

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

PROPOSAL 2-14 (revised 09 April 2014)

(proposed admin. amendments in purple: 28 July 2014)

(VOTING UNITS: FULL SENATE)

Proposal to Modify Senate Procedure 506.1.1

EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND SCHOOL DEANS

I Introduction

The Senate developed several shared governance proposals in 1992, one of which was proposal 16-92 for the Review and Reappointment of Department Chairs and School Deans “Departmental Governance”. Over the years the procedure evolved and fixes were introduced to address problems encountered. The current procedure has a separate procedure for review of School Dean and Department Chair under the same number. Thus, Senators of Departments (Schools) would vote on modification made to those for School Deans (Department Chairs) even though they were unaffected by it. Furthermore, modification were made at some point in the procedure without regard to the overall structure and as a consequence several contradictory statements got incorporated. The procedure became baroque and complicated with contradictory statements. In summer of 2013, Senate President, Dean and Chairs of College of Engineering, and Provost worked on part of the procedure. This proposal was introduced in the Senate on September 9th 2013. Appendix B shows the old proposal with the following markups to identify the various problems and solutions:

~~Red strike out~~ — Deleted in summer of 2013.

~~Black Italic~~ — New language added in summer of 2013.

~~Blue Italic~~ — Analysis comments by the Administrative Policy Committee.

According to proposal 16-92, each department and school was to establish – as part of their charter – procedures for searching for a department chair or school dean and for evaluation and reappointment of the chair or school dean. Senate Proposal 6-11 (Procedure 506.1.1), adopted in March 2011, established for the first time the same evaluation process for department chairs and the same process for all school deans. It also states that upon conclusion of a review the Evaluation Committee should make recommendations on any changes they deem necessary. After the conclusion of several chair reviews feedback was received. After considering all suggestions, the following procedure is proposed to modify the chair review procedure. At the same time, the procedure for School Deans is cleaned up and aligned.

The current proposal is a new format to show clean lines of implementation and attempts to use old proposal language when possible. Contradictory statements have been removed. Conceptually, the following changes have been made:

1. A single procedure is used for Department Chairs and School Deans.
2. The survey instrument now has three sets of questions. (i) A set specified by College Dean for all departments in the college, or by Provost for all the schools. (ii) A set chosen by the review committee (as before) of the academic unit. (iii) Two questions chosen by the Administrator being reviewed.
3. A separate procedure for conducting survey and ballot that is significantly more confidential and anonymous which should help in increasing participation in the review process.
4. Language approved by the Senate for implementation of the result.

II Terminology

~~The administrative responsibilities of Department Chair and School Dean are similar, as are the three year term of appointments. But the school~~ **School Deans reports report** to the Provost and ~~the Department Chair~~ **Chairs**

~~reports~~ **report** to the College Dean. To develop a common procedure for the review of Department Chair and School Dean, a terminology is needed that will be applicable to both.

Academic Unit or just Unit: A school or a department.

Department Chair/School Dean and College Dean/Provost: Throughout the procedure it will be implicitly understood that Department Chair will be associated with college Dean and School Dean will be associated with Provost.

Committee: Unit Review Committee

III Frequency of Review

The term of appointment for a *Department Chair/School Dean* is three years. Reappointment reviews will take place in the third year of the first term of appointment. Subsequent reviews for consecutive appointments will take place in the second year to allow for a search in the third year if ~~the evaluation indicates waning support.~~ **necessary.**

The evaluation process also may be initiated by the *College Dean/Provost* or by the faculty (by a simple majority vote) at any time earlier, but not more than once a year. **During the first term, this evaluation is formative not normative by means of a simple survey instrument without ballots to provide timely feedback so that the School Dean/Chair can adjust policy or practice. It is meant to provide the School Dean/Chair with an opportunity to respond to any problems early on in their tenure and to demonstrate the ability to lead in a constructive and inclusive manner.**

At any point in the evaluation process, the *Department Chair/School Dean* may decide not to seek reappointment. In this case, the review process ends and all material related to the review process will be destroyed.

