

**Faculty Senate Governance Committee
Continuity Report
Prepared By: Stephen Owen**

1. The Governance Committee considered several initiatives that were not brought to completion in the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate, as the committee's attention was turned to other items. Should the 2011-2012 Governance Committee wish to continue them, they are:
 - a. A motion (attached below), based on conversation in the committee, to revise department chair/school director evaluation processes and to create renewable terms of service. The Council of Chairs was in favor of, and recommended to the Governance Committee, the elimination of the quadrennial evaluations. The motion did not proceed from the Governance Committee because there remained practical concerns about the implementation and imposition of the renewable term provision.
 - b. The Faculty Senate Executive Council referred to the Governance Committee the task of exploring the possibility of setting aside a weekly "common hour" during which no classes (or a minimal number of classes) would be held, to facilitate a common time for programming and/or meetings. We did not have time to explore this issue.
 - c. The Faculty Senate Executive Council, in the formal list of committee objectives, charged the Governance Committee with reviewing the procedures utilized by the Faculty Appeals Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee. The committee decided that it would be best to formally request each committee to review its own procedures. If the committee and/or Faculty Senate Executive Council wish to retain this objective, the first point of contact for the committee would be to contact the Appeals and Grievance Committee chairs to ask them to undertake such a review.
 - d. A particularly significant charge to the committee from the Faculty Senate Executive Council was the following: "Develop criteria for distinguishing between governance or structural changes and curricular changes in academic affairs. (a) Develop a document with table of contents that lists the process that each such governance or structural change must go through, from start to finish. (b) For each type of governance or structural change, create documents with the appropriate signature lines for the proposal and approval of such changes." Other committee business left too little time to accomplish this task, but it is a significant one for the committee to undertake – although the committee would only likely be able to do so if this was issued as one, among few other, of the committee's primary objectives.
 - e. In its formal list of committee objectives, the Faculty Senate Executive Council asked the committee to review and, if necessary, make recommendations

regarding the department chair/school director evaluation form. The committee did review the form currently utilized, but did not draw conclusions about whether revisions were necessary.

2. One of the most substantial tasks that the Governance Committee must undertake is conducting the faculty evaluation of academic deans and the University Librarian. Here are some points of information regarding that process:
 - a. Refer to page 6 of the 2011-2012 Personnel Timetable ([http://provost.radford.edu/policy_manuals/2011-2012%20Personnel%20Timeline%20\(By%20Action\)%20REV-06-28-11.pdf](http://provost.radford.edu/policy_manuals/2011-2012%20Personnel%20Timeline%20(By%20Action)%20REV-06-28-11.pdf)) for dates pertinent to the dean evaluation process.
 - b. Collect from each dean and the University Librarian the annual report that they are to distribute by March 30. Arrange for the Faculty Senate Secretary to place these evaluations in the Faculty Senate web space, as you will need to link to them in the online dean's evaluation form.
 - c. Relevant policy documents related to dean evaluations are Section 1.4.3.1 of the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook* and Section 1.10 of the *Administrative and Professional Faculty Handbook*.
 - d. As noted in the Personnel Timetable and the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook*, the questions administered on the dean's evaluation form are to be developed between the Provost and Governance Committee, with the approval of the Governance Committee. Last year, there was no change to the questions. Note that the questions for College of Graduate and Professional Studies and McConnell Library differ somewhat from those administered for the six undergraduate colleges.
 - e. Evaluations are administered to Administrative and Professional Faculty within each college and to Teaching and Research Faculty (tenured, tenure-track, special purpose, full-time temporary, adjunct) within each college. In the spring semester, work with Vickie Taylor in the Provost's Office to obtain a list (with e-mail addresses) of AP and T&R faculty (including adjuncts) listed by college, as well as library faculty. It is best for this to be in an Excel file.
 - f. Dean evaluations are submitted directly to the Provost. Last year, each committee member took the "lead" on writing up one dean's (University Librarian's) evaluation (not from his or her own college), and then the committee as a whole reviewed each of the evaluations. For each dean and University Librarian (8 total), the committee submitted:
 1. A narrative of approximately 2-3 paragraphs summarizing the numerical results and comments. The narrative included the number of respondents and a breakdown by type of faculty, indications of highest and lowest ratings, and a summary (with representative excerpts) of comments. A sample template:

Dear Provost _____,

The Governance Committee of the Faculty Senate has conducted the annual deans' evaluations for the academic year _____.

