The fourth regular meeting of the 1995/1996 Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, 5 December 1995, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

7 November 1995

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call
B. Announcements
C. Richard Eakin, Chancellor
D. Tinsley Yarbrough, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
E. James Hallock, Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences

IV. Unfinished Business

V. Report of Committees

A. Agenda Committee, Michael Carrafiello
   Proposed 1996-97 Agenda Committee and Faculty Senate Meeting Dates (attachment 1).
B. Credits Committee, Bob Woodside
   Revision to Undergraduate Catalog, reference to Credit (attachment 2).
C. University Curriculum Committee, Jim Smith
   Undergraduate curriculum matters contained in the meeting minutes of 9 November 1995. (Copies of the minutes have been distributed to Faculty Senators and Alternates. Others may request copies from the Faculty Senate office at ext. 6537.)
D. Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Evaluations, Jeff Johnson
   Proposed Administrator Evaluation Forms (attachment 3).

VI. New Business

Attachment 1.

AGENDA COMMITTEE REPORT
1996-1997 AGENDA COMMITTEE AND FACULTY SENATE MEETING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 1996</th>
<th>Spring 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 21  Classes Begin</td>
<td>January 13  Classes Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2  State Holiday</td>
<td>January 20  State Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10-13  Fall Break</td>
<td>March 9-16  Spring Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11-15  Early Registration</td>
<td>March 28  State Holiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 27-30 Thanksgiving Break       March 31-April 4 Early Registration
December 7     Classes End              April 29     Classes End
December 9-14  Exams                    April 30     Reading Day
May 1-8       Exams

Agenda will meet:
August 27, 1996
October 1, 1996
October 29, 1996
November 19, 1996
January 7, 1997
February 4, 1997
March 4, 1997
April 8, 1997

Faculty Senate will meet:
September 10, 1996
October 15, 1996
November 5, 1996
December 3, 1996
January 21, 1997
February 18, 1997
March 18, 1997
April 22, 1997
April 29, 1997
(Organizational Meeting)

Attachment 2.

CREDITS COMMITTEE REPORT

REVISION TO UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG, REFERENCE TO CREDIT
Revise the Undergraduate Catalog, Section 5: Academic Regulations, subsection Credits (page 46) by adding the following as a second paragraph:

"Courses offered in nontraditional formats, e.g., concentrated or abbreviated time periods, must be designed to ensure an opportunity for preparation, reflection, and analysis concerning the subject matter. At least one calendar week of reflection and analysis should be provided to students for each semester hour of undergraduate credit awarded."

Attachment 3.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATIONS REPORT

PROPOSED ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORMS

Work Summary:
The ad hoc committee on administrator evaluation was appointed in Spring of 1992 with the charge of recommending new instruments and methods for soliciting faculty opinion about the performance of administrators -- chairs, deans, the vice chancellors for academic affairs and health sciences, and the chancellor. Following a survey of the literature on administrator evaluation, the committee concluded that separate forms were needed for each level of administrator rather than one general form for all administrators (as was the previous practice at ECU). This committee piloted the DECAD form for the evaluation of chairs and sought the comments and suggestions of deans, department chairs, and faculty about the appropriateness of the form. Based on the results of the pilot administration, the committee recommended ECU adopt this form, and the Faculty Senate and Chancellor accepted the recommendation in March 1994. This form is now in regular use for surveying faculty opinion about the performance of department chairs.
With respect to faculty evaluation of deans, the committee conducted interviews with selected deans about the areas of job performance they believed most important and this information, along with information from the available literature, served as a basis for developing survey items. The committee also developed separate survey forms for the vice chancellors and chancellor and invited comment from these administrators about the relevance of proposed items to their job responsibilities. These three evaluation forms were piloted in December 1994 and subsequently revised based on the findings of the pilot survey. The committee reported to the Faculty Senate in January 1995 with a recommendation that these forms be adopted for annually surveying faculty opinion about the performance of administrators. The Senate referred the forms back to the committee for further review. The committee has reviewed the items on each form in light of data from the pilot administration and identified the items in terms of importance as determined by both administrators and faculty. The attached recommended survey forms represent substantially shorter versions than those presented to the Senate last spring. In the judgment of the committee, these surveys cannot be shortened further and remain meaningful. These evaluation forms meet the concerns of Senators as expressed in Spring 1995 and are in keeping with the original charge of the committee.

The committee recommends to the Faculty Senate and university administration the adoption of the attached questionnaires for soliciting faculty opinion about the performance of deans, vice chancellors, and the chancellor.

Recommended Procedures For Administering These Forms and Interpreting Results:

1. The administrators to be included in these surveys are deans of instructional units, the vice chancellors for academic affairs and health sciences, and the chancellor. Solicitation of faculty perceptions about the performance of other administrators, if desired, will require different forms tailored to the responsibilities of the administrators.
2. Each administrator to be surveyed should be in at least his/her second semester of employment in the position. It is recommended that faculty opinion of administrators' performance be solicited each spring.
3. The faculty to be surveyed are those who hold full-time appointments at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructors, and lecturers who have been employed at ECU for at least one semester.
4. Responses will be analyzed and reported by frequency of contact with the administrator and the respondent's position (faculty rank or faculty/administrator status).
5. The administrators to be evaluated will rate the importance of the job performance items reflected in the survey for comparison to faculty ratings of importance.
6. The analysis and report will parallel the DECAD format, including analyses of the following: faculty ratings of importance faculty ratings of performance weighted by faculty importance ratings performance weighted by administrator importance ratings agreement among faculty on importance (intraclass correlation) administrator/faculty agreement on importance
7. Training on the interpretation of results is recommended for all administrators who supervise deans and vice chancellors (just as training was recommended for deans on their interpretation of the DECAD).
The Following Assumptions Guided The Work on Developing These Forms and Procedures:

1. As with the evaluations of faculty teaching and department chair performance, results from these surveys are assumed to be only one part of a broader evaluation process for administrators. The goal is to provide faculty perceptions which can inform the evaluation of administrators.

2. The forms necessarily focus on key performance factors as identified by both administrators and faculty rather than an exhaustive list of duties in order to keep the forms relatively brief and thus increase the likelihood of response.

3. The committee specifically recommends that there be no overall rating item in order to lessen the likelihood that faculty will respond based on like/dislike for the administrator and also reduce the likelihood that supervisors will rely on an overall item to the exclusion of other information about performance.

4. There is variation in responsibilities for administrators. For example, representation of a unit to external constituents may be more important in one type of unit than in others or more important at different points in time, and thus performance in this area may take on different significance in different evaluations. The feedback provided by faculty about the performance of administrators on different items and the perceived importance of items should serve as information for the administrator's supervisor in rendering a final evaluation; judgments about the relative importance of different items necessarily will be made by the supervisor.

Members of the Ad hoc Committee on Administrator Evaluation:

Jeff Johnson (Sociology and ICMR) -- Chair
Linda Allred (Department of Psychology)
Joe Ciechalski (School of Education)
Havva Meric (School of Business)
Carmine Scavo (Department of Political Science)
Helen Grove (School of Human Environmental Sciences)

Copies of the three proposed evaluation forms and a suggested form for qualitative evaluation are available in the Faculty Senate office, 140 Rawl Annex, at ext. 6537.