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TO: Dr. Fred Mynard, Chair, Senate Executive Committee  
FROM: Brooks A. Keel, President  
DATE: February 22, 2013  
SUBJECT: February 20, 2013 Faculty Senate Recommendation:  
Periodic Review of Department Chairs  

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the February 20, 2013, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of February 21, 2013, I have approved the motion below presented to the Senate by Dr. Robert Costomiris.

MOTION:

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 104.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair.

2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair

3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

* Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”

RATIONALE:

The role of department chair is crucial to the well-being of a department. Yet, up to this time, there has been no uniformly applied method of evaluating a department chair’s performance. Recognizing this need, the Faculty Welfare Committee has drafted the attached motion. It is the committee's expectation that the method of evaluating the department chair outlined in the motion will yield more informed decisions about the performance of department chairs and consequently result in even better departmental governance.

gm

c:

Dr. Jean Bartels
Dr. Diana Cone
Ms. Candace Griffith
TO: President Brooks Keel  
FROM: Jean E. Bartels, Ph.D., RN  
Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs  
DATE: February 21, 2013  
SUBJ: February 20, 2013, Faculty Senate Recommendation: Periodic Review of Department Chairs

I recommend approval of the motion presented by Robert Costomiris on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee at the February 20, 2013, Faculty Senate meeting.

MOTION:

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments, the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 104.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair.

2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair

3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

AA/EO Institution
Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”

RATIONALE:

The role of department chair is crucial to the well-being of a department. Yet, up to this time, there has been no uniformly applied method of evaluating a department chair’s performance. Recognizing this need, the Faculty Welfare Committee has drafted the attached motion. It is the committee’s expectation that the method of evaluating the department chair outlined in the motion will yield more informed decisions about the performance of department chairs and consequently result in even better departmental governance.

JEB/ls

pc: Dr. Fred Mynrd
     Dr. Diana Cone
     Ms. Candace Griffith
TO:       Dr. Brooks A. Keel, President
FROM:    Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair, Senate Executive Committee
DATE:    February 21, 2013
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Recommendation
Periodic Review of Department Chairs

I am pleased to report that the Senate recommends approval of the motion presented by Robert Costomiris on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee at the February 20, 2013, Faculty Senate meeting.

Motion:

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 104.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair.

2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair

3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide
if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

* Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”

RATIONALE:
The role of department chair is crucial to the well-being of a department. Yet, up to this time, there has been no uniformly applied method of evaluating a department chair's performance. Recognizing this need, the Faculty Welfare Committee has drafted the attached motion. It is the committee's expectation that the method of evaluating the department chair outlined in the motion will yield more informed decisions about the performance of department chairs and consequently result in even better departmental governance.
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c: Dr. Jean Bartels
Dr. Diana Cone
Ms. Candace Griffith
 Faculty Welfare Committee
30 January 2013

Periodic Review of Department Chairs

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 1045.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair.

2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair.

3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

*Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Periodic Review of Department Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>2/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person or Group</td>
<td>Robert Customis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robtcost@georgiasouthern.edu">robtcost@georgiasouthern.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.” Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include: 1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair. 2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair 3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit. Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description or question</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>The role of department chair is crucial to the well-being of a department. Yet, up to this time, there has been no uniformly applied method of evaluating a department chair’s performance. Recognizing this need, the Faculty Welfare Committee has drafted the attached motion. It is the committee’s expectation that the method of evaluating the department chair outlined in the motion will yield more informed decisions about the performance of department chairs and consequently result in even better departmental governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Costomiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SEC Response | 2/13/2013: this motion was approved for inclusion on the agenda of the February 20, 2013 meeting. |
| Senate Response | 2/20/2013: the faculty senate approved this motion unanimously, after a friendly amendment corrected "under Section 105.03" into "under Section 104.03". |

1. **Motion Request (FWC): Periodic Review of Department Chairs**
   
   Moderator Mynard (COSM) noted that this motion was the result of a similar motion approved last year not being approved by President Keel. Since then it had been revised via consultation between the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Council of Deans.

   Robert Costomiris (CLASS) read the motion (the link is above), noting an amendment to its wording to reflect changes in the numbering of Faculty Handbook sections.
The motion was Approved. Provost Bartels praised the productive collaboration of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Deans.