This letter summarizes the evaluations of Dean _____ by the faculty of the College of _____.

_____ of _____ faculty members responded to the survey and _____ provided comments. Of these faculty, _____ were tenured/tenure track, _____ were special purpose, etc. With respect to the numerical ratings, Dean _____ received the highest evaluations in the areas of _____ <e.g., "in the area of nicest office (mean: 4.24),"...>. The areas rated lowest by the faculty were _____.

In general, the written comments were (positive/negative/mixed), as they mentioned... (distill themes and illustrative comments).

The Governance Committee of the Faculty Senate is hopeful that these evaluations will be useful in your annual assessment of deans.

2. An unedited copy of all comments from the evaluation. This can be taken directly from the Qualtrics output.
 3. A data table for the quantitative indicators, listing the number of responses in each evaluative category (exceptional, exceeds expectations, etc.) for each of the questions. This can be generated in Qualtrics.
- g. The survey itself is conducted using the Qualtrics program. Details follow.
1. The Qualtrics webpage is available through the Radford University webpage: <http://acadcomp.asp.radford.edu/qualtrics/>. I'd rather not put the username and password in an open document, given that these are personnel materials. However, I am happy to provide the information to the incoming chair of the Governance Committee.
 2. Note that this is a special build of Qualtrics that is designed to remove IP addresses, to ensure anonymity of responses.
 3. To prepare for the administration of the evaluations, you'll need to create one Excel file for each college, listing the faculty in that college (AP and T&R, or library for the University Librarian) within each college. The e-mail field is the most important, and if I recall, that column in Excel needs to be headed either "PrimaryEmail" or "Email" (without the quotation marks) in order to successfully import – although I don't remember which. Then, you can create a Qualtrics panel containing the list for each college by importing the Excel file (see

<http://www.qualtrics.com/university/researchsuite/distributing/panels/build-a-panel>).

4. The 2011 questionnaires are available. You can copy and then (if necessary) edit them to update any necessary information. If you click the "Create Survey" tab, there's an option to "Create from Copy," so you don't have to generate each questionnaire from scratch.
5. The "Edit Survey" tab is where you can make changes to each survey instrument. At the very least, you'll need to update the names for units with different deans than they had last year, and you'll need to update the links to each dean's annual goals (see item 2b, above).
6. The 2010-2011 Governance Committee developed the following instruction set to appear within the survey, itself:

Faculty evaluation of deans is conducted by the Faculty Senate Governance Committee under the authority of Section 1.4.3.1 of the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook. Evaluation forms are distributed to all Teaching and Research (T&R) Faculty and Administrative and Professional (AP) Faculty within a college. Be advised that the Governance Committee will process evaluations as described in Section 1.4.3.1 of the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook:

"The Committee shall summarize the data and comments from the faculty evaluations by type of faculty (tenured and tenure-track; special purpose and full-time temporary; and adjunct faculty, unless there is only one person in a category) for each College Dean and make appropriate recommendations based on the data. The Committee summary and recommendations, together with copies of each Dean evaluation form, shall be forwarded to the Provost." It is at the Provost's discretion to determine whether to share the verbatim comments from the evaluation forms with the Dean.

Also, please note that this evaluation must be completed in one session; if you close your browser before completing the form, you may not return to the form. Evaluations will "time out" four hours after starting; at that point, completed items will be counted but no further changes can be made.

