MOTION: The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends approval of the highlighted revisions to the Department Chair Evaluation policy in the University Regulations to clarify the dean’s role in assignment of scores for the “Chair Responsibility” section of service. (see attachment)

VOTE: The motion passed with a hand vote of 12-1, 3 abstentions.

Response requested:

- approval for placement in University Catalog
- approval for placement in University Regulations
- recommendation to Board for placement in Board Policy Manual
- none (sent as information item)
- other action requested/comments:

October 6, 2014

Administrative review of Senate action (unnecessary for information items):

- reviewed by VPAA/Provost. Check ______ if comments attached
- reviewed by General Counsel. Check ______ if comments attached

Presidential action:

- approve; ______ reject; ______ return to Senate for discussion/modification (comments attached)

Date of Board approval (if applicable): __________________________

PLEASE RETURN SIGNED ORIGINAL AND ATTACHMENT TO THE FACULTY SENATE OFFICE, BOX 75.
3-3-301(4) Department Chair Evaluation. Evaluation of those in the position of chair shall follow the standard University evaluation process (see Board Policy Manual, 1-1-307 and 2-3-Part 8 and University Regulations 3-3-Part 8). The portion of a chair’s workload devoted to chair duties shall be evaluated as “Chair Responsibilities” as a separate subcategory under service, which will be averaged into the overall service score as a weighted average according to workload. If the respective college dean chooses not to evaluate all faculty in his or her college for annual review, an annual evaluation of each chair, in his/her capacity as chair shall be conducted. Although the dean does not assign scores in the annual/biennial evaluation process, the dean will assign scores in evaluating the “chair responsibility” section of service. This evaluation will be averaged with the department faculty’s evaluation of the chair’s workload in his/her capacity as chair. If there is a disagreement as to the level of evaluation (as defined in 3-3-801(f)) between the department faculty’s evaluation of the chair, in his/her capacity as chair, and the dean’s evaluation, the results of each evaluation will be sent to the Chief Academic Officer as an information item. If the department faculty’s or dean’s evaluation of the chair’s performance as chair is at the level of “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement”, the dean shall convene a meeting with the department faculty to discuss the evaluation.