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Section 2.7 of the Faculty Handbook states that chairs are appointed by the Provost with the advice of the faculty members of the department and the dean. The aim of a chair selection process is to identify a faculty member who is committed to work for the betterment of the department and who enjoys the trust and confidence of both the dean and a majority of the department faculty. Currently, the Provost asks the dean to obtain the advice from the department faculty and convey that advice to the Provost along with the dean’s own recommendation.

The department faculty, in consultation with the dean, should adopt a process for providing advice to the dean and the Provost concerning selection of the department chair. The process for providing advice regarding potential candidates for department chair should be guided by the following principles:

1. The process should be fair and inclusive.
2. The process should be respectful and confidential.
3. The process should yield substantive information that will allow the Provost to make a well-informed decision, such as:
	1. what are the qualities and accomplishments of the potential candidate(s),
	2. what past experiences do the candidate(s) have leading or chairing programs, departments, committees, or organizations,
	3. to what extent do the candidate(s) have the confidence/support of the faculty, and
	4. what are the concerns, if any, that faculty may have regarding potential candidate(s) serving as chair.

The dean may request that the department revise the process if it fails to meet any of these principles.

For each candidate who receives the support of the department faculty, the department should provide the dean and Provost with substantive information as described above. It is preferred that the department provide multiple candidates; however, the department faculty may choose to nominate a single candidate. The department faculty may include the results of a secret ballot that confirms the level of support for each candidate. Should a department’s process be unable to produce any candidate that (a) has the support of the department, (b) has the confidence of the dean, and (c) is willing to serve as chair, then the members of the department participating in the process and the dean should work cooperatively to identify a candidate they can recommend to the Provost.

*Draft guidelines reviewed by Faculty Senate Council, Deans and Provost Fall 2016; final guidelines approved by the Provost December 2016.*

# Protocol on Departmental Administrative Support and Chair Evaluation

(Established 12/04/90; Revised October 2006 and 2008)

## Administrative Course Releases

In recognition of the time and attention required to do an effective job as department chair, and sensitive to the demands created by larger numbers of students and faculty, the departments in the College shall be authorized administrative allocations as follows:

1. The dean will establish an allocation of course releases for each department or program. A base allocation will be three courses a year if the department, program or center has the equivalent of six or more full-time faculty and staff. (Course reductions for departments with less than the equivalent of six full-time faculty and staff shall be determined on a case-by-case basis.)
2. An additional allocation of one course a year if the department, program or center generated over 12,000 student credit units of course work in the previous academic-year (Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters, based on official enrollment reports).
3. An additional allocation of one course a year if the department, program or center served 150 or more majors (based on the previous Spring Quarter's official enrollment reports).
4. A departmental allocation of course releases for a chair shall not be modified (increased or decreased) during an incumbent’s three-year term. Any modification shall be made at the end of the three year term.
5. An additional allocation of one course a year for program review during the self-study and external review process is available pending funding from the provost.

NOTE: changes to course releases for chair responsibilities of a department will only be adjusted at the end of a chair’s term. There will be no mid-term adjustments.

## Distribution of Administrative Course Releases

A department's administrative/chair course releases may be distributed among the faculty of the department for chair-related administrative activities at the discretion of the department chair, with the approval of the dean. It is assumed that the chair, if tenure-stream, also takes the standard one-course reduction (from the nominal seven-course load) for scholarship.

## Administrative Stipend

In recognition of the professional career costs of serving as chair, the increasing summer duties of the chair, and the role of the department in the success of the Summer Session, the College shall allocate administrative stipends as follows:

1. A base stipend of $1500 a quarter.

The summer responsibilities of the department usually handled by the chair include but are not limited to such tasks as responding to the academic needs of the Undergraduate Summer Program students and faculty, supervising summer facilities projects, conducting junior degree audits, assisting faculty preparing for third-year review or tenure review, preparing for the start of Fall Quarter, completing fiscal year matters, orienting new faculty, advising students, hiring quarterly adjunct lecturer faculty for the Fall, and conducting routine departmental business. If the department chair will not be available during the summer, the dean, in consultation with the chair, will select a suitable available alternative willing and able to perform these tasks either in place of the chair or in collaboration with the chair. If the chair delegates or shares the departmental summer responsibilities, the summer stipend will be awarded to or shared with the colleague/s chosen.

