

TO: CHBS Faculty Members  
FR: Katherine Hawkins, Ph.D.  
Dean, College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences  
DA: March 30, 2012  
RE: Report on progress toward annual goals for 2011-2012

As per the RU *2011-2012 Time Schedule for Personnel Decisions*, it's my pleasure to report to you on my progress to date toward my annual goals for 2011-2012, as approved by Provost Sam Minner and shared with you at the CHBS fall convocation in August of 2011.

1. Appoint permanent CHBS Executive Secretary and CHBS Associate Dean before the beginning of the new contract period (i.e., August 10<sup>th</sup>).

Pursuant to this goal, Professor of Criminal Justice Dr. Tod Burke was appointed CHBS Associate Dean and Ms. Rhonda McCroskey was appointed CHBS Executive Secretary.

2. Meet at least twice during the academic year with CHBS faculty and chairs, my dean colleagues, the provost's office, as well as with other important constituencies across the Radford campus (e.g., representatives of the Faculty Senate, Office of Development, Office of University Relations, Dean of Students Office, Core Curriculum Director, New Student Programs).

Since my arrival on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011, I have spent a great deal of time meeting with my new colleagues from across campus, as well as within the college. In the fall semester, I met with the faculties of each of the units in our college. This spring, I offered to meet again with any department faculty group interested in meeting with me and have met with several groups of faculty as a consequence (e.g., Criminal Justice Department, Philosophy and Religion Department Personnel Committee, English Department Personnel Committee). I have met at least twice so far this academic year with representatives of the Faculty Senate, Office of Development, Office of University Relations, Dean of Students Office, Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Management, as well as representatives from a number of other constituencies on campus. I meet with my dean colleagues, as well as Provost Sam Minner and representatives of his office, nearly every week in regular meetings of the Academic Affairs Leadership Team. Meetings with the CHBS Leadership Team are scheduled every two weeks, although we have canceled two meetings for lack of urgency of agenda items to be addressed. The CHBS Leadership Team met in January in an off-campus retreat at which we discussed matters relevant to faculty evaluation in CHBS. We were joined by Dr. Minner for that meeting. I have also met twice with the secretarial staff in CHBS to hear and attempt to address their concerns.

3. Work with CHBS faculty and the university's Office of Development to identify potential members for two planned CHBS boards: alumni advisory and corporate advisory. Recruit core members for both boards by the end of the academic year.

Based on my interactions with CHBS faculty and the RU Office of Development, I made a decision to revise my planned efforts to recruit for advisory boards for the college. First, I decided to pursue the creation of an advisory board composed of both alumni and corporate friends of the college, effectively combining the two planned boards into one. Second, I decided to take advantage of the opportunity to pursue the creation of an advisory board to contribute toward our efforts to support prelaw students at RU.

Regarding the first group, the CHBS Advisory Board, in addition to short trips to meet with RU alumni in the Radford/Blacksburg area, I also traveled to Washington, D.C., and Fairfax County, VA, in December of 2011 to meet with potential board members. Based on those initial interactions, a core group of founding board members was established. That group is currently working on a constitution to govern its functioning. Plans are in the advanced stages for another meeting of the core group members before the end of the academic year.

Regarding the second group, the CHBS Prewlaw Advisory Board, I am pleased to report to you that Mr. Chris Huther, an RU alum, has assumed leadership of that board. During his visit to campus on Friday, March 23<sup>rd</sup>, to meet with other potential members of the prelaw advisory group, Mr. Huther made a significant gift to the college to develop a “mock trial” class to be offered in the college annually for five years, with the pilot offering in the spring of 2013. Faculty members from several departments in CHBS are already engaged in determining the specific requirements of that class.

4. Complete disciplinary peer review of departmental guidelines for merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion. Begin faculty-led process to undertake any desired revisions to department guidelines.

A review of existing departmental guidelines for merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion revealed that some guidelines had not been reviewed or revised since their creation, which in some instances was 1994. Given that much has changed since 1994, including the creation of a new list of RU “peer institutions,” I asked the department chairs and school director to lead their faculty members in a review of their departmental/school guidelines that would include seeking peer feedback on their existing guidelines. I asked that these reviews be completed by two peer institutions, preferably from the list of RU’s new peer institutions. I asked that the reviews be completed by the end of the academic year.

Several departments have already completed not only their reviews engaging external peers, but have also undertaken a faculty-led process to revise their department’s guidelines. Two departments, Political Science and History, have already completed the revision process and have voted to accept revised department guidelines that I believe will effectively serve their strategic interests into the future. The other academic units in CHBS are all on schedule to complete at least their external reviews by peers by the end of the academic year.