IV Constituency and Unit Review Committee

The Academic Unit Charter shall specify who is eligible to participate in the evaluation process as well as the structure and selection of the Committee for the review of their *Department Chair/School Dean*. The Charter shall define if the tabulation of the survey results and ballot counting for faculty and staff will be separate or together. The Committee will *not* include the current *Department Chair/School Dean* or any faculty or staff member *who* has a conflict of interest regarding the current *Department Chair/School Dean*'s review. The *College Dean/Provost* will resolve any conflict of interest if a doubt is raised regarding any individual's eligibility to serve as a member of the Committee.

The *College Dean/Provost* will appoint a member from outside the Unit to the Committee. This external committee member is an observer who ensures the integrity of the review process ~~is not compromised by the internal politics of the Unit.~~ The external member also acts as a liaison to the *College Dean/Provost* .

Any question related to the implementation or interpretation of ~~the~~ this procedure should be directed to the *College Dean/Provost* either through the external member or by the chair of the committee.

V Process Initiation

The *College Dean/Provost* will ask the *Department Chair/School Dean* to establish the Committee as per the Unit Charter in two weeks. The *College Dean/Provost* will also ask the *Department Chair/School Dean* to write her/his self-evaluation report as per the description in Department Chair/School Dean's Self-Evaluation and give it to the *College Dean/Provost* within two weeks.

VI Department Chair/School Dean's Self-Evaluation

The *Department Chair/School Dean* should prepare a written document evaluating his/her performance for the period of evaluation. This document should include but need not be limited to:

- A. Address each of the charges given at the time of his / her appointment.
- B. Achievement of the Unit's goals for the period of review.
- C. Budget and its management.
- D. Growth and quality of academic programs.
- E. Future needs and directions of the Unit.

F. Any goal that the *Department Chair/School Dean* thinks is controversial in the Unit and the effort (s)he made to address the controversy.

The *Department Chair/School Dean* is encouraged to provide comparative quantitative data in this report where relevant.

The distribution of this report will be followed by a meeting of all members of the department. The purpose of this meeting will be for the *Department Chair/School Dean* to answer questions and provide clarification about the report.

VII First Meeting of the Unit Review Committee

The *College Dean/Provost* shall call the first meeting of the Committee and review its charge, the procedures it should operate under, and the deadlines it should meet. A suggested timetable for the Committee's activities is provided as Appendix A. The *College Dean/Provost* will give the following documents to the Committee.

1. A redacted copy of the letter of appointment describing the charge given to the *Department Chair/School Dean*.
2. The self-evaluation report of the *Department Chair/School Dean*.
3. Results of the previous evaluation if the *Department Chair/School Dean* is seeking another term.
4. A set of survey questions that is common to all departments in the college or to all schools in the university.

The review committee shall decide if additional material is needed (for example, comparative data from Institutional Analysis) and seek to procure such material.

After the *College Dean/Provost* has left the room, the Committee shall elect its chair, establish (if possible) a convenient meeting time, and inform the Unit constituents the structure and membership of the Committee. The Committee is authorized to call Unit constituency meetings as it deems necessary.

VIII Survey Instrument

The survey instrument will have the following components.

- (1) A set of questions provided by the *College Dean/Provost* in an electronic file.
- (2) A set of question that the Committee chooses.

The Committee should look at the survey instruments posted on the Senate site, which are updated each time an academic unit conducts a review of its administrator. The Committee should look for questions that will help constituents provide additional information or perspective on the charge given to the *Department Chair/School Dean*.

If the survey results are to be tabulated separately for faculty and staff, then the set of questions for faculty and staff can be different.

- (3) Up to two questions that the *Department Chair/School Dean* may provide if (s)he so chooses.

The survey instruments will be created in an electronic file that will be later sent to the Senate Administrative Assistant for conducting the survey as discussed in Survey .

IX Unit Constituency Input

The *Department Chair/School Dean*'s self-evaluation report, the **redacted** letter of appointment describing the charge, and the survey instruments should be sent (posted electronically) to the constituents of the unit. This should be followed with meeting of the Unit Constituents without the *Department Chair/School Dean*. At the meeting the past evaluation results may also be shown. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss, change, and approve the survey instruments. Also a decision should be made if the comments from the survey will be included verbatim in the report described in Survey Report.