# Evaluations of Chairs

(Developed 2013-14 in consultation with Council of Chairs)

## Background

In the distant past, most chairs did not receive useful, systematic feedback from their department colleagues about the quality of their work as chair. This was not good either for their professional development or for the Department and College. Since the chair has authority over many budgetary, assignment and evaluation issues, it is difficult for some staff and faculty to provide an honest assessment of the chair’s performance without some structure. After 2002, the College allowed chairs to change their weightings to a maximum of 60% of a chair’s evaluation for service. For that reason the College required all departments to develop informal developmental evaluations as a way to assist chairs in their professional development.

Even with these changes, most chairs have not received useful, systematic feedback from the departments and none have received feedback from the dean about the quality of their work as chair. Since the *Faculty Handbook* [section 2.7] states that the chair of a department reports to the dean, the dean serves as the chair’s supervisor and should provide feedback and should evaluate the work as chair. To implement this dean-level evaluation process, the dean conducted many conversations with the Council of Chairs in 2013-14 and convened a task force to work on the project in winter 2014. The following was developed from that work and announced to the Council in spring 2014.

In spring 2014, several chairs and program directors asked to participate in a pilot effort where the College used Survey Monkey to seek developmental feedback from departmental colleagues. Faculty who wished to provide feedback in person met with their associate dean. A summary of the departmental feedback was delivered to all participating chairs in the fall quarter. The Council of Chairs evaluated this process during the 2014-15 year and recommended that it be continued. .

## Timing

*Developmental Feedback from the department*

The dean will coordinate developmental feedback for the chair and program director from departmental colleagues annually using the Survey Monkey tool. The department may choose to propose a different process to collect developmental feedback and must submit that proposed process to the dean for approval. The developmental feedback will not become part of the chair’s permanent file, but may inform the cycle evaluation score for chair work. The dean’s office will also provide developmental feedback.

*Cycle Merit Evaluations for Chair Activity and Weightings*

For chairs appointed fall 2014 or later, in multi-year cycle evaluations, chair activity will be evaluated as 50% of a chair’s regular faculty cycle evaluation weighting for the years during which the faculty served as chair. Chair activity will be its own category and that part of the evaluation score will be based on information gathered from departmental colleagues during the term as well as information gathered from the dean’s office staff during the term. The chair will still be evaluated in teaching, scholarship and service by his/her departmental colleagues, using the weightings available to all tenured faculty members. The category of service, as evaluated by solely by the colleagues, shall focus on non-chair service activities. Chairs should enumerate those non-chair service activities clearly in their FAR. The scores assigned by the department for teaching, scholarship and service will account for the other 50% of the chair’s overall evaluation score.

Chairs may change or shorten their evaluation cycles (3 year or 5 year) to coincide with their term as chair.

## Implementation

Developmental evaluations will be conducted for existing chairs on a regular basis as described above. The cycle evaluation process will begin fall 2014.

**Procedures and Policies for the College Academic-year Planning Process**

**Academic-Year Plan (AYP) Description**

Each Academic-year Planning Workbook is composed of four sheets – Faculty Resources and Planning, Faculty Load, CORE, and full-year teaching plan.

**A. Faculty Resource and Planning Sheet** (maintained by the dean’s office, no data entry by departments is required). This sheet is divided into two areas: (1) *Planning and Resource Summary* and (2) *Faculty Resources.*

***Planning and Resource Summary:*** The first area includes the section target, faculty resource summary (calculated automatically from data in section B), and a narrative description of the section target determination.

***Faculty Resources:*** The second area contains teaching load and release data for all types of faculty. The faculty are divided by types that correlate to budget categories: tenured, tenure-track and Senior Lecturers; non-tenure-track continuing faculty (lab instructors and adjunct professors); Lecturers, Adjunct Lecturers (AYAL), and quarterly Adjunct Lecturer faculty (QAL). Quarterly Adjunct Lecturer faculty load is calculated automatically from the teaching load summaries and the section target. The table includes the following columns:

Faculty Name

Rank

*FTE* (full-time equivalent)

Appointment / line description

*Initial teaching load* (typically 7 for tenured and tenure-track faculty; 7 for Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, and lab instructors, 7 for academic-year adjunct lecturers)

