

AAUP

NEWS

Volume XIV No. 9 May 16, 2003

Faculty Senate responds to BOT comments about presidential evaluation process

The Cincinnati State Faculty Senate has sent a letter to the members of the College Board of Trustees in response to remarks made by Mr. John Steele, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, at the April 22 Board meeting.

As reported in the May 8 *AAUP News*, Mr. Steele told Faculty Senate President Diane Stump at the April 22 Board meeting that information provided by the Senate in response to the Board's request for faculty input in the Board's evaluation of President Ron Wright was "not credible."

Diane said that all of the members of the Senate were involved in writing the letter to the Board, and all Senate members signed the letters. The Senate's letter was sent to each of the eight Board member.

The full text of the Senate's letter appears on page 2.

The Senate's letter says, "Good evaluation instruments and processes should help employees at every level of an organization to continuously improve. The members of the Faculty Senate, like all Cincinnati State faculty

members, are very interested in developing a consistent process and reliable instruments to assist the Board in its evaluation of the President."

The letter also states, "During the months ahead, the Senate will conduct additional research and then select and administer a reliable assessment instrument for Faculty input for the Board's evaluation of the College President. We will report the results to the Board annually, beginning in the 2003-2004 academic year."

Presidential evaluation forms distributed this week

RDI Marketing Services, an independent survey research firm, is distributing to all full-time employees materials for employee evaluation of President Ron Wright.

Copies of evaluation materials are being mailed to employees at their campus address, except faculty on their term off, who will receive materials at their home address.

The evaluation instrument is the same 50-question survey that was used in 1999 and 2000, when the Cincinnati State Board

of Trustees used RDI Marketing Services to collect employee input for the Board's evaluation of President Wright.

The Cincinnati State AAUP Executive Committee decided pay for an independent evaluation conducted by RDI after Board of Trustees Chairman John Steele publicly questioned the credibility of input for President Wright's evaluation which was collected by the Faculty Senate.

Evaluations should be returned to RDI by May 27.

NOTE: All information will be kept confidential by RDI, and no individual responses will be identified.

RDI will prepare a report on evaluation results, which will compare data collected this year with the 1999 and 2000 presidential evaluation results. The report is expected to be issued in mid-June.

Any full-time employee who does not receive an evaluation form should notify RDI Project Director Anita Martin at 513-984-5927, extension 227.

Cincinnati State Faculty Senate Letter to the College Board of Trustees

May 8, 2003

To Members of the Board of Trustees:

We are writing in response to Mr. Steele's comments to Senate President Diane Stump at the April 22 Board meeting.

We regret the misunderstanding that occurred concerning the distribution of our evaluation input to all Board members simultaneously. We thought that sending information to all Board members would expedite the Board's review processes.

We also regret reaching the conclusion that the Board does not value the input of the faculty into the evaluation of the President of the College. We reached this conclusion based on Mr. Steele's letter requesting faculty input, Diane's subsequent telephone conversation with Mr. Steele which attempted to clarify how best to meet the Board's needs, and Mr. Steele's comments to Diane at the April Board meeting.

We believe that meaningful personnel evaluation should be objective and formative, and not used in a punitive manner. Good evaluation instruments and processes should help employees at every level of an organization to continuously improve. The members of the Faculty Senate, like all Cincinnati State faculty members, are very interested in developing a consistent process and reliable instruments to assist the Board in its evaluation of the President.

Mr. Steele's request for input allowed only 14 days for devising, distributing, collecting, processing, and delivering evaluation data. The

members of the Senate discussed a number of possible approaches, and selected the method used this year not because it was the best method available, but because it was the best method that could be implemented in the time available.

It is appropriate for employees to have input into the evaluation of the President of the College. Many organizations, including many of Cincinnati's most admired organizations, implement assessment processes that "go up and down the organization." Similarly, student input plays a large role in evaluation of faculty members because they are our primary "customers." Negative student feedback—which even the most skilled of us receives on occasion—gives us opportunities to examine our perceived weaknesses and then to make adjustments and improvements in our work.

The contractual provision that ensures a Faculty role in the Board's assessment of the President is not unique; many institutions of higher education have similar policies or practices. The evaluation instrument used by the Board in 1999 and 2000 to seek employee input was developed based on criteria provided by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in its publication *Presidential Assessment: A Guide to the Periodic Review of the Performance of Chief Executives*, which certainly suggests that other Boards of Trustees value broad-based employee input into Board evaluation of Presidents.

Finally, we regret that Mr. Steele, in his response to the

information collected by the Senate, focused only on what he perceived as negative feedback.

We believe that the data collected by the Senate, albeit subjective in form, is not unilaterally critical of President Wright. We believe that a careful reading of the comments reveals a wide range of views about the President's strengths and weaknesses, and also reveals a large number of meaningful and credible suggestions for improvement. It is not reasonable to expect only positive feedback to emerge from an evaluation process, but that is what Mr. Steele's remarks at the April Board meeting seemed to express.