Please indicate your rating of Dean ___ of the College of ___ on the form below. You may also provide written comments in the space provided.

7. In order to ensure the integrity of the evaluation process, the 2010-2011 Governance Committee used the following settings in "survey options," which needed to be made for each survey. They include:

- a. Make sure "Back Button" is unchecked.
 - b. Make sure "Save and Continue" is unchecked.
 - c. Make sure "By Invitation Only" is checked.
 - d. Check "This survey is valid from (and indicate the start date and end date, based on the Personnel Timetable).
 - e. In the "Partial Completion" section, select "After 4 Hours."
 - f. The other settings in "Survey Options" are fine.
8. To send the survey, click the "Distribute Survey" tab, and then the "Email Survey" button. In the "To" drop-down menu, you can navigate to the appropriate panel (developed in item 3, above) for that college. Enter your name and e-mail address, and an appropriate subject line, in the message. You'll see that there is preprinted text in the message with links – leave those, and above them, place your introductory message. You can click "Send Test Email" to email yourself to see what the message will look like, and you click "Schedule Mailing" to actually send the e-mail and links to all recipients.

The text used by the 2010-2011 Governance Committee as the body of the e-mail (consistent with the instruction set in item 6, above) was:

Dear Faculty of the College of __,

*Each year, the Faculty Senate Governance Committee is responsible for conducting faculty evaluation of deans. Below, you will find a link to the evaluation form for Dean __ of the College of __. Per the Personnel Timetable, all evaluations must be completed by __. **Please note that this evaluation must be completed in one session; if you close your browser before completing the form, you may not return to the form. Evaluations will "time out" four hours after starting; at that point, completed items will be counted but no further changes can be made.***

<Here is where the links are that were pre-printed in the email>

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Chair, Faculty Senate Governance Committee

9. Results may be viewed in the "View Reports" tab. The results can also be exported to a variety of formats from this tab.

One important note: The quantitative part of the questionnaire contains a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Unsatisfactory" to

“Exceptional.” There is also an “Insufficient information to evaluate” option that respondents may select.

Currently, the Likert scale is scored (by Qualtrics) on a 1-5 numerical scale and the “Insufficient information to evaluate” option is scored (by Qualtrics) as the value 8. This poses a difficulty in interpretation. The Qualtrics program appears to require that all options have a numeric value, and there is no value that is logical for “Insufficient information to evaluate,” because it really is not part of the Likert scale. As a result, inclusion of the “Insufficient information to evaluate” option in the analysis of the Likert results artificially skews the mean values of each quantitative item. There may be a way to exclude the “Insufficient information to evaluate” option from the calculation of the mean in Qualtrics, but we were unable to discover a way to do so last year.

What we did last year to account for this, in order to ensure that mean values of the quantitative Likert scale items were accurate, was to export the quantitative results to Excel. In Excel, we recalculated the mean for the quantitative items, without counting the “Insufficient information to evaluate” category. These means were the ones used when reporting highest and lowest categories in the narrative report described in 2-f-1, above. However, we did include the “Insufficient information to evaluate” category in the table of responses provided to the Provost, described in 2-f-3, above.

10. If I can be of assistance with Qualtrics, just let me know.

**MOTION: TERMS AND EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS/SCHOOL DIRECTORS
REFERRED BY: GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

MOTION

The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook* (deletions in strikethrough, insertions in red):

Section 1.3.2.1: Term of Service as Department Chair or School Director

Department Chairs and School Directors will be appointed for ~~renewable~~ four-year terms. ~~During the spring of the third year, an in-depth formal evaluation shall be conducted by the Dean in consultation with the faculty of the department or school. (See section 1.4.2, evaluation of Chairs and Directors.)~~ Terms of Department Chairs and School Directors may be renewed, with additional in-depth evaluations to take place in the third year of each term. **In the semester prior to the conclusion of each four-year term, a process shall be conducted as described in section 1.3.2 to determine who will be selected as department chair or school director for the next four-year term. In the selection process, the incumbent chair may choose to stand for re-selection.**