Parliamentarian Cook raised the issue of a start date for this policy.

Costomiris said that hadn’t been discussed because they weren’t sure whether an approved policy becomes effective immediately the President approves it, or it has to be “codified” in published sources like the *Handbook* in order for it to be put into effect.

Cook thought it would be prudent and fair for Deans to advise the chairs on when this would come into play so the chairs have lead time for any preparation they might need to do, just as chairs advise faculty of when they will be reviewed. Costomiris agreed, and Cook further suggested that the Provost, Deans, and chairs develop an implementation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President’s Response</th>
<th>2/22/2013: The president approved this motion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Motion Request

2/1/2013

SHORT TITLE:
(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Periodic Review of Department Chairs

MOTION(s):
(Please write out your motion in the exact form/wording on which you want the Senate to vote.)

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments, the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.” Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include: 1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair. 2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair. 3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit. Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision. * Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”

RATIONALE(s):
(Please explain why the motion should be considered by the Faculty Senate, remembering that the Senate does not deal with issues limited to individual colleges or administrative units. Include pertinent data and source references for information and/or language.)

The role of department chair is crucial to the well-being of a department. Yet, up to this time, there has been no uniformly applied method of evaluating a department chair’s performance. Recognizing this need, the Faculty Welfare Committee has drafted the attached motion. It is the committee’s expectation that the method of evaluating the department chair outlined in the motion will yield more informed decisions about the performance of department chairs and
consequently result in even better departmental governance. Signed, Robert Costomiris Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form.

Submitted by: robtcost
E-Mail: robtcost@georgiasouthern.edu

Phone: 800837
Re-Enter Email: robtcost@georgiasouthern.edu

ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted. Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward.

Response: Approved

SEC Response:
2/13/2013

this motion was approved for inclusion on the agenda of the February 20, 2013 meeting.

Senate Response:
2/20/2013

the faculty senate approved this motion unanimously, after a friendly amendment corrected "under Section 105.03" into "under Section 104.03".

Presidents Response:
2/22/2013

The president approved this motion.
Faculty Welfare Committee

30 January 2013

Periodic Review of Department Chairs

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

Department Chairs shall undergo a thorough performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum 30% of the department’s voting membership*. In the fifth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fifth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct said review. This review shall include:

1) A review by the department’s voting membership of the Chair’s review portfolio, which shall include, at a minimum: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments over the past five years, a summary of the Chair’s goals for the department for the next five years, the faculty’s annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the Chair, and the Dean’s annual evaluations of the Chair.

2) A meeting between the Dean and the voting membership of the faculty to discuss the job performance of the Chair.

3) A vote by the department’s voting membership indicating whether they support or not the chair’s job performance and including any written comments the faculty wishes to submit.

Voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot at the time of the meeting or by a similar anonymous electronic method. Two members of the department will tabulate votes with the results being presented to department members and the Dean. After considering the advisory vote, and following any further consultation between the Dean and faculty, the Dean will decide if the Chair shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Dean decides, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision.

*Voting membership is defined as the “Corps of Instruction” in Article 1, Section 3 of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University and consists of: “full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training. Persons holding adjunct appointments or other honorary titles shall not be considered to be members of the faculty.”
TO: Dr. Clara Krug, Chair, Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Brooks A. Keel, Ph.D., President
DATE: June 29, 2012
SUBJECT: June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate Recommendation: Faculty Welfare Committee Motion to Regarding Periodic Review of Department Chairs.

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of June 7, 2012, I am DEFERRING this motion to the Council of Deans (CoD) for discussion and recommendations and charge the Provost with responsibility to carry forward a recommendation to the Senate from the CoD. Because the Deans are charged with responsibility for appointing and overseeing the various department chairs, it seems appropriate that they be provided an opportunity to provide input into this motion before the President takes action.

gm

c. Dr. Jean Bartels
   Dr. Mike Smith
   Ms. Candace Griffith
TO:       President Brooks Keel
FROM:     William T. Moore
           Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
DATE:     June 7, 2012
SUBJ:     June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate Recommendation:
           Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Periodic Review of Department Chairs

I recommend approval of the motion presented by the Senate Executive Committee at the June 6, 2012, Senate meeting.