If necessary, the faculty and staff meeting may be separate to discuss the survey instruments and release of comments in the report.

X Survey

The survey instruments and the list of e-mail address (faculty and staff separated) will be sent to the Senate Administrative Assistant (SAA) as per the procedure described in Senate Procedure ~~707.1.1~~ 507.1.1. The Senate Administrative Assistant will conduct the survey for the Unit and return the results in electronic form to the chair and the external member of the review committee. The Committee chair will inform SAA the receipt of the files and ask SAA to delete all survey results that (s)he has. It is the responsibility of the chair and the external member of the Committee to maintain security of these files and the information that it contains.

XI Survey Report

The Committee will prepare a report that includes:

1. Tabulated results.
2. Summary statements of the major accomplishments and ~~problem~~ areas **for improvement** of the *Department Chair/School Dean* over the period of evaluation.
3. Verbatim statements if approved by the Unit Constituency in Unit Constituency Input.

XII Department Chair/School Dean's response

The Committee will give the *Department Chair/School Dean* the report generated in the above section. The *Department Chair/School Dean* will be asked if (s)he would like to respond to the report before it is presented to the Unit Constituency. The *Department Chair/School Dean* has 5 working days to respond to the report of the Committee.

The survey report will be augmented with the *Department Chair/School Dean's* response and will now on be called the 'report'.

If the *College Dean/Provost* informs the committee that the *Department Chair/School Dean* has decided not to seek reappointment then all review material will be destroyed and the Committee disbanded. The *College Dean/Provost* will inform the Unit constituents about the *Department Chair/School Dean's* decision at the time of dissolution of the committee.

XIII Dissemination of survey results

The Committee will arrange a closed meeting at which they will circulate the report. Copies of the report will not be taken outside the meeting room. All but two copies of the report will be destroyed after the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is the dissemination of survey material only, and not for additional discussion of the *Department Chair/School Dean's* performance.

For the period of review, the Committee will ensure a copy of the report is available for viewing by the Unit Constituents at a secure site where no copies can be made. The site can be the *College Dean/Provost's* office or within the offices of the Unit.

XIV Balloting

The Committee Chair will ask the Senate Administrative Assistant (SAA) to conduct the ballot on the question below as per the procedure described in Senate Procedure ~~707.1.1~~ 507.1.1.

(Name of *Department Chair/School Dean*) should be reappointed and continue as the *Department Chair/School Dean* of the unit.

Yes _____ No _____ **No Opinion Abstain** _____

The SAA will return the results of the ballot to the chair and the external member of the Committee. The Committee chair will inform SAA the receipt of the result and ask SAA to delete all survey results that (s)he has. The *Department Chair/School Dean* (**first**) and the Unit constituency (**second**) will be informed of the ballot results by the Committee.

XV Report to the College Dean/Provost

A file containing the self-evaluation of the *Department Chair/School Dean*, the tabulated results of the questionnaire, the verbatim comments, the synthesis of open-ended questions, the summary statements of the committee, the response of the *Department Chair/School Dean* and the results of the ballot will be forwarded to the *College Dean/Provost* .

The Committee will write a memo to the Senate President and the *College Dean/Provost* with the recommendations for changes in the evaluation procedure if any.

XVI Report by the College Dean/Provost

The *College Dean/Provost* must prepare a written ~~statement on the strengths and weaknesses~~ **evaluation** of the *Department Chair/School Dean*, including but not limited to the following areas:

- a. Guidance and management of the quality and growth of the academic programs within the Unit.
- b. Guidance and support of research activities within the Unit.
- c. Practice of sound financial management within the Unit.
- d. Management and guidance of personnel within the Unit.
- e. Definition of goals within the department and progress of the Unit toward these established goals.

The *College Dean/Provost* will meet with the *Department Chair/School Dean* to discuss the evaluation, ballot results, and the reappointment recommendation.