During the four-year term, ~~C~~continuation in the role as Department Chair or School Director shall be based on the Chair/Director's enjoying the continued trust and confidence of the faculty and Dean as reflected in the evaluations of the Chair or Director by the department faculty and by the Dean. **Each year, the Department Chair or School Director must, in consultation with the department or school faculty and the Dean, establish annual goals.** As described in section 1.4.2 of this Handbook, annual evaluations of Department Chairs and School Directors by departmental faculty and by the Dean shall be based on the responsibilities and annual goals communicated to the chair or director and shall identify specific weakness, if any, and recommendations for improvement.

Whenever weaknesses are identified in a final, signed evaluation as serious, either by the department faculty or by the Dean, the chair or director shall develop a plan for improvement and a reasonable time line, to be approved by the Dean in consultation with the department faculty, as deemed appropriate by the Dean. In the event that improvement is not satisfactorily effected within the time line, the Dean, in consultation with the department faculty, may recommend an alternative plan and time line or shall recommend to the Provost removal of the chair or director.

Section 1.4.2: Evaluation of Department Chairs and School Directors

A. Annual Evaluation

The Department/School Personnel Committee shall evaluate the Department Chair or School Director annually in two separate evaluations, one as a faculty member and one as chair or director. Both evaluations shall be conveyed to both the Department Chair or School Director and the College Dean. The College Dean shall review the Personnel Committee's evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a

faculty member, and shall separately evaluate him or her as a chair or director, subject to review by the Provost.

Evaluations of Department Chairs or School Directors shall be prepared annually in writing before the end of the spring semester. The primary purpose of the evaluation will be to provide guidance for development and to provide assessment for decisions related to merit pay and continuation in the role. ~~These annual evaluations will be available for consideration by the Dean during the detailed review that will be conducted during the third year of each Chair's or Director's four year term.~~

The annual evaluation of Department Chairs and School Directors shall be conducted as follows:

1. Evaluation as Faculty: The criteria for evaluation as a faculty member shall be the same as those for all faculty members except that the minimal weights allowable for teaching and university service shall be commensurate with their reassigned time. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall administer and collect the same data for the Department Chair or School Director as for all department faculty.
2. Evaluation as Chair or Director: ~~Prior to the annual evaluation of the Chair or Director, each Chair or Director shall prepare and distribute to all faculty within the department or school an annual report summarizing his or her accomplishments related to responsibilities as Chair or Director, with reference to goals established for the year.~~ The criteria for evaluation as Chair or Director shall reflect the duties and responsibilities of the chair or director as listed in section 4.2.3.1 of this Handbook. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall circulate to all currently employed faculty of the department who reported to the Chair or Director during all or part of the evaluation period a Department Chair/School Director evaluation form based upon these evaluation criteria and shall include an appropriate place for an overall evaluation of the Chair or Director. Faculty beginning their employment during the semester in which the evaluation is conducted would not evaluate the Chair or Director since they were not employed by the University during the evaluation period. The forms will be completed and returned to the Department/School Personnel Committee.
3. Data and comments from the faculty evaluations shall be summarized by the Department/School Personnel Committee. ~~The Department/School Personnel Committee should also take into account the Chair or School Director's annual report in preparing their evaluation of the Chair or Director.~~ The Department/School Personnel Committee shall then evaluate the Department Chair or School Director as a faculty member and separately as a chair, in tentative evaluations to be sent to the Department Chair or School Director.
4. Each Chair or Director will be given the opportunity to respond to both of the Personnel Committee's tentative evaluations of the Chair or Director-- as a faculty member and as a Chair or Director-- before the finalized evaluations are forwarded to the Dean. The appeal procedures shall be the same as those described for faculty.

