

Report
From the Committee on Faculty Governance
May 4, 2007

In 2005 the Faculty Governance Committee was charged with a number of items. The first was to recommend a procedure of having faculty representatives attend the board meetings; we completed that work in the spring of 2006. The next task was to recommend procedures for the inclusion of faculty in the evaluation of the Deans, Provost, and Department and Program Heads. During the 2006-2007 academic year, the committee surveyed a group of peer schools about their procedures; interviewed the President, Provost and Deans; solicited responses from Program and Department Heads; met with the faculty for discussion; and surveyed the entire faculty on key issues we had identified. We now present our recommendations.

I. Evaluation of Provost and Deans

It is important to remember that the Provost and Deans are already evaluated on an annual basis. The President evaluates the Provost and the Provost evaluates the Deans. Usually the person being evaluated prepares a statement of activities and goals and that is used as a basis for discussion. The committee's charge was to recommend procedures for including faculty in this process. These are our recommendations:

- A. Include faculty in the evaluation every third year. That would give the individual time to get established and would ensure faculty participation in the review process on a regular basis thereafter. We recommend that this cycle be established on a staggered basis so that faculty involvement is not being done for all four individuals in the same year.
- B. We recommend that a new committee be established called the Faculty Administrators Evaluation Committee (FAEC) to undertake this task. The FAEC would have six elected tenured faculty members, two from the law school and four from the undergraduate program, with terms of three years each. Membership should be staggered so two people are being elected each year, but to begin the work, we suggest that two members (including one law member) have two-year terms, two people have three-year terms, and two people (including one law member) have four year terms. Thereafter new members would be elected for three-year terms. During their term on the Faculty Review Committee, members or alternates would be ineligible for the FAEC.
- C. The FAEC's charge would be to create the instruments used for including faculty in the evaluation process, to oversee the administration of the faculty involvement in the evaluation process, and to report the results to the supervisor (President in the case of the Provost and Provost in the case of the Deans.) We recommend that the instruments used for the evaluation include an electronic survey to all faculty who fall under that person's jurisdiction and that the survey include opportunities for open-ended remarks. In addition, department heads and those who serve on committees that work directly with

the person should also be solicited for responses. We provide some suggested survey questions in an appendix and some of these might serve as standard questions to be asked for everyone, but the actual form of the survey would be determined by the FAEC working with the supervisor and each person being evaluated. The FAEC would be responsible for making sure the evaluations happen on schedule. The procedures should be established by April 1, 2008.

- D. The FAEC would work to ensure that all responses remain anonymous, but also that the person being evaluated can see the results. The results would go to the President to be part of his evaluation of the Provost and to the Provost to be part of her evaluation of the Deans.
- E. While it falls outside our charge, we noted in our interviews that the Provost and some of the Deans have other constituencies within the university besides the faculty. We recommend that some method be developed for including them as part of the evaluation process as well.

II. Department and Program Heads

There is no set procedure at the moment for regular evaluation of the Department and Program Heads. Practice has varied from Dean to Dean over the past several years and from Department to Department and Program to Program. We recommend the following:

There are basically two types of evaluations. One is the type done for self-improvement, the other for consideration of merit and reappointment. The first type, the sort faculty regularly does with student evaluations in their classes, is often most effective if the primary audience is the person being evaluated. Thus the committee recommends faculty involvement with two forms of evaluation for Department and Program Heads.

1. Each Department or Program should take the initiative to determine methods and procedures for evaluating the Head. While the committee recommends that such evaluation be done on either an annual or bi-annual cycle, each may determine that. They should also determine the methods, making sure to protect anonymity. This might involve an anonymous survey or interviews done by a senior member and then summarized for the Head. Some sample questions are included below. This evaluation would be an internal one with the Head as the primary recipient of the information and would not involve the Deans, except to check that some sort of procedure has been implemented.
2. The Deans do, of course, annually evaluate the Heads they deal with as part of the regular faculty review using the Faculty Activities Report and impressions based on their interaction with the Head, but our recommendation is about how to include faculty in the evaluation process and to make it more formal. The Deans should evaluate Department and Program Heads in the fourth year of the appointed term and that evaluation should involve the participation of the Department or Program Faculty in the process.

3. The Dean should have primary responsibility for evaluation of the Heads who come under his/her administration. In cross-disciplinary programs, the Deans would decide among themselves as to which one of them should take responsibility for the process.
4. The inclusion of faculty in the process should include the use of an anonymous survey, but might also include formal letters and oral interviews. Since departments and programs vary so much in size and discipline, the faculty of each Department or Program should work with the Dean and the Head in determining the instruments and the questions. It might be that the Dean would suggest certain standard questions that would be asked of everyone. We suggest some sample questions below.
5. The Dean would ensure that all responses were kept anonymous.
6. The Dean would share the results with the person being evaluated.
7. Questions should be added to the annual Faculty Activity Reports to allow Department and Program Heads to report on their activities.
8. It is important that both Heads and Department and Program Faculty know what the duties of the position are. The location of a web site such as the one developed for the college should be distributed to everyone before evaluation. When new appointments are made, there should be some training to ensure consistency in practice and expectation.

Faculty Governance Committee
Pam Simpson, Chair
Dorothy Brown (resigned Feb. 2006)
Krzysztof Jasiewicz
Pam Luecke
Jeff Kosky
Elizabeth Knapp
Rob Straughan

Appendix
Sample Evaluation Forms
Department or Program Heads

1. What is the Head's greatest strength?
2. Are there areas that need improvement?
3. Is the Head an effective spokesperson for your department/program in advocating your positions to the administration?
4. Does the Head effectively communicate to your department/program the information you need from the administration?
5. Is the Head an effective leader and facilitator for your department/program?
6. Does the Head listen to and give fair consideration to all points of view within your department/program?
7. Does the Head fairly distribute resources within the department/program?
8. Does the Head consult with faculty in a timely manner and meet deadlines?
9. What of the Head's interactions with students in your program?

10. Does the Head appropriately follow the procedures laid out in the Faculty Handbook?

Appendix II and III, Sample Questions for Deans and Provost, see attachments.