

Summer 7-10-1974

## Senate Meeting July 10, 1974

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting July 10, 1974" (1974). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 230.  
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/230>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISURed@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISURed@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

July 10, 1974

Volume V, No. 16

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Introduction of Visitors

Administrator's Remarks

Proposal for the Evaluation of Department Chairpersons

Committee Reports

Communications

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

## Academic Senate Minutes

July 10, 1974

Volume V, No. 16

### CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Kolasa called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

### ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll. The Vice Chairperson declared a quorum to be present.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

V, 140  
Mr. Henry requested that his remarks be expanded in the minutes. The clarification reads: "Mr. Henry communicated his concern over the lack of action on the correction of the unsafe conditions of the upper west plaza entrance of the Union." A motion (Mr. Taylor, Mr. Steinbach) to approve the minutes as revised by Mr. Henry was approved.

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Taylor introduced members of Dr. Edwards' higher education class who were visiting the Senate meeting.

### ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

Dean Helgeson reported for the administration. He reported that the Board of Higher Education at its meeting held yesterday in Peoria had approved the doctor of arts program in mathematics for ISU. He stated that this was a very significant step. More significant was that the Board ruled that only two campuses in the state would offer the doctor of arts degrees, Illinois State and Chicago Circle. Dean Helgeson stated that we expect to bring additional doctor of arts programs to the BHE this fall. He reported that the Board had also approved a DA program at Chicago Circle. Dean Helgeson also reported that the BHE had passed a resolution asking the governor to hold to the original BHE budget recommendation. This would mean that the additional salary money for ISU faculty and civil service personnel would be disapproved.

Mr. Taylor asked Dean Helgeson if there was any organized effort to get the governor to sign the bill or to get the legislature to override his veto. The answer was no. Dean Helgeson also explained at this time that the President was on vacation and that was why he was making the administrative remarks.

Mr. Hicklin explained that he had received a call from a faculty member at Northern Illinois University. He had stated that Northern Illinois University was starting, outside of official circles, an ad hoc group to petition the governor and the legislature to sustain the raise. Mr. Hicklin requested that persons interested in this kind of activity contact him.

## REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

There were no remarks from the Student Association President.

## INFORMATION ITEM

### I. Proposal for the Evaluation of Department Chairpersons.

Mr. Mead was introduced to present the information item on the evaluation of department chairpersons. Mr. Mead asked leave of the chair to allow the entire University community to engage in the discussion at this time. Mr. Mead introduced members of the Administrative Affairs Committee: Felicitas Berlanga, Robert Duty, Alan Hickrod, Alan Johnson, Ed Koehl, Roger Potter, and Patrick Tarrant. Mr. Mead reviewed the history of the proposal for the evaluation of administrators and stated that when the present Senate took over they found this to be the oldest item on the calendar of the Administrative Affairs Committee. He noted that the committee had conducted several meetings, some of which ran three or four hours long. They had distributed a rather elaborate questionnaire to all faculty members on the campus and to all chairpersons and all other members of the administration. Both the questionnaire and its results have been distributed to the Academic Senate and has been provided to the Vidette for general public information. Mr. Mead briefly summarized the results of the questionnaire. He stated that 93% of the respondents of all categories were favorable to revision of the present system of evaluation of chairpersons. The committee decided to approach the problem of evaluation of administrators on a piece meal basis with the first step being to come up with a proposal for the evaluation of chairpersons. The next step would be the evaluation of other administrators.

Mr. Mead stated that the proposal which was circulated tonight dated 7-10-74 was the fifth draft of this particular proposal. (See appendix) Mr. Mead summarized the basis of the input that they had received. The committee plans other committee sessions after the fall schedule resumes at which time they will invite all interested persons to come and express themselves on this matter. The committee feels that they have an extraordinarily strong mandate to do something in this area. The committee denied any charges that they were attempting to rush this through. Mr. Mead stated that he hoped tonight would be an information session in both directions - both to inform the Senate and to receive suggestions from the Senate.