XVII Implementation of the Results

The *College Dean/Provost* will forward the report and his/her recommendation through the administrative structure to the University President.

When the administration decides to reappoint a department chair or a school dean contrary to a majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the academic unit.

If two-thirds majority of the voting constituency of either faculty or staff, votes not to reappoint a department chair or a school dean, the administration will normally honor the decision of the academic unit. When the administration decides contrary to a 2/3 majority vote, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the department/school.

At a meeting with the Unit, the *College Dean/Provost* shall present the Administration's decision and discuss the contents of the report. The *Department Chair/School Dean* will not be present at this meeting.

XVIII Closure and Storage of Evaluation Material

All evaluation material will be kept in the office of the *College Dean/Provost* , and will be supplied to the next Evaluation Committee as described First Meeting of the Unit Review Committee. All evaluation material, except that required by the human resources, will be destroyed once the *Department Chair/School Dean* leaves the position.

Appendix A: Sample Time Line of the Review Process

The time line below is suggestive and not prescriptive. It is possible to reduce the total time for the review process by doing some activities simultaneously. It is recommended that the Unit Review Committee establish its own time line for conducting review in a timely manner.

- Week 1 & 2 The *College Dean/Provost* asks the *Department Chair/School Dean* to form the review committee and write the self-evaluation report. See Section Process Initiation.
- Week 3 The *College Dean/Provost* calls the first meeting of the committee, defines the charge, and gives all relevant documents. The committee elects chair, and if possible decide on a meeting time and informs the constituency of the committee structure and membership. See First Meeting of the Unit Review Committee
- Week 4 Committee develops survey instruments for the constituencies. See Survey Instrument.
- Week 5 Unit constituency to approve the survey Instrument. See Unit Constituency Input
- Week 6-7 The Committee send the survey instruments and list of e-mail addresses to the Senate Administrative Assistant who conducts the survey and return the results as per procedure described in Senate Procedure ~~707.1.1~~ 507.1.1. See Survey .
- Week 8 Committee writes report. See Survey Report.
- Week 9 Committee Send Report to the *Department Chair/School Dean* and obtain her/his response. See Department Chair/School Dean's response.
- Week 10 Committee calls a meeting of the Unit Constituency for reading of the report and establishes a secure site where any constituent can see the report. See Dissemination of survey results
- Week 11 Ballot for reappointment is conducted as per procedure described in Senate Procedure ~~707.1.1~~ 507.1.1. See Balloting
- Week 12 The Committee sends the report to the *College Dean/Provost* . See Sections Report to the College Dean/Provost and Report by the College Dean/Provost
- Week 13 The *College Dean/Provost* writes the report and calls Unit Constituency meeting to discuss it. See Report by the College Dean/Provost .

Appendix B: Annotated Proposal 6-11

Following scheme is used to identify changes and problems in the 506.1.1 procedure that was approved as proposal 6-11 on **23 March 2011** [The existing procedure]

Red strike out	Deleted in summer of 2013.
Black Italic	New language added in summer of 2013.
Blue Italic	Analysis comments by the Administrative Policy Committee.

Background:

Senate Procedure 506.1.1 states that upon conclusion of a review the Evaluation Committee should make recommendations on any changes they deem necessary. After the conclusion of several chair reviews feedback was received. After giving all of the suggestions consideration the following procedure is proposed to modify the chair review procedure. No changes are proposed to the School Dean review in this proposal.

The Senate has the responsibility and authority to establish procedures for the selections of Deans, School Deans and Department Chairs (Senate Constitution Article III.F.1.a.10) and the responsibility to make recommendations for their evaluation (Senate Constitution Article III.F.4.b.9). Following the adoption of the departmental governance policies defined by Senate Proposal 16-92, university units established revised procedures for searching for new Chairs and evaluating the performance of those serving as Chairs.