MOTION:

In the interests of shared governance and to ensure consistency across academic departments, the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03, “Evaluation of Administrators.” The term of office for Department Chairs shall be five years. A Chair shall not be limited to a particular number of consecutive terms. In the fourth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fourth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct a thorough review of the Chair’s performance to determine whether the current chair should be recommended for renewal for a succeeding term. This review shall include:

1. a meeting between the Dean and the faculty of the department to discuss their concerns,
2. a review by the department’s faculty of the faculty’s annual evaluations of the Chair and all other relevant evidence, including but not limited to: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments for the current term, and a summary of the Chair’s goals for the coming term,
3. a vote by the voting members of the department to recommend or not to recommend that the current chair be renewed.

Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultation deemed appropriate, the Dean will either reappoint the Chair for another five-year term or begin the process for the selection of a new Chair. If the Dean decides to renew the term of the Chair despite a negative vote by the department’s faculty, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment.
RATIONALE:

The language in the 2011-12 Faculty Handbook, Section 105.03, states: “In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, directors, and department chairs) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fourth year. In Academic Affairs, the survey portion of this process is carried out for deans, directors, and department chairs annually to provide information for continuous improvement. The review seeks input from subordinates and peers and focuses on the administrator’s management/organizational ability, leadership, and progress on the unit’s stated goals and objectives.” This statement lacks any specific means by which a chair’s subordinates and/or peers (here meaning the department’s faculty) might meaningfully evaluate the chair’s performance, leadership, and progress, thus hampering the ability of the department to “provide information for continuous improvement.” The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that this motion addresses this lack in the current policy. While some colleges already might have a policy regarding the evaluation of department chairs, the Faculty Welfare Committee believes this university level model will provide a method all colleges and departments can profitably use.

WTM/ls

pc: Dr. Clara Krug
    Dr. Kathy Albertson
    Ms. Candace Griffith
TO: Dr. Brooks A. Keel, President

FROM: Clara Krug, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

DATE: June 7, 2012

SUBJECT: June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate Recommendation
Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Periodic Review of Department Chairs

I am pleased to report that the Senate recommends approval of the motion presented by the Senate Executive Committee at the June 6, 2012, Senate meeting.

MOTION:

In the interests of shared governance and to insure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 “Evaluation of Administrators.”

The term of office for Department Chairs shall be five years. A Chair shall not be limited to a particular number of consecutive terms. In the fourth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fourth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct a thorough review of the Chair’s performance to determine whether the current chair should be recommended for renewal for a succeeding term. This review shall include:

1. a meeting between the Dean and the faculty of the department to discuss their concerns
2. a review by the department’s faculty of the faculty’s annual evaluations of the Chair and all other relevant evidence, including but not limited to: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments for the current term, and a summary of the Chair’s goals for the coming term
3. a vote by the voting members of the department to recommend or not to recommend that the current chair be renewed

Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultation deemed appropriate, the Dean will either reappoint the Chair for another five-year term or begin the process for the selection of a new Chair. If the Dean decides to renew the term of the Chair despite a negative vote by the department’s faculty, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment.

RATIONALE:

The language in the 2011-12 Faculty Handbook Section 105.03 states: "In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, directors, and department chairs) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fourth year. In Academic Affairs, the survey portion of this process
is carried out for deans, directors, and department chairs annually to provide information for continuous improvement. The review seeks input from subordinates and peers and focuses on the administrator’s management/organizational ability, leadership, and progress on the unit’s stated goals and objectives. This statement lacks any specific means by which a chair’s subordinates and/or peers (here meaning the department’s faculty) might meaningfully evaluate the chair’s performance, leadership, and progress, thus hampering the ability of the department to “provide information for continuous improvement.” The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that this motion addresses this lack in the current policy. While some colleges already might have a policy regarding the evaluation of department chairs, the Faculty Welfare Committee believes this university level model will provide a method all colleges and departments can profitably use.

gm

c:  Dr. Ted Moore
    Dr. Kathy Albertson
    Ms. Candace Griffith
Motion Request

5/9/2012

SHORT TITLE:
(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Periodic Review of Department Chairs

MOTION(s):
(Please write out your motion in the exact form/wording on which you want the Senate to vote.)