Mr. Hickrod raised a question as to what the evaluation is to be used for. He asked for the reaction of the Senate to putting in the evaluation of chairpersons via questionnaires into the APT process for salary increases for department chairpersons. Mr. White asked Dean Helgeson to explain what the present system of evaluation of department chairpersons. Dean Helgeson explained that the present system includes the evaluation of the department chairpersons by the dean in respect to performance and in respect to salary increases. There are many variations in the procedures and in what extent the deans go back to the department heads with reports on their judgments. The faculty handbook on page 10 states that there will be a policy of department evaluations by college deans and this includes visits by persons external to the University.

Mr. Laymon questioned the questionnaires being unsigned and being returned directly to the dean. He recognized also that the present system of evaluation of faculty members were not signed; although student evaluations are not signed, Mr. Laymon argued that faculty members should in fact sign and be held accountable for their remarks about department heads. Mr. Mead stated that the proposal calls for aggregate results unidentified by individuals to be returned to the department head. Mr. Mead stated that he expected the handling of the questionnaires to be one of the controversial items. Mr. Mead stated that in the questionnaire circulated to the campus 60% of the respondents felt that the questionnaires should be unsigned and there were some very strong personal opinions expressed. The comments from faculty questionnaires gave the picture to the committee that there would be far more harm done by signed questionnaires as to harm that might be done to the department heads by unsigned questionnaires. Mr. Laymon stated that this was a Ku Klux Klan type of approach where people could hide behind a mask of anonymity provided by the unsigned questionnaires. It was pointed out that there was no provision for student input. Mr. Taylor noted that not only was there an absence of student input on this but noted its absence in the selection of department chairmen on this campus. Mr. Hickrod explained that the college councils control the procedures for the selection of department heads and that this would be up for periodic review by the college council. Mr. Woods stated that he thought that Mr. Ritt, Chairperson of the Mathematics Department, wrote a very informative letter about the process and pointed out the bad aspects of the questionnaire. Mr. Woods stated that the questionnaire would not be valid and he pointed out various inconsistencies. He stated that they had run some statistical evidence and could not find any significant differences in merit. He expressed concern that we were dumping all this on the APT committees. He suggested that a better possibility would be for evaluation to go across departmental lines. The Chairperson asked that the visiting chairpersons come to the table and state any input that they have.

Mr. Laymon pointed up some of the inconsistencies of using APT procedures for evaluation of department heads and the problems of appeal procedures. Mr. Mead answered some of the problems and stated that ultimately only the Dean of the University has final authority on the decision-making considering department head raises.

Mr. Mead stated that one of the reasons for this revised proposal was the admonition on the part of Mr. Goleash and the President to keep the evaluation and appeal procedures simple and not to establish any additional committees to do this. In answer to a question from Mr. Henry about what the procedure would be, Mr. Mead stated that it was true as Mr. Henry had suggested that the same procedure for evaluation of department heads and the same people would be involved; it would simply be an expansion of the process of collecting data. Mr. Hickrod pointed out the difficulties of comparing gradings from different departments. He stated that they had to decide if this would be normative or performance references. Is it possible to compare rankings of department chairpersons?

Mr. Friedhoff, Chairperson of the Department of Psychology, was invited to the table. He stated that his first reaction to the proposal centered on the current lack of feedback to the department chairperson, the absence of data being returned to the department so that chairpersons could improve their performances. Mr. Friedhoff said he agreed with Mr. Hickrod that certain variables need to be taken into account such as small class or small departments which would be likely to give better ratings to an instructor or department head than large classes or departments. Mr. Friedhoff noted that at the present time department chairpersons must teach at least one class regardless of the size of the department. This means that there is a high variation in the time an individual department head is able to give to individual faculty members. Mr. Friedhoff stated that the dean of the college should take into consideration the problems facing different department heads which vary widely. Mr. Friedhoff again noted that the questionnaire contains no statement as to how the department head interacts with students. Mr. Friedhoff stated that last year he developed his own form and distributed it to faculty members and handed in the results to the dean. He admitted that there was a particular bias in the instrument since it was set up in terms of his own perceptions.

Mr. Hicklin contributed some remarks about the history of evaluation at ISU and reiterated what Mr. Hickrod and Mr. Taylor stated about the lack of student input and the correlation between department head evaluations and faculty evaluations utilizing anonymous ratings. Mr. Liberta raised some questions related to a four-year or quadriennial super rating process, which is liable to lead to a rotating chairmanship. Mr. Liberta raised the perennial questions of political models of department heads. Mr. Smith discussed the hidden agenda here that some of the faculty members resent the evaluation procedures now being used. He related a communication which he had received in which the suggestion was made that a department head resign if they were deficient in more than ten of the fifteen criteria.