Over the last twenty years, the University administration has come to believe that these procedures should be defined by University-wide policy and not on a unit-by-unit basis. Among the rationales for this change is the fact that Chairs and School Deans are administrative officers and thus serve at the discretion of the president, The University but units have rights of appeal as defined in the grievance policy outlined by [Senate Proposal 23-00](#). As an extension of this fact, units have the power of review and comment during searching, hiring, and evaluating/reviewing. *[The underlined statement has been addressed by the Senate Motion at the Senate meeting 543.]*

Academic units and members of the administrative team have disagreed whether an individual unit can direct a search to be for internal or external candidates. This proposal mandates an **open** search for a School Dean and grants the authority to resolve this issue to the appropriate **College** Dean or the Provost in consultation with the department for a Chair search. *[This is a review process. This statement does not belong here.]*

This proposal contains language duplicated from current, approved charter procedures for both School Deans (i.e., Forestry) and Department Chairs (i.e., Chemical Engineering). Editorial and other changes have been made to the material which afford the following differences:

1. All School Dean searches will be open in scope. *[This is a review process. This statement does not belong here.]*
2. The proposal contains an annual mechanism by which the Provost, School Dean (for Associate Deans), or a majority of the School's faculty and staff can initiate an interim review.
3. Units still have to evaluate their chairs after three years of service, but a mechanism for surveys after the second and fifth years of service so as to provide useful feedback for improvement is included. Most charters previously allowed for this at the end of every year but only if a Senator requested one or if a majority of the unit faculty assessed by vote requested one. *[Belongs to Charter]*
4. School Deans and Chairs currently serving terms during the term when this proposal is approved will enter the evaluation cycle according to the years passed since their most recent appointment or reappointment.

Proposal Text:

This policy applies to Departmental Chairs and Deans of Schools only. Search provisions for Deans of Colleges and the Dean of the Graduate School are governed by Proposal 19-07 (Senate Procedures 802.1.1) and Proposal 17-

B. Evaluation of the School Dean and Associate School Dean

1. Every third year, the School Dean shall be evaluated to determine whether he/she will be re-appointed. This evaluation will be conducted by the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee using University-wide guidelines and concentrating on performance in the following areas: 1) establishing objectives consistent with the School's mission and, 2) meeting those stated objectives. Membership of the committee may be augmented by faculty and staff from other colleges, schools, or universities as is deemed necessary by the faculty and staff of the School in consultation with the Provost. Students as well as members of the School's Advisory Board may also serve on the committee as is appropriate. The evaluation process will include a written self-evaluation by the School Dean, survey of faculty and staff opinions of the School Dean's performance of his/her responsibilities, a summary of the faculty and staff comments and opinions compiled by the Committee, and the School Dean's response to their report. The committee will hold a secret ballot vote of the School's members (as defined by the charter) to provide advice regarding the School Dean's reappointment. The Committee's report, School Dean's response, and the results of the vote will be disseminated to all School faculty and staff, and submitted to the Provost. A copy of the evaluation shall be placed in the permanent records of the School. The Provost should meet with the faculty and staff of the School to discuss the evaluation results before action is taken on reappointment. The final decision to reappoint or replace the School Dean is made by the University upper administration as specified by MTU policies. *[The underlined statement has been addressed by the Senate Motion at the Senate meeting 543.]*
2. *[School of Forestry is the only academic unit that evaluates Associate School Deans and it is written in their Charter. It does not belong in a University Procedure]* Every third year, the Associate School Dean position if it exists in the school will also be evaluated to determine whether he/she will be re-appointed. This evaluation will also be conducted by the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee using the guidelines adopted for University-wide usage and concentrating on performance in the duties listed for the position in the school's charter. Membership of the Committee may be augmented by faculty and staff from other colleges or departments as is deemed necessary by the faculty and staff of the School in consultation with the School Dean. Students may also serve on the committee as is appropriate to the evaluation criteria. The evaluation process will include a written self-evaluation by the Associate School Dean, survey of faculty and staff opinions of the Associate School Dean's performance of his/her duties, a summary of the faculty and staff comments and opinions compiled by the Committee, and the Associate School Dean's response to their report. A secret ballot of the School tenure-track and research faculty will be conducted to solicit input on whether the Associate School Dean should or should not be re-appointed. The Committee's report, Associate School Dean's response, and the results of the vote will be disseminated to all School faculty and staff, and submitted to the School Dean. A copy of the evaluation shall be placed in the permanent records of the School. The School Dean will meet with the faculty and staff of the School to discuss the evaluation results before action is taken on reappointment. Final responsibility to retain or replace the Associate School Dean rests with the School Dean and the School Dean's decision to reappoint the Associate School Dean must be confirmed by a simple majority vote of the tenure-track and research faculty using a secret ballot.
3. *[Nothing prevents any unit for writing this in their Charter]* Interim Survey of the School Dean and Associate School Dean. Once per interim year (i.e., years one or two), a survey of the School Dean's performance may also be done if any one of the Provost, the School Dean, or a majority of the faculty and staff of the School (as defined in the School's charter) request(s) a special survey. The School Dean leadership skills shall be surveyed using questions deemed appropriate by an interim evaluation committee (formed as described below). These surveys are meant to provide the School Dean with an opportunity to respond to any problems, real or imagined, early on in their tenure and to demonstrate the ability to lead in a constructive and inclusive manner. Interim surveys will be conducted by a committee comprised of three persons, one faculty member appointed by the Provost, one elected by the faculty, and one from the Professional staff. The purpose of this committee will be to prepare an appropriate questionnaire (the Provost can suggest questions), distribute this to interested parties, and compile the results which will be presented to the School Dean for his/her use and to the