5. Achieve an acceptable level of transparency of processes for reappointment, tenure and promotion with a goal of maintaining a high level of openness, credibility and objectivity at all levels of review.

When I came to RU to interview for the dean's position in February of 2011, one of the issues that emerged during my discussions with various faculty groups was a specific concern over a perceived lack of clarity of expectations for performance, as well as about the various review processes, in general. In addressing this concern as dean, my first action was to insure that every member of the CHBS faculty have access to their departmental/school guidelines for merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion. We discovered there were instances in which faculty members had been at RU for years and yet had never seen their own department's evaluation guidelines. That problem has now been resolved.

Early in the process for reappointment, tenure and promotion, I asked each department chair/school director to meet, along with their unit's Personnel Committee chair, with Doug Brinkman, a long-time member of the Faculty Senate and advisor to the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee. Dr. Brinkman, who is also an attorney and judge, advised the group on the importance of basing faculty evaluations on clearly stated expectations for faculty performance, as well as on properly documenting any concerns, and providing specific guidance for any requests for improvement in performance. I confirmed my support for such an approach, as well.

I then met with all 14 CHBS faculty members who were applying for tenure and/or promotion to share my perspective on the process that should be followed for tenure and promotion, as articulated above. I also answered any questions they had about the process and invited them to visit with me at any point throughout the process if they had questions or concerns about it. The discussion that followed confirmed to me that insufficient guidance exists for many faculty members on what to include in their portfolios for tenure and/or promotion. As a consequence, I appointed a subcommittee of the CHBS leadership team to develop guidelines in that regard. I also asked them to do the same for the annual chair/director reviews, as no documentation exists to provide direction for those reviews, either. The subcommittee members are committed to producing the new guidelines by the end of the spring semester.

Following my review of materials submitted for tenure and/or promotion, I offered to meet with any candidates for tenure and/or promotion, as well as any department/school Personnel or Tenure or Promotion Committee members in the event that there were any questions about my recommendations. I met with several candidates and committee members as a consequence. I hope those meetings helped to clarify the positions I took on those cases, as well as my rationale for taking those positions.

Unfortunately, the Faculty Senate Committee charged with administering dean reviews was unable to approve my request to incorporate questions into their survey regarding the openness, transparency and objectivity of the CHBS process. Therefore, I will seek

faculty members' feedback on that through another mechanism before the end of the spring semester.

6. Complete internal review of departmental five-year plans. Work with departments to revise/update plans in light of university's strategic goals.

Much has transpired since the development of department/school level five-year plans in CHBS (e.g., high level of administrative turnover, four years of severe budget cuts). Given the plans may no longer accurately reflect the short and longer-term goals of the academic units in CHBS, I asked department chairs and the school director to lead their faculties in a review of their five-year plans with the goal of making them more consistent with their current aspirations. All of the academic units in CHBS are on schedule to complete those reviews by the end of the academic year.

7. Expand opportunities for both internal and external grant-funded scholarship, broadly defined. Initially, the focus will be on increasing faculty access to small grants for new initiatives, including the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Early in the fall semester, I invited representatives from the Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Management to meet with the CHBS Leadership Team. At that meeting, they distributed lists of external grants that were relevant to each of the diverse disciplines in CHBS. They also offered to work with individual CHBS faculty members to develop research profiles in the "Community of Scholars" database.

I set aside internal funds to award four \$5,000 grants for CHBS faculty members to engage in the scholarship of online teaching and learning. Those grants have already been awarded and classes developed through this mechanism will be taught during the summer of 2012 or during the 2012-2013 academic year. I also offered \$1,000 incentives to the first six CHBS faculty members to submit competitive external grants through the Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Management.

Provost Minner challenged each college dean to establish "push" goals for submission for external funding. The CHBS Leadership Team determined that 10 submissions for external funding would be an appropriate "push" goal for CHBS. To date, we have nine external grants already submitted or under development for submission to external grant funding agencies, including one I'm writing for the "Liberty Tree Initiative" in support of First Amendment activities at RU. We are very close to achieving our push goal and I'm confident that by the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, we will have achieved it.

8. Undertake emergency preparedness training provided by the university and other agencies.

I participated in Level One FEMA training on emergency management. I also participated in a "table-top" exercise to manage an emergency involving RU study abroad students. In addition, I participated in Threat Assessment training offered by the Department of Justice.