5. The Department/School Personnel Committee's summary and overall evaluations of the Department Chair or School Director as a faculty member and as a chair or director shall be forwarded to the College Dean. All data used by the Personnel Committee shall be made available to the College Dean.
6. A minority report signed by all concurring faculty may be written if either or both of the Personnel Committee's evaluations are unacceptable to a minority of the committee members. A minority report is seen as an exception rather than standard procedure and shall include a justification for its creation. The minority report shall be submitted to the Dean as a separate document and shall be included with the Personnel Committee's evaluations. A copy shall be sent to the Chair or Director.
7. If the Dean disagrees with the Department/School Personnel Committee's evaluation of the Chair or Director as a faculty member in his or her review thereof, he or she shall give the Department Chair or School Director and Personnel Committee Chair a written statement of the reason(s) for the disagreement. The Department Personnel Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on any points of perceived disagreement.
8. The Dean shall communicate his or her evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director to the Department Chair or School Director in writing. The Department Chair or School Director shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to his or her evaluation as chair prior to the Dean's communication of a final evaluation to the Personnel Committee and to the Provost.
9. The College Dean shall forward her or his evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director, together with the evaluation of that role by the Department/School Personnel Committee, to the Provost, with copies sent to the Department Chair or School Director and to the Department/School Personnel Committee. In a case of a departure by the Dean from the evaluation by the Personnel Committee, the Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on the reason(s) for the departure.
10. The College Dean's evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director, and all pertinent data including any written responses from the Chair or Director and/or the Personnel Committee, shall be reviewed by the Provost, who shall provide written justification for any disagreement with the Dean's evaluation. In the event of disagreement by the Department Chair or School Director with the Dean's evaluation of him or her as chair, the Provost shall render a decision in the matter.
11. If the Chair or Director wishes to appeal his or her evaluation(s) either as faculty member or as chair, or the review(s) thereof by the Dean or the Provost, respectively, the process followed shall be consistent with that for faculty appeals. The final evaluations of the Department Chair or School Director both

as a faculty member and as a chair, following any possible appeals, become part of the Department Chair's/School Director's personnel file, and shall serve as the basis for merit pay increases, for any possible reappointment, tenure, or promotion, and for decisions on retention as Department Chair or School Director.

B. ~~Quadrennial Evaluation~~

~~Every four years, in spring of the third year of the Department Chair's or School Director's four-year term, in lieu of the annual evaluation as chair or director described in section A, an in-depth formal evaluation as chair or director shall be conducted by the Dean in consultation with the faculty of the department or school. (The policies and procedures affecting the annual evaluation of the Chair or Director as faculty member will not change.)~~

- ~~1. Prior to the quadrennial evaluation of the Chair or Director, each Chair or Director shall prepare and distribute to all faculty within the department or school a quadrennial report summarizing his or her accomplishments related to responsibilities as Chair or Director, and with reference to the attainment of goals established for the previous four-year period.~~
- ~~2. The criteria for evaluation as Chair or Director shall reflect the duties and responsibilities of the chair or director as listed in section 4.2.3.1 of this Handbook. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall circulate to all faculty of the department a Department Chair/School Director evaluation form based upon these evaluation criteria and shall include an appropriate place for an overall evaluation of the Chair or Director during his/her current four-year term. The forms will be completed and returned to the Department/School Personnel Committee.~~
- ~~3. Data and comments from the faculty evaluations shall be summarized by the Department/School Personnel Committee. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall then evaluate the Department Chair/School Director as a faculty member (during the current year) and separately as a chair (over the past four years), in tentative evaluations to be sent to the Department Chair or School Director. In completing the quadrennial evaluation, the Department/School Personnel Committee should take into account the Chair or School Director's annual evaluations for the previous three years. The letter or memorandum prepared by the Department/School Personnel Committee for this evaluation should be addressed to the Dean and copied to the Chair/Director.~~
- ~~4. Each Chair or Director will be given the opportunity to respond to both of the Personnel Committee's tentative evaluations of the Chair or Director -- as a faculty member and as a Chair or Director -- before the finalized evaluations are forwarded to the Dean. The appeal procedures shall be the same as those described for faculty.~~