Provost. One departmental meeting for all involved parties shall be held at the end to discuss the results whereupon all data should be destroyed with one record being kept in the Provost's office.

4. Closure

The department's Senator or his/her designee must inform the Senate that the School's evaluation process has been concluded and offer any recommendations for changes in the evaluation process the Evaluation Committee deems necessary. This can be done during a Senate meeting or by email to the Senate office before the date of the last Senate meeting for the year in question.

B. Evaluation and Reappointment of Chairs

1. The Department Charter shall specify who is eligible to participate in the evaluation process as well as the structure and selection of the Evaluation Committee for their Chair. The Evaluation Committee will not include the current chair or any faculty member ~~that~~ who has a conflict of interest regarding the current chair's evaluation. Written guidelines on these types of conflict-of-interest situations may not be in the MTU faculty handbook or in the Board of Control Bylaws and Policies. *[What kind of conflict of interest are we talking here that are not even defined in university policy? Let Dean resolve these unspecified conflicts]*
2. **Frequency of Evaluation:**

~~The term of appointment for the Chair is three years and the Chair's performance will be assessed by means of a survey (conducted in the second year of the first term only) and reviews. The survey need to be conducted so as to provide timely feedback to the Chair so they can adjust policy or practice before their in-depth review for reappointment.~~

~~Reappointment reviews take place in the third year of the first term and then in the second year of the consecutive appointments to allow for a search in the third year if the evaluation indicates waning support. A search will normally be conducted if the support is less than 50% of the voting constituency.~~

*The term of appointment for a Chair is three years. The Chair's performance will be assessed by means of a survey conducted in the second year of the first term of appointment. The survey needs to be conducted to provide timely feedback so that the Chair can adjust policy or practice before the reappointment review. This second-year survey does **not** include a ballot regarding reappointment.*

*Reappointment reviews take place in the third year of the first term of appointment. Subsequent reviews for consecutive appointments take place in the second year to allow for a search in the third year if the evaluation indicates waning support. A search will normally be conducted if the support is less than 50% of the voting constituency. *[Contradicted by later statement. The underlined statement has been addressed by the Senate Motion at the Senate meeting 543.]**

The evaluation process also may be initiated by the Dean or by the faculty (by a simple majority vote) at any time earlier, but not more than once a year.

At any point in the evaluation process, the Chair may decide not to seek reappointment. In this case, the evaluation process ends and all written and electronically stored material related to the evaluation process will be destroyed.