In the interests of shared governance and to insure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 "Evaluation of Administrators." The term of office for Department Chairs shall be five years. A Chair shall not be limited to a particular number of consecutive terms. In the fourth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fourth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct a thorough review of the Chair’s performance to determine whether the current chair should be recommended for renewal for a succeeding term. This review shall include: 1. a meeting between the Dean and the faculty of the department to discuss their concerns 2. a review by the department’s faculty of the faculty’s annual evaluations of the Chair and all other relevant evidence, including but not limited to: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments for the current term, and a summary of the Chair’s goals for the coming term 3. a vote by the voting members of the department to recommend or not to recommend that the current chair be renewed Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultation deemed appropriate, the Dean will either reappoint the Chair for another five-year term or begin the process for the selection of a new Chair. If the Dean decides to renew the term of the Chair despite a negative vote by the department's faculty, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment.

RATIONALE(s):
(Please explain why the motion should be considered by the Faculty Senate, remembering that the Senate does not deal with issues limited to individual colleges or administrative units. Include pertinent data and source references for information and/or language.)

The language in the 2011-12 Faculty Handbook Section 105.03 states: "In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, directors, and department chairs) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fourth year. In Academic Affairs, the survey portion of this process is carried out for deans, directors, and department chairs annually to provide information for continuous improvement. The review seeks input from subordinates and peers and focuses on the administrator’s management/organizational ability, leadership, and progress on the unit’s stated goals and objectives." This statement lacks any specific means by which a chair's subordinates and/or peers (here meaning the department's faculty) might meaningfully evaluate the chair's performance, leadership, and progress, thus hampering the ability of the department to "provide information for continuous improvement." The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that this motion addresses this lack in the current policy. While some colleges already might have a policy regarding the evaluation of department chairs, the Faculty Welfare Committee believes
This university level model will provide a method all colleges and departments can profitably use.
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SEC Response:
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The SEC voted unanimously to include this motion on the agenda of the June 6 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Senate Response:
6/6/2012

Approved by the Senate

Presidents Response:
6/29/2012

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of June 7, 2012, I am DEFERRING this motion to the Council of Deans (CoD) for discussion and recommendations and charge the
Provost with responsibility to carry forward a recommendation to the Senate from the CoD. Because the Deans are charged with responsibility for appointing and overseeing the various department chairs, it seems appropriate that they be provided an opportunity to provide input into this motion before the President takes action.  

-------------  

The following update was provided on July 13, 2012 and articulated in the president's remark at the September 19 senate meeting:  

As you know, the June 6 Faculty Senate Welfare Committee passed two motions regarding review, evaluation and no confidence votes for Chairs. I initially indicated that I intended to defer these motions to the Council of Dean's (CoD) for their input. Because the Faculty Senate rules require me to take action on such things within 30 days, this review by the CoD could not take place within this time frame, and I had no choice but to deny both motions. These motions have now been fully discussed by the CoD, and I am including Provost Bartel's overview of the discussion below. I agree with their assessment and therefore DISAPPROVE both of these motions passed by the Welfare Committee. However, having said that, Provost Bartels and I both agree that there is room for improvement in standardizing Chair review, and I therefore urge both the Council of Deans and the Faculty Senate to work together on proposing new language that might be more acceptable. I will ask Moderator Mynard and Provost Bartels to work together to determine that best way path forward related to this discussion.  

--------------------------  

The Council of Deans met on Wednesday, July 11th to discuss two motions approved by the Faculty Senate: Evaluation of Chairs; Votes of No Confidence in Chairs. Their recommendations were as follows: The Deans noted that they do not have opposition to a formalized process of evaluating Chairs on a periodic basis. It was noted, however, that annual reviews of Chairs already exists. In those reviews, all faculty have the opportunity to rate their Chair's performance against specific criteria and provide subjective information regarding the Chair's performance. In most colleges, Deans met with faculty every 4-5 years to discuss the Chair's performance. The proposal, as written, provides a degree on process that was judged to be beyond the scope of faculty responsibility. Suggestions for rewording of the policy, including an elimination of term years for Chairs were recommended. Deans agreed that moving to term limits for Chairs would make hiring and retaining Chairs difficult. The Deans would be willing to work on revisions to the policy if this would be agreeable to the Faculty Senate.