5. ~~The Department/School Personnel Committee's summary and overall evaluations of the Department Chair or Director as a faculty member and as a chair or director shall be forwarded to the College Dean. All data used by the Personnel Committee shall be made available to the College Dean.~~
6. ~~A minority report signed by all concurring faculty may be written if either or both of the Personnel Committee's evaluations are unacceptable to a minority of the committee members. A minority report is seen as an exception rather than standard procedure and shall include a justification for its creation. The minority report shall be submitted to the Dean as a separate document, and shall be included with the Personnel Committee's evaluations. A copy shall be sent to the Chair or Director.~~
7. ~~If the Dean disagrees with the Department/School Personnel Committee's evaluation of the Chair or Director as a faculty member in his review thereof, she or he shall give the Department Chair or School Director and Personnel Committee Chair a written statement of the reason(s) for the disagreement. The Department Personnel Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on any points of perceived disagreement.~~
8. ~~The Dean shall meet with the Chair or Director to discuss his/her accomplishments and goals as Chair or Director. At this time, the Dean and Chair or Director can initiate a preliminary discussion of the goals the Chair or Director anticipates setting for him/herself as Chair or Director and for the department or school for the next four years.~~
9. ~~The Dean shall communicate his or her evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director to the Department Chair or School Director in writing. Included in this evaluation shall be a recommendation to the Provost regarding reappointment of the Chair or Director for another four-year term. The Department Chair or School Director shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to his or her evaluation as chair or director prior to the Dean's communication of a final evaluation to the Personnel Committee and to the Provost.~~
10. ~~The College Dean shall forward her or his evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director, including the Dean's recommendation for reappointment of the chair or director for another term, together with the evaluation of that role by the Department/School Personnel Committee, to the Provost, with copies sent to the Department Chair and to the Department Personnel Committee. In a case of a departure by the Dean from the evaluation by the Personnel Committee, the Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on the reason(s) for the departure.~~
11. ~~The College Dean's evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair, and all pertinent data including any written responses from the Chair or Director and/or the Personnel Committee, shall be reviewed by the Provost, who shall provide written justification for any disagreement with the Dean's~~

evaluation. In the event of disagreement by the Department Chair or School Director with the Dean's evaluation of him or her as chair or director or with the Dean's recommendation regarding reappointment for another term, the Provost shall render a decision in the matter.

12. If the Chair or Director wishes to appeal either his or her annual evaluation as faculty member or his or her quadrennial evaluation as chair or director, or the review(s) thereof by the Dean or the Provost, respectively, the process followed shall be consistent with that for faculty appeals. The final evaluations of the Department Chair or School Director both as a faculty member and as a chair or director, following any possible appeals, become part of the Department Chair's or School Director's personnel file, and shall serve as the basis for merit pay increases, for any possible reappointment, tenure, or promotion, and for decisions on retention as Department Chair or School Director.
13. Chairs/Directors who are reappointed for subsequent four-year terms must submit for the review and approval of the Dean written copies of the of the goals they have established for themselves as chairs/deans and of their departments/schools during their next term. These goals must be submitted to the Dean by May 15 of the year of the quadrennial review. The degree to which these goals are fulfilled shall be assessed as part of the Chair's/Director's next quadrennial evaluation.

RATIONALE

This motion establishes a four-year term for department chairs and school directors, at the conclusion of which departments or schools will undertake a new selection process. It is possible for the incumbent chair to be re-selected at the conclusion of this process. The motion also removes the quadrennial evaluation process because, as originally conceived, it was designed to inform the reappointment of a sitting chair. Instead, material from the quadrennial evaluation (i.e., chair/director establishment of goals and evaluation regarding progress toward attaining those goals) has been reworked into the annual evaluation process.