3. Self-Evaluation by the Department Chair: During a mandatory reappointment review, the Chair will prepare a written report that is distributed to all faculty and staff of the department. This report should include but need not be limited to:

- A. Achievement of the department goals for the period of evaluation.
- B. Budget and its management.
- C. Growth and quality of academic programs.
- D. Future needs and directions of the department/~~school~~.
- E. The charge given to the Chair or any goal of the department that the Chair thinks is controversial in the department and the effort the Chair has made to address the controversy.

The distribution of this report will be followed by a meeting of all members of the department. The purpose of this meeting will be for the Chair to answer questions and provide clarification about the report.

4. Evaluation Procedures: ~~Department Evaluation Committee will create a survey questionnaire with which their members can evaluate the Chair's performance.~~ *The Department Evaluation Committee will create a survey questionnaire to be used to evaluate the Chair's performance.* The Department's Evaluation Committee will determine the format **and method** of the questionnaire. Each College Dean's office will keep sample questionnaires on file to help Department Committees prepare their own survey instrument. The Senate office also has a listing of suggested questions. Once prepared, questionnaires will be sent to ~~all faculty and staff of the department~~ *those who are eligible to participate in the survey as defined by the Department Charter.* Evaluation committees should use the Senate's standard balloting procedures (**given below**). ~~The faculty and staff will be given one week to return the completed form to the Evaluation Committee.~~ *The survey participants shall be given 7 calendar days to return the completed form to the Evaluation Committee.*

-
The questionnaire should include but not be limited to addressing the following areas:

- a. Guidance and management of the quality and growth of the academic programs within the Department.*
- b. Guidance and support of research activities within the Department.*
- c. Practice of sound financial management within the Department.*
- d. Management and guidance of personnel within the Department.*
- e. Definition of goals within the Department and progress of the Department toward these established goals.*

5. Processing of Questionnaire Results: *[Also discussed in Dissemination of Questionnaire Results]*

The Evaluation Committee will tabulate and analyze the results. ~~The committee will be sensitive to the interests and concerns of various members of the unit while preparing, conducting, and tabulating the results of the survey (including tenured/tenure track faculty, lecturers, staff, "professors of practice," research engineer/scientists, administrators) within the department. The committee will synthesize comments from open ended questions and prepare summary statements of the major accomplishments and problem areas of the Chair over the period of evaluation.~~ *The committee will synthesize comments from the open-ended questions and prepare summary statements of the major accomplishments and problem areas of the Chair over the period of evaluation.*

[Comments should be verbatim if possible. In any case the verbatim comments should be given to the Dean] The committee will comment on progress in previously identified problem areas. Results of the previous evaluation may be obtained from the College Dean.*[The Dean should give these to the committee at the first meeting, before the survey instrument is designed.]*

6. Chair's Response: The Evaluation Committee will give the Chair a *complete* copy of the survey results, ~~which may include~~ *including* tabulated results, synthesis of the open-ended questions, and summary statements. The Chair will be asked if he/she would like to respond to the report before it is presented to members of the department. If the Chair decides not to seek reappointment, then the process is terminated, and the members of the department will be informed of the Chair's decision. All material, including digital media, related to the evaluation process will be destroyed.

7. Dissemination of Questionnaire Results: The evaluation committee will prepare a report, including the tabulated results, synthesis of open-ended questions, any summary statements prepared by the committee, and (if provided) the response of the Chair. The Evaluation Committee will arrange a closed departmental meeting at which they will circulate this report to all faculty and staff in the department. Copies of the documents will not be taken outside the meeting room. All but two copies of the documents will be destroyed after the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is the dissemination of evaluation material only, and not for additional discussion of the Chair's performance.

One copy of the report will be kept in the office of the College Dean. Any member of the department may see the evaluation material at any time during the reappointment process at the office of the College Dean. The second copy will be used in the file described in item 9.

8. Balloting: A vote on the question below will be conducted using ~~the Senate standard balloting procedures (see section C. below)~~ *a secret ballot.* The ballot will be sent only to the ~~members of the senate constituency in the department~~ *eligible participants* and tabulated by the Evaluating Committee.