Mr. Mead explained some of the items and made additional comments on how these procedures would hopefully result in better chairperson performance. Mr. Henry pointed out the inconsistency of the department chairperson handing out a statement of what he was going to do without first receiving faculty and student input, and then the faculty and students turning around and evaluating him on how well he carries out what he stated he was going to do. Mr. Henry stated that the APT procedures are too rigid now, and this particular procedure will result in additional rigidity which is unfortunate. He suggested that we should rather suggest general guidelines to the deans and let the deans have some latitude in decision making. Mr. White asked what has proved wrong with the present system. Mr. Duty responded and stated that the committee felt that the four year evaluation basis had not been adhered to. Mr. Mead stated that there was concern over the lack of anonymity. He stated that the present system stresses evaluation of programs rather than evaluation of chairpersons. Mr. Helgeson stated that the outstanding shortcoming of the present system is that the chairperson did not receive enough feedback to feel that they were gaining information on what they were doing right and wrong. Dean Helgeson stated that this was probably

a very valid criticism of the present system. He stated that to some extent the present system is working very well since many persons are not aware that it is going on. Dean Helgeson stated that this process recommended here would have much less anonymity than in the present process. He stated that this proposed process would place the chairperson under the microscope for a short period of time for all to see, to the obvious knowledge of all. He stated that many persons in this position might decide that the chairpersonship was not worth the extra \$50 or so a month which we presently pay department heads. Dean Helgeson felt that there is some implication in this process which goes counter to the whole relationship of the department head to the administration. Dean Helgeson reiterated his belief that the evaluation process should go hand in hand with the evaluation of the program rather than separating the evaluation of the leadership of the department.

Mr. Taylor asked that Dean Helgeson and Mr. Mead respond to his statement that this was a very thinly veiled attempt to challenge the role of the deans of the colleges and the Dean of the University. Mr. Taylor regretted that this was in fact a message to the administration that the present system is not meeting the concerns of the faculty. Mr. Taylor pleaded for leaving the details of the evaluation system to the administration.

Mr. Reitan responded to some of the various comments on the basis of his experience as chairman of the history department. Mr. Reitan agreed that this is in fact a message to the deans to do their jobs. Mr. Reitan stated that he is not as confident that the present system is working as well as Dean Helgeson thinks. Mr. Reitan said it would be helpful if Dean Helgeson furnished a list of the University departments that have been evaluated. Mr. Reitan calculated that if five departments a year were evaluated it would take seven years to get around to the entire University. He stated that as far as he knew the history department had never been evaluated in the manner thus described by Dean Helgeson. Mr. Reitan testified that he had never received any written evaluation of his performance from his dean. Mr. Reitan stated that he had no written record from any dean above him about what he had done as chairperson. Mr. Reitan explained that while faculty members were told where they stood none of his raises or lack of raises was ever explained to him by any one. He stated that he thought the University administration should be doing this, but they had not been so it was quite proper for the Senate to be engaged in discussing this and telling what our expectations are.

Mr. Woods stated that he agreed with the remarks of Mr. Reitan. The administration should be doing this. He suggested that the questionnaire be redone and many items be removed which do not seem relevant to the evaluation of department chairpersons. Mr. Mead explained how the criteria had been collected. He reiterated the long hours which the committee had deliberated to come up with the present effort. Mr. Mead cited that only two of the four hundred respondents stated that they did not think there were universal criteria for the evaluation of department chairpersons.

Mr. Ficek stated that he felt the questionnaires was designed for the assassination of department chairpersons for what faculty do not do. Mr. White reiterated the fact that the present system is so quiet that no one seems to know what the schedule is or when their department is coming up for study again. Mr. White stated that the faculty should be aware when the next chairperson evaluation is to occur. Mr. Henry noted that there is no provision here for the department chairperson to respond to criticism before the final evaluation comes back to him from the college dean.

Mr. Roderick responded to Mr. Woods' criticism of the questionnaire. He stated that as a faculty member he responded to the student input, and he saw no harm in department heads responding to input. Mr. Roderick stated that the chairperson would probably appreciate getting information on his strengths and weaknesses. Mr. Roderick said that he would like to see these documents sent to the college deans and that possibly the Senate could approve the final guidelines as they do now approve the final criteria for APT procedures.

