

Jan 31 2017

Present: Janis, Leo, Michele

Notes from the meeting discussion:

Previous ad hoc committee had questioned the purpose of the survey, and we would like clarity on purpose and use of information.

The AFT and Ad Hoc committee expressed a number of concerns about validity of the survey, and we agree that it is most prudent to redesign the survey. The problems are referenced below in the recommendations to redesign the survey.

Considered potential value of gathering qualitative information about purpose of survey and how information will be used.

AAC Recommendations:

1) Redesign the survey based on AFT and Ad Hoc committee recommendations.

- Ask Senate the purpose of the survey
- Reduce the number of survey questions
 - President now has 48 questions, we recommend to reduce by half
 - Reduce the number of questions for other administrators/deans as well
 - If we can access raw data from prior surveys, use data reduction techniques to identify optimal items
- Redesign rating scale options in accordance with recommendations from AFT and Ad Hoc committee
 - Improve range, for instance “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” with neutral midpoint
 - Add “Don’t Know” option
- Develop new questions based on job descriptions
- Improve item content regarding faculty-administrator interactions. Specifically, items regarding administrator-faculty communications/interactions, should be specific to the respondents’ direct interactions and not based on their general perspective of interactions between administrator and faculty as a whole
 - Examples: “responsiveness to faculty concerns;” “representing the concerns of the faculty to the President, Provost, and other University officials”
- Compare newly redesigned questions to old/current questions
- AFT recommendation to reword prompt for open-ended comment, eliminating word “constructive”

2) Administrator Assessment Schedule

- Decision: Follow Ad Hoc committee recommendation for who should be evaluated OR follow old plan, which does not align with Ad Hoc committee recommendation
 - Administrators to be assessed based on current plan:

- VP enrollment management, VP Student development, Dean Business, Dean Library
- Administrators to be assessed based on Ad Hoc committee recommendations:
 - FIRST Provost, President, Deans THEN VPs

3) Council composition and capacity to manage workload.

- Charges of the AAC are not aligned to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc committee.
 - Ad Hoc committee recommended two committees: one to administer survey, one to prepare reports to minimize bias
- Not sufficient number on current council (7 recommended)
- Late formation of current council (Dec 2016)
- Not all colleges represented: Current representatives are Business (Solomon), Humanities and Social Sciences (Michele), Education (Janis), Science and Health (Leo)

Prepared by: Michele Cascardi, PhD