seramur stated the committee discussed this at their last meeting. Peter Brouwer stated Arts & Science does make it public in summary form. Not the actual responses. Faculty should have a right to know in summary form. The President is going through a wide scale evaluation. There will be open meetings. This is being take up by Faculty Senate.

Tim Schwob stated Faculty senate has an ad hoc committee to look at the process for evaluation deans. Tim is chair, Peter Brouwer, David curry and Rebecca Reames are on the committee. Will make a recommendation to the Provost for evaluating deans.

Eileen Raymond noted with A &S, it is a select group of faculty. There are three people that aggregate the quantitative data. The qualitative data is not shared.

It was noted the question could be divided.

Peter Brouwer stated a concern it assumed the tools used to collect the data. Better to have human beings going through the data. Concern of removing the committee from the analysis.

Tim Schwob made a motion to split the question.

The problem is near the end. The complete file of aggregated ata goes to both the Dean and the Provost for their consideration.

A motion to remove this data. A motion was made by Tim Schwob to remove this, seconded by Bob Vadas. Motion to split the question. Motion carried.

Tim removed his motion.

A motion to extend the meeting for 5 minutes was made by Kathy Valentine, seconded by Mike Sovay. Motion carried.
A motion was made by Tim Schwob, seconded by Kathy Valentine to approve “for the purpose of assisting the Dean.” Motion carried.

“And with the Dean” motion made by Kathy Valentine, seconded by Lynn Hall. Motion carried.

“And which will facilitate the aggregation of…” Motion made by Eileen Raymond, seconded by Kathy Valentine. Motion carried.

“The complete file of aggregated data to both the Dean and the Provost for their consideration.”

“Once the completed instruments have been collected, the Personnel Committee will analyze…” Tim made a motion it be kept.

Bob Vadas asked what the committee’s thought were on this. Initial details involved the Personnel Committee.

Linda stated the committee felt it was important to have a committee to take this data and summarize and aggregate.

Eileen Raymond noted a concern what do they mean by summarize data. This means different things on this campus, quantitative and qualitative.

Peter Brouwer stated summary meant descriptive statistics. Qualitative data would have summary but not actual written responses. Kathy Valentine asked if qualitative comments could be summarized into a list.

Bob Vadas had a concern about summarizing data. Could it say Personnel Committee will organize and document data.

A motion to extend the meeting for 5 minutes was made by Don Straight, seconded by Bob Vadas. Motion carried.

Lynn Hall made a motion to the amendment, seconded by Rick Bates. To strike responses and add the word data. Motion carried.

Voting as means to analyze and summarize the data. Keep as strike. Vote taken. 1 – Yes 16- No Will keep it.

“This summary, along with the raw data will be forwarded to both the Dean and the Provost for their consideration.” Eileen Raymond withdrew her motion.

Tim Schwob stated “The data summary will also (not?) be shared with the faculty of the school.”
Linda Seramur stated there were four options: 1) share nothing with the faculty 2) share summary with faculty 3) share data and summary with faculty 4) faculty get only raw data.

Tim Schwob made a motion that we share with faculty, seconded by Bob Vadas. Motion carried.

Eileen Raymond said faculty need to consider what we do ourselves with course evaluations. They are not encouraged to share results with those outside of the Personnel Committee. The data was unhelpful. We have experience from another school that suggestions this data was not helpful. It was hurtful.

Bob Vadas stated should be about the SOE/PS not the A&S school. Should be privvy to this information.

A motion to extend the meeting 5 minutes was made by Bob Vadas, seconded by Don Straight. Motion carried.

Fred Bigenho stated the data should be shared with faculty. The dean is someone who is looking after the faculty. Should have an idea of how he is doing.

Rick Bates stated with due respect to Eileen’s motion, there is a clear separation of academic and administrative evaluations.

Lucille Watertson asked what is the purpose of sharing this information. What purpose does it serve.

Peter Brouwer said it is his opinion the dean serves both the administration and the faculty. There is no accountability to the faculty. He believes it should be shared in respectful and professional manner.

Sergei Abramovich stated there seems to be an assumption the data summary will be negative; it may be positive.

Linda Seramur asked to call the question. Motion by Lucille Waterson, seconded by Kathy Valentine. Motion carried.

A motion was made that something will be shared with the faculty. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Rick Bates that summary will be shared, seconded by Kathy Valentine. Motion carried.

Fred Bigenho asked how would the data be different. Peter Brouwer responded the summary would not include the individual responses. Would include summary of qualitative responses not individual.
A motion that summary will be shared by faculty in school. Motion carried (1 – no).

Amending Process

Eileen Raymond made a motion to insert “at least seven days before the duly called meeting…,” seconded by Tim Schwob. Motion carried.

A motion to extend the meeting by 4 minutes was made by Lynn Hall, seconded by Mike Sovay. Motion carried.

Don Straight noted by-laws should be policies.

Linda Seramur stated we will not vote on this today. This document will be sent to all voting faculty through campus mail. Will receive in the mail a hard copy ballot. Will check by-laws for turn around time.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Kathy Valentine, seconded by Lynn Hall. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 1:20.