Mr. Mead stated that he did not know anything in the recent years that the Senate has received a stronger indication of interest in. Mr. McCarney was invited to the table. He commended the Administrative Affairs Committee for bringing this into the open, because he had had a bad experience with it in the College of Arts and Sciences in his attempt to get the same kind of proposition adopted.

Mr. Helgeson stated that we had gone through a period in which we had not made up our minds about what the role of the department leadership was going to be. He noted that there was no questions relating the performance of the chairperson in terms of his objectives. This would probably have to be added. Mr. Helgeson stated that if we move to a rotating chairmanship that the evaluation of chairpersons would have to be completely different from the proposal. Some departments had not decided whether they wanted a committee of faculty members making decisions or directors drawn from the faculty making decisions. The leadership role should be clarified in the annual statement that the chairperson makes to the faculty. Mr. Helgeson stated that since the Board of Regents has stated that each administrator should be evaluated every five years on the basis of tenure retention, it might be wise for the department chairperson to keep his credentials current by scholarly productivity and teaching performance. Dean Helgeson raised the question if the APT committee could evaluate the questionnaires or if the chairperson should merely receive the feedback. Mr. Helgeson stated that he was torn between self-defense and defense of the committee. He stated that the deans of the colleges would not be adverse to receiving the conclusions of the committee. He stated that he did not believe that we were far apart in spirit. Mr. Young said he had the feeling that the Senate did agree that administrative evaluation should be done. He suggested that we broaden the base of discussion on the actual procedures by broadening the base of the committee and perhaps putting it into an ad hoc committee of administrators and others, so that when we come back in the fall they would have a package in front of us on which we can reach consensus. Mr. Young stated his hope that we would not do anything to polarize chairpersons from the Senate or chairpersons from the faculty.



Mr. Taylor suggested that the committee enter into discussion with the deans of the colleges and the Dean of the University with the consensus of the Senate that there needs to be something done to improve evaluation over the present system. He said that it was fruitless to beat the poor questionnaire to death. Mr. Mead stated that Mr. Taylor's statements assumed that the committee had not been meeting with the deans when in fact they had been meeting with the deans--in fact, Dean Rives has sat in on the meetings--and had decided in addition that the next two meetings would be broadly advertised to solicit attendance by the deans, faculty, students, and other members of the University community. Mr. Taylor referred to the last paragraphs of Mr. Ritt's letter and suggested that it was not the proper business of the Senate to deal with the criteria and questionnaires in such specificity until the administration had been consulted. It was again suggested by Mr. Young that the committee to study this be reconstituted on an ad hoc basis, including students, department chairpersons, deans, etc. Mr. Taylor asked Dean Helgeson if he was willing to sit down and come up with a proposal for the fall.

Mr. Helgeson responded that he did not think the deans would need membership on the committee in order to consult with the committee. He did not see any need to reconstitute the membership of the committee. He stated that Dean Rives was meeting with the committee regularly. Mr. Helgeson stated that he was not concerned about rapprochement; he felt that the committee had been very open and had let the administration know what their thinking was. Dean Helgeson stated that he had met with them today at their invitation. He stated that he did need additional time and the committee had agreed.

Mr. Woods stated that he felt it would be wrong to evaluate department chairpersons strictly on a personal basis. Mr. Roderick quoted from the section of the University Constitution which stated that it was the role of the Academic Senate to set up procedures for the evaluation of faculty and administrators. Mr. Ficek stated that this was in fact a detailed procedure rather than a policy statement. If this were policy, then the Senate would state that the department heads would be evaluated. Mr. Ficek stated that he did agree that there was a hidden agenda. He stated that this seems to be an indictment of the deans, and perhaps we should have started with a procedure for the evaluation of the deans. Mr. Laymon stated that the dean should not be offering criteria for the department head before they are evaluated. Mr. Laymon said that we must have delineations by virtue of job specifications and then go about setting up procedures.