During the months ahead, the Senate will conduct additional research and then select and administer a reliable assessment instrument for Faculty input for the Board's evaluation of the College President. We will report the results to the Board annually, beginning in the 2003-2004 academic year.

If Board members wish to ask additional questions or discuss this matter with the Faculty Senate, we would be happy to schedule a meeting for that purpose.

Sincerely,

Cincinnati State Technical and Community College Faculty Senate

Signed by:
George Armstrong
Paul Callahan
Ron Craig
Pam Ecker
Mary Frey
Jeri Hancox
Bob McLain
Diane Stump
Don Youngpeter

Program workload “points” calculations to be completed soon; Program chairs should examine data carefully

The Cincinnati State AAUP Executive Committee urges all faculty Program Chairs to review carefully data distributed this week by the College’s Institutional Research Office concerning the number of full time equivalent (FTE) students in Program Admitted status and Pre-Admit (also called Pre-Tech) status for each degree program.

AAUP Chapter President Pam Ecker said the calculation of program workload units for the 2003-04 academic year will be based on the student FTE data distributed to chairs after the 14th day of the Late Fall, Winter, and Spring terms.

“If there are errors in the data reports, Program Chairs need to report these problems no later than May 30,” Pam said.

Each Program Chair and Pre-Tech Advisor should receive two spreadsheets from Anne Foster, Acting Director of Institutional Research and Planning. The spreadsheets list all Program Admitted and Pre-Tech students in the program as of the 14th day of Spring Term.

The spreadsheets for Spring were sent to Division Deans on May 15.

Similar spreadsheets were sent to the Deans and should have been distributed to Program Chairs in Late Fall Term and Winter Term.

Since Late Fall, the College has been preparing these lists--as required by the Faculty Unit 1 contract--using an automated process developed by the Information Technology Services department. The automated process, which is still considered to be in “test mode,” automatically changes a

student’s status to Program Admitted when all requirements have been met.

The requirements that “trigger” an automatic status change were defined by a work group that included faculty representatives and have been reviewed several times for accuracy.

The Faculty Unit 1 contract states in Article VIII (G) that each degree Program Chair is assigned a “base” of 4 workload units for a program with up to 40 full time equivalent (FTE) students in Program Admitted status.

If a program is larger than 40 FTEs, the program earns one additional unit for the 41st through 60th Program Admitted FTEs, and an additional unit each time a threshold of 20 Program Admitted FTE students is crossed.

Pam said that calculations needed to determine if a program qualifies for units beyond the base of 4 have essentially been “on hold” for more than two years.

“When the College computer system was upgraded to Colleague R-16, we somehow lost the ability to count Admitted and Pre-Tech students,” Pam said. “Since we could no longer get valid data about the FTEs in each program, the program workload points haven’t changed.”

Pam said that last summer’s negotiations resulted in a new contract provision which states that the administration will supply to Program Chairs lists of all Program Admitted and Pre-Tech students registered in their programs as of the 14th day of the term. The contract provision also states that Program Chairs shall work with the College to insure the accuracy of the data.

“Monica Posey and Anne Foster have worked hard to implement this contract provision that is intended to make it possible to again calculate program points accurately. The ITS department also has provided good support for this task,” Pam said.

“A few chairs reported discrepancies in their data for Late Fall and Winter Terms,” Pam said. “Despite the new automated process, some students who should be in Program Admitted status are still appearing on the Pre-Tech lists.”

“It’s important for all Program Chairs to take a close look at the Spring reports,” Pam said.

“The AAUP Executive Committee would like to be able to give the administration the go-ahead for calculating 2003-04 program points,” Pam said. “However, we want to be sure that Program Chairs are satisfied with the accuracy of the data they are receiving.”

The logo for the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) is displayed in a large, bold, serif font.

Mark your calendar!

Cincinnati State AAUP Business Meeting

Open to all chapter members

Thursday, May 29, 1:00-2:00 p.m.

Location to be announced



Froggie Friday End-of-Year Celebration

Friday, June 13

Time: 11:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Location: to be announced

Preferred attire: Froggie shirts!

**CINCINNATI STATE CHAPTER
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
3520 CENTRAL PARKWAY
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45223-2690**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT

PAM ECKER
PHONE: 513/569-1722

VICE PRESIDENT

JOYCE RIMLINGER

GRIEVANCE OFFICER

JOHN BATTISTONE

SECRETARY

GEOFF WOOLF

MEMBERSHIP CHAIR

KEN STOLL

TREASURER

PAUL DAVIS

MEMBER-AT-LARGE

RON CRAIG

PAST PRESIDENT

BOB EVESLAGE