San José State
U N I V E R S I T Y

A campus of The California State University

SS-S04-5

At its meeting of April 19, 2004, the Academic Senate passed the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Terri Thames for the Executive Committee.

SENSE-OF-THE-SENATE RESOLUTION
DEPARTMENT CHAIR TASK FORCE REPORT

Whereas,   In March 2003, the Academic Senate passed SM-S03-2 to form a task force to review campus data related to issues and recommendations identified in a CSU Task Force report on the roles and responsibilities of department chairs;

Whereas,   The SJSU Task Force completed its work upon presentation of their report to the Academic Senate on February 22, 2004; be it therefore

Resolved   That the SJSU Academic Senate accept the report and extend its appreciation to the members of the task force for their dedication and efforts that led to a very helpful and thorough report with recommendations designed to help improve the role and work of department chairs, thereby helping the university as a whole; and

Resolved   That the Chair of the Senate work with the Office of Faculty Affairs and University Council of Chairs and Directors to assist in seeing that the recommendations of the report are pursued; and be it finally

Resolved   That the report be appropriately linked on the SJSU Academic Senate website.

Department Chairs' Report – Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps

Following is a list of the recommendations made by the Task Force on Department Chairs, along with information on who is to follow up on the recommendation and any additional steps that need to be taken. This list was prepared at a 3/19/04 meeting of Dennis Jaehne, Sigurd Meldal, Joan Merdinger, Peter Lee, Bill Nance and Annette Nellen.

A complete copy of the task force's report can be found at the Senate website at the link for committees and task forces.

Recommendation	Next Steps	Timing
1. Adopt the proposed chair position description as the generic standard *menu of components from which any particular* chair or director's *job description is constructed*. 2. (combined with #1 here) 3. Dean should meet with faculty and incoming chair to identify and formalize specific expectations for unit chairs.	▪ A Senate policy is not warranted. ▪ Faculty Affairs should put the description on its website (under "Chair's Link") ▪ Add to job description – participate in UCCD ▪ Deans and others should access the description at the website. Deans and chairs may want to make modifications to the generic description. ▪ Deans and chairs should let faculty know that the info is at the Faculty Affairs website.	By May 2004
4. Chair position description, as formalized for a chair, should be used as the basis for evaluation of chair performance. 5. Proposed generic evaluation forms (App D), tailored to specific unit needs, to be used to guide chair evaluation process 6. Specific evaluation expectations should be linked to position description and set forth clearly by Dean and faculty at time of chair's initial appointment 7. Dean to meet annually at end of each AY to review chair's performance (is not an official personnel action); analyze unit's needs, discuss chair's strengths and weaknesses and identify areas for training and/or improvement 8. Evaluation at end of 4-year term 9. Evaluation instruments	▪ Provost, through Faculty Affairs to ensure that all chairs and deans aware of the recommended evaluation instruments and that they are used. ▪ Faculty Affairs to work with Steve Aquino to create computerized instrument as appropriate (using those at Appendix D) ▪ Provost and Faculty Affairs to be sure evaluations of chairs as chairs are only to address FTEA time ▪ Faculty Affairs to work with Deans to prepare evaluation instruments (Appendix D)	As soon as possible

should use 5 point Likert-type scale items with option for N/A or "Not Enough Info" 10. Evaluation instruments should contain space for open-ended responses. 11. Evaluations should be based solely on responsibilities of chair assignment for portion of work funded by FTEA (not eaching and research standards)	▪ Prof Stds to add note to new RTP policy to ensure that chairs are evaluated based on their FTEA (chair duties only) and FTEF (teaching/research). Similar comment to be added to revised PTR policy. ▪ Prof Stds to review sabattical policy to see if modification needed to be sure chairs are evaluated based on true assignment (FTEA versus FTEF).	
12. Continue to allow Deans and chairs flexibility to establish modes of fiscal mgmt that work well for college in context of specific unit needs. Continue fiscal mgmt training for all new chairs. Deans are encouraged to provide chairs with discretionary funds where possible to allow chairs to foster creative initiatives within unit, reward deserving faculty , improve faculty morale, etc.	▪ Deans and chairs to do ▪ Exec Comm to be sure this concept is built into new Budget Policy to be written in Spring 2004	Ongoing Now!
13. University should continue to recognize and support UCCD and conduct analysis of critical mgmt info flows, networks, pathways on campus and make recommendations for improvement	▪ Exec Comm to look into creation of a University Administrative Procedures Manual that would state and explain purpose and role of both UCCD and Council of Deans (Provost's Council) in addition to other information/decision-making bodes on campus. NOTE: Original recommendation asked that UCCD have formal statutes similar to Council of Deans. We determined that there was no formal status of either, but existed due to will of parties (UCCD) and provost (Council of Deans).	
14. Current FTEA allocation formula needs to be modified to account for and accommodate disparities (see report for specifics). (problems in underallocating FTEA, not recognizing that current that does not consider headcount or special needs, such as accreditation, underallocates FTEA). Consider using CSUS formula.	▪ Provost needs to implement a new formula.	Provost to work with Deans to implement.

15. Senate should undertake a detailed analysis of sources and types of "bureaucratic paperwork" on campus and determine ways to make this work more efficient, including ways to distribute it appropriately between chairs, faculty and clerical staff. Consider additional allocation of FTEA to support "associate chair."	▪ Everyone should look for ways to reduce paperwork. ▪ RPB to look at efficiencies identified by campus in Spring 2004	Ongoing
16. Continue chair training efforts	▪ IPAR ▪ HR ▪ Faculty Affairs	Ongoing
17. Pending successful evaluation of Chair-in-Residence program, continue to support this position with appropriate FTEA time and formal status.	▪ Dennis and Peter Lee working on evaluation	Spring 2004
18. Develop a formal chair training program that both identifies training appropriate to chair's evolution in position and needs of new versus experienced chairs. Also consider a chair mentor program and allow faculty considering becoming a chair to attend training as appropriate. Provost should continue to fund attendance at CSU Chair workshops. Create a book of chair best practices. Educate faculty as to role of chair, including provide them with statement of chair responsibilities. Chair appreciation and recognition.	▪ Chair-in-Residence to work with UCCD, Faculty Affairs, IPAR and HR on creating and implementing training and to see to funding requests and education of faculty about chair role. ▪ Provost and deans to provide funding. ▪ Ask Nancy Stake about a "Chair's News" spot in SJSU This Week and occasional Chair Spotlight in Washington Square. ▪ Faculty Recognition Luncheon – intro comments to identify faculty who take on added responsibility of serving as chair ▪ Deans should include time at college meeting for chair updates and recognition.	Ongoing Seems like plenty of work for a Chair-in-Residence. Annette Annette Deans