*Other A&S course load* (courses taught for other A&S departments or programs, counted in the other unit’s section target)

*Sch* Scholarly Release

*Sabb* Sabbatical Release

*A&S Admin* Service in an administrative role to the College

*Univ* University release

*Reduc & Retire* Reduced time arrangements (permanent) or Phased retirement arrangements

LOAAny leave of absence - medical, family, other paid or unpaid leave

*Other / non-A&S course load* (other leave arrangements and courses taught for units outside the College such as CPE)

*Release / Load Description* Explanation of releases

*Teaching Load* (the expected load calculated by subtracting releases or load in the preceding columns from the initial load)

*Actual Load – Full Year* (load calculated from the actual full-year plan, summarized on the “facload sheet” and linked directly to the faculty resource sheet. If an instructor is changed in the full year plan, the actual teaching loads will change.)

*Variance* (the difference between the expected teaching load and the actual teaching load; should be zero; a non-zero variance indicates a problem either with one of the worksheets or a “real” problem with an individual load).

**B. Faculty Load**. (a resource page, no data entry required, data is refreshed from the full year plan). The faculty load sheet automatically generates faculty load tables from the full year plan. All individual faculty members are listed, by faculty type, with each course they teach and their teaching load summary. All faculty types are included in the main, “big” table. A second table redundantly calculates only the QAL total since the names of these faculty are often not known until just before a quarter begins. Only the full, “big” table will be printed. We confirm all teaching overloads using this information.

The faculty load tables are pivot tables set up to be refreshed when the workbook is opened (or with the data refresh button in the Data menu with the red exclamation mark command, !). After updating the full year plan, either go to the faculty load sheet and refresh the data with the ! red exclamation mark command or save the workbook, close the workbook and re-open the workbook.

**C. Core.** (,Section counts are calculated automatically from the full year plan) All courses offered by a unit/department are listed with the requirements fulfilled by the courses indicated. The dean’s office will update this table as new courses are approved by the Core Committees.

**D. Full-year Plan Sheet**. The teaching schedule for the entire year is described in the full-year plan. The column headings are described below:

*Quarter* (in PeopleSoft notation)

*Department* course ID

Course Number

Instructor’s Name

*Instructor Type* (TT- tenure-track, TE-tenured, SRL – Senior Lecturer, NTCC – non-tenure-track continuing, LEC – Lecturers, AYAL – fixed-term lecturers, QAL – quarterly adjunct lecturer)

*Units* (typically four or five, if variable use lowest possible)

*Load* (course load assignment, typically one for lecture-only courses)

*RLC* (residential learning community linked course)

**Policies / Procedures**

**Change Agents**

The Faculty Resource and Planning Sheet can only be modified by the dean’s office. The full-year teaching plan will be modified throughout the year by the departments in consultation with the dean’s office. Please refer to the Chairs’ Timetable for exact dates, The general cycle is described below.

**General Academic-year Planning Cycle for Year 0X-0Y**

Planning 0X-0Y

January-March– First draft of the Academic-year Plan provided to departments with Resource and Planning Sheet completed. Department completes the full-year plan; dean’s office and chairs meet; dean’s office approves plan by March 15 each year)

Updated full year plans are due on the dates set forth in the Chairs’ Timetable, but generally:

June – Second draft of full-year plan.

September – Third draft of full-year plan i

December – Fourth draft of full-year plan i

March – Fifth Draft of full-year plan (June – Final full-year plan (email changes). The dean’s office will request an update, not the full-year plan itself.

**Changes to the Full-year Plan:** When a department submits a new full-year plan, the sheet is cut and pasted into the dean’s office copy of the AYP. All links and pivot tables are then checked to make sure all are functional. The pivot tables need to be refreshed when any changes are made to the full-year plan. If the cell is red, then there is a data entry error that should be corrected before it is submitted to the associate dean.

**Adding /Canceling Classes:** If a course is added, a new row must be inserted into the full-year plan spreadsheet and the faculty load pivot table refreshed. If a course is cancelled, the appropriate row should be deleted from the spreadsheet and the faculty load pivot table refreshed. Variances in teaching loads will then appear on the faculty resources and planning sheet and appropriate action taken.