(Name of Chair) should be reappointed or continue as the Chair of the Department

Yes _____ No _____ No Opinion _____

~~All the faculty and staff of the department will be informed of the ballot results by the Evaluation Committee. The Dean will report the ballot results to the Chair during their meeting described in Section 10. [That is a big change without a discussion by the Senate].~~

9. Implementation of Evaluation Results: A file containing the self-evaluation of the Chair, the original completed questionnaires, the tabulated results of the questionnaire, the synthesis of open-ended questions, the summary statements of the committee, the response of the Chair, and the results of the ballot will be forwarded to the College Dean. ~~the Provost, and the President who will make the final decision on reappointment.~~

When the administration decides contrary to a 2/3 majority vote, the College Dean or the Provost will provide written explanation of the reasons for that decision to the members of the department. *[Contradicts earlier statement. The statement has been addressed by the Senate Motion at the Senate meeting 543.]*

10. Report by College Dean: ~~When~~ Whether a Chair is reappointed, or denied reappointment the ~~direct supervisor of the Chair~~ College Dean must prepare a written statement on the strengths and weaknesses of the Chair, including but not limited to the following areas:

- a. Guidance and management of the quality and growth of the academic programs within the department.
- b. Guidance and support of research activities within the department.
- c. Practice of sound financial management within the department.
- d. Management and guidance of personnel within the department.
- e. Definition of goals within the department and progress of the department toward these established goals.

The Dean will meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation, ballot results, and the reappointment recommendation.

The Dean will forward the evaluation results and his/her report to the Provost and President who will make the final decision on reappointment.

~~The report is distributed to all members of the department and a meeting with the College Dean is held to answer questions and to provide clarifications.~~

The College Dean shall present and discuss the contents of the report at a meeting with the Department. The Dean will also inform the Department of the ballot results at this meeting. The Chair will not be present at this meeting.

11. Storage of Reports: The self-evaluation report of the Chair, the report of the College Dean, the tabulated results, the synthesis of open-ended questions, the summary statements of the committee, and the ballot results will be kept in the office of the College Dean, and will be supplied to the next Evaluation Committee. The above documents including digital information (emails, downloaded files, etc.) will be destroyed once the Chair leaves the position.

12. Closure: The department's Senator or his/her designee must inform the Senate that the evaluation process has been concluded and offer any recommendations for changes in the evaluation process the Evaluation Committee deems necessary. This can be done during a Senate meeting or by email to the Senate office before the date of the last Senate meeting for the year in question.

~~How to conduct a Secret Ballot Procedure~~

~~Secret ballots will be conducted using a double envelope process. The marked ballot will be placed into a small sealed envelope. This envelope must be sealed into a larger envelope, which must be signed by the voter across the flap. The Committee (Promotion and Tenure in the case of a School or the Search or Evaluation Committee in the case of a Chair) must be present when the votes are separated from the large outer envelope by the School Dean's or Chair's Administrative Associate. The School Dean's or Chair's Administrative Associate also will record the names of the voters. Finally, the School Dean's or Chair's Administrative Associate will mix the smaller envelopes and give them to the appropriate Committee for vote counting. The department or school can decide if the counting is conducted with a quorum of faculty members present or if the committee can count the votes. [Will be using procedure described in Senate Procedure 707.1-1 507.1.1]~~

Proposal 16-92:

Adopted as Amended by Senate: 29 September 1993

Approved by President: 15 February 1994

Approved by Board of Control: 18 March 1994

Proposal 6-11:

Introduced to Senate: 10 November 2010

Adopted by Senate: 02 February 2011

Amended by Administration: 11 March 2011

Amendments Adopted by Senate: 23 March 2011

-

-

Proposal 2-14:

Introduced to Senate: 26 March 2014

Added by Committee highlighted in yellow: 02 April 2014

Approved Amendment highlighted in green: 09 April 2014

Vote postponed for 2 weeks

Approved by Senate: 23 April 2014

Approved by Administration with amendments (in purple): 28 July 2014

Senate Approved Amendments: 24 September 2014

Corrected typographical error in five places from Senate Procedure #707.1.1 to 507.1.1: 19 November 2014