University of Virginia General Faculty Council (GFC)

Minutes: June 12, 2001 12:30-2:00 PM, Room 481 Newcomb

Hall

Members Present: Mary Abouzeid, Frank Butros, Chuck Callaghan, Donal Day, Joe Gieck, Carol Hunter, Bill Keene, Lotta Lofgren, Jan Redick, Max Salinas, Ellie Wilson

Members Absent: Jann Balmer, Rosie Dunn, James Freeman, Aaron Laushway, Maurice Lipper, Barbara Millar, Lynda White

The meeting was chaired by Frank Butros

1. Minutes of the May 14, 2001 meeting were approved as corrected.
2. Chair's Report: Frank Butros reported that, following the May 14 meeting, he promptly sent messages of thanks to John Casteen, Leonard Sandridge, and Kathy Reed. He said the response from each of the individuals was gratifying; an indication, perhaps, that the General Faculty Council is perceived as an important body at the University. A suggestion was made from the floor that inviting these individuals (or their counterparts) to attend council meetings should be an annual event. There was unanimous consensus that this was an excellent idea, and should be implemented. (Note: At a later point in the meeting, during general discussion, it was suggested that Anda Webb (Associate VP/Provost), specifically, be invited to an upcoming meeting. Anda will be replacing Kathy Reed in the Provost's Office.)

   Frank Butros also reported that he had been contacted by Colette Sheehy to have a Gen-Fac representative to work with Tom Gausvik and Anda Webb on the new reward and recognition policy. A general discussion followed on the following points related to this award: (1) is this award for classified staff only, or does it include general faculty?; and (2) are funds available to make the award meaningful? To avoid rambling speculation, the Chair asked the members to wait until he has met with Tom Gausvik and Anda Webb on this matter.

3. Committee Reports:

Faculty Information Technology Skills Task Force – Carol Hunter. The Final Report of the Faculty Information Technology Skills Task Force completed in May has been presented to the Dean's Technology Council. An executive summary of this report will be submitted to the new Dean for addition to his

agenda. The Task Force has recommended that the "Provost's Office establish a standing committee, composed of representatives from ITC, Alderman Library, and major academic units including the College of Arts and Sciences

and the School of Engineering. This advisory committee should be charged with oversight of all information technology resources relevant to the mission of the

faculty."

4. Other reports and new business:

Mary Abouzeid reported on the results of her initial contact with Student Techies to provide assistance with the General Faculty Council website. After viewing the site, Paul Doherty (director) indicated that the site was in fairly good shape, but he had some suggestions for improvement; such as adding the

new UVA logo, etc. Building on discussions in prior council meetings, it was decided that we do want to have our photographs on the website, along with relevant bio information and contact information for each council member. Jan Redick will contact Student Techies for information on continuing this process. Frank Butros will check out whether medical photography can take digital photos of council members.

Frank Butros initiated a preliminary discussion of the "goals and objectives" of the General Faculty Council. A handout which he had prepared (attached) provided specific criteria of "objectives" vs "goals", and will serve as a guideline as the council defines its own goals/objectives in upcoming months.

A discussion about future meetings resulted in the decision to meet in July of this year, but not to have a meeting in August.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 PM.

NEXT MEETING: July 10, 2001 12:30 PM Room 389, Newcomb Hall

Submitted by: Jan Redick

OBJECTIVES

We frequently hear the words goal and objectives used interchangeably. However,

OBJECTIVES are statements that meet the eight criteria listed below, while

GOALS are statements that are neither time-oriented nor precise in terms of specific measurable outcome. Goals are statements of general direction.

EXAMPLE

GOAL: To be the leader in cancer research.

OBJECTIVE: By the year 2010, we will have a protocol to treat 95% of all forms of cancer.

CRITERIA OF SOUNDLY CONCEIVED OBJECTIVES

Valid objectives possess eight common characteristics:

1. **CLEAR and SPECIFIC**: The most common weakness of organizational objectives is that they are stated in general terms. Objectives must state in CLEAR & SIMPLE terms exactly what is desired as AN END RESULT. A clearly written objective specifies one result only and does not include such words as increase, improve, or maximize unless additional modifiers are used. Example: Improve productivity by 7%
2. **MEASURABLE:** Objectives must have built-in performance indicators so that we can assess whether or not they have been accomplished. For example, if the objective is to improve productivity by 10% during the next year, then one can measure the progress during the year and can compare actual performance with expectations. On the other hand, if the objective is stated as improving productivity, it becomes meaningless since its meaning differs with different people. As a matter of fact a 0.1% improvement in productivity or 100% improvement will satisfy the objective.
3. **TIME-SPECIFIC**: Objectives must state a definite target date for accomplishment. To state that we will develop a policy without specifying the time limit may drag on for years.

4. **RESULT ORIENTED**: Objectives should focus on results, not activities. Activities are the means by which objectives are accomplished. For example, having an HMO representative attend a meeting to increase faculty council members knowledge of HMO practices is a task, while the main objective is increasing knowledge of members.

5. **REALISTIC**: Objectives should be attainable with some effort. Objectives that are unrealistically high are ineffective. For example, increasing the council's budget from $2,500/year to $100,000/year is not realistic.

6. **DEMANDING (CHALLENGING):** Objectives that require an effort on the part of members provide a sense of achievement.

7. **MENAINGFUL**: Objectives should be meaningful in terms of what they contribute to the institution or the individual.

8. **MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE:** Objectives should be supportive of higher-level units of the organization. Stated objectives should contribute to the accomplishments of the institution.