Mr. Henry expressed a hope that we could close off our discussion and forward it to the committee. Mr. Henry stated that he did not see anything wrong with putting down a policy on paper if in fact all persons involved had had their say. He stated that he hoped we would not tie the hands of the department chairperson as we have done on the APT procedures. A pleas was made that the department heads are in a better position to provide expertise and that we should let them draw up the particulars and details.

Mr. Taylor stated that as a member of the Board of Regents it was his understanding that the Senate did not have the right to legislate, that the Senate was only to advise, and he viewed the actions of the Senate as moving toward legislation.

Mr. Hicklin raised a point of order. He respectfully requested that Mr. Taylor speak either as a Senator or as a Regent, but not as both. He stated that the Senate would not take lying down his rulings as a Regent on the actions of the Senate. If Mr. Taylor could not differentiate between the two roles, then he should resign either as a Senator or as a Regent. Mr. Taylor responded that he was concerned about whether this body had the right to discuss this, to impose it upon someone without giving the administration a chance to come up with a policy.

Mr. Reitan stated that this system was a positive move for faculty members to express how the department chairpersons are doing their job. Mr. Helgeson defended the deans and warned the Senate that the deans cannot be expected to report to the Senate all the shortcomings of the departments. He stated that we must respect the essential privacy of the evaluation. He stated that he accepted the criticism of the present system that there is not enough feedback to the chairperson from the faculty. He asked that the Senate not be too impatient with the colleges which have only been reinstated within the past year.

Mr. Mead stated that the committee did have a mandate for taking action on this topic. Mr. Henry reiterated from the Constitution that the Academic Senate was designated the task of evaluation of faculty and administrative personnel. Mr. Henry remarked that he thought it was clear that the Academic Senate could formulate policy on this matter.

Mr. Taylor asked for a ruling of the chair as to whether or not a motion was in order. The chair did not rule at this point. Mr. Henry stated that the normal processes following an information item should take care of the situation.

V, 141

Mr. Mead stated that if any members of the Senate did not feel that this was a matter for the Senate, then he would welcome a negative motion to take it away from the committee and do something else with it. A motion (Mr. Taylor, Mr. Woods) that the Administrative Affairs Committee meet with the Dean of the University and the various college deans and formulate a policy recommendation for the Administrative Affairs Committee for consideration by the Senate at a time the Committee thinks appropriate for action was made. Ms. Chesebro recommended that we respect our colleagues on procedures and be less specific in our recommendations as to the course of action to be taken. Mr. Taylor amended his motion according to Ms. Chesebro's suggestion to read: that the Administrative Affairs Committee proceed as they see fit in cooperation with appropriate administrative officers to consider and recommend action on this matter.

V, 141A

Mr. Duty defended the committee against the charges that they had been dealing with hidden agendas and the assassination of department heads; he asserted that such things were not considered by the committee. Mr. Helgeson reiterated that he was quite satisfied with the way the committee had been acting, and he stated his hope that we could persuade the maker of the motion to withdraw it since no motion would be the better course. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Woods withdrew their motion. Mr. Woods explained that he had seconded the motion on the basis of the attempt to bring in the deans who would then bring in the policy approved and ready for discussion. He stated that the motion was not meant to be dictatorial.

Mr. Mead stated that the committee would furnish public notice by letter to all the department heads when they would be meeting again.

V, 142

A motion (Mr. Laymon, Mr. Reitan) that the Academic Senate express its appreciation to the Administrative Affairs Committee for a difficult job that was well-done and hope that they continue with their fine efforts was approved unanimously.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

Vice Chairperson Kolasa reported that the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be on Wednesday, July 17 at 4:00 p.m. in the President's Conference Room.

Ms. Chesebro stated that the Academic Affairs Committee had no report.

Mr. Mead reported for the Administrative Affairs Committee. He stated that the committee is researching and discussing the summer school schedule for possible revision. He would like to have the minutes show that the committee solicits from all members of the University community their preferences regarding the revision of the schedule.

Mr. Smith reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. He stated that the committee was working on a proposal for faculty members to purchase summer school retirement. Mr. Smith asked that the Executive Committee put this on the agenda as an action item for the July 24 meeting. He stated that the Committee had also met with Dean Helgeson and Scott Eatherly about the referee body to settle jurisdictional disputes between Ethics, Academic Freedom and Tenure, and Grievance Committees.

There was no report from the Student Affairs Committee.

### COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Hicklin again requested that the various chairpersons of the standing committees notify the secretary on the status of the various items on the calendar so that an accurate calendar could be drawn up.

Mr. Mead stated that he had sent a letter to all Senators asking for possible suggestions as to areas of conflict of interest, such as those that were discussed in connection with the University Union.

Mr. Steinbach asked about the status of the proposed bicycle regulations. Mr. Morris responded that there was a proposed draft for implementation in the fall which was distributed about a week ago to solicit input.

Mr. Allred asked about the existence of a student bail bond fund. Mr. Arnold stated that there was such a fund administered by the Student Association Office.

V, 143

A motion (Mr. Quane, Mr. Steinbach) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,  
Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary



M E M O R A N D U M

FROM: Administrative Affairs Committee

TO: Academic Senate

RE: Proposal for a System of Chairperson Evaluation, 7-10-74

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: The purpose of this proposal is positive. It is intended:

- (a) to provide chairpersons with clearer guidelines in regard to role expectations from those to whom they are presently accountable;
- (b) to provide chairpersons with supportive feedback in areas where their performance is meritorious;
- (c) to suggest to chairpersons areas in which performance might be improved;
- (d) to provide to college deans a broader and more reliable range of data for their assessment and advisement of chairperson performance.
- (e) Finally, it should be noted that all of the items in the following proposal are (and can be) merely advisory and can provide no more than a part of the data that college and university deans must take into consideration in their advising and evaluating of departmental chairpersons. The effective implementation of this proposal will depend, in the end, upon the commitment of deans, chairpersons, and faculty to collegial spirit and judicious purpose in promoting the broader interests of the university.

1. Early in the school year the college dean and chairperson will develop an understanding in regard to the chairperson's role objectives for that school year.
2. Each chairperson will provide annually, prior to the first Friday in December, to the dean of his/her college and to each faculty member within his/her department a brief statement focusing upon his/her goals and objectives as chairperson and his/her assessment of the problems that require confrontation for the meeting of these goals and objectives.
3. The APT committee of each department, minus the departmental chairperson, at the outset of its annual APT deliberations will evaluate its chairperson in terms of the three categories of "teaching," "scholarship," and "service" after having solicited input from the chairperson on the form used for faculty evaluation. Those departments that do not ordinarily have APT committees will elect an ad hoc APT committee for this purpose.
4. In regard to the category of "teaching," the APT committee's assessment of the chairperson's teaching will be based in part, as is the case for the rest of the department, on student response through the departmental course evaluator questionnaire, administered in the same fashion as for other faculty.
5. Summary evaluations in the three categories of "teaching," "scholarship," and "service" will be provided by the APT committee directly to the Dean of the College. The APT committee will also provide aggregated data from the student course evaluations to the Chairperson, but not until the semester evaluated has terminated.
6. In addition, standard university-wide questionnaires will be completed annually, between the first and second Fridays in December, by the full-time faculty within each department. These questionnaires will be unsigned and will be returned directly to the dean of the college by the second Friday in December. Only those faculty who, at the completion of that semester, will have served fully three consecutive semesters under the chairperson (in the capacity of either full or acting chairperson) will be eligible to respond. In order to provide

the chairperson with adequate time to make progress toward accomplishing his/her long term objectives, a chairperson shall have served more than one academic year before the questionnaire will be administered. The dean of the college will distribute and collect the questionnaires and make use of the questionnaire data in his/her APT considerations relating to that chairperson.

7. Aggregated data from the computerized portion of these questionnaires and summaries of the remaining portion of these questionnaires (inasmuch as individual faculty indicate their permission to reveal the latter information) will be returned as soon as possible to each chairperson, but not before APT evaluations of faculty are due in the college dean's office.
8. The dean of each college will provide during the final month of each school year to each chairperson (acting and full) continuing under his/her jurisdiction evaluation of that chairperson, based upon the previously mentioned data and such other data as he/she may request.
9. An appeal procedure and schedule will be established whereby the final annual evaluation and recommendation by the dean may be appealed by the affected chairperson, first to his/her college dean and then to the dean of the university.
10. At least one semester prior to the end of each four year period of service as chairperson (time served in the capacity of acting as well as full chairperson will be combined where the chairperson has served consecutively in both capacities), each chairperson will indicate to the dean of his/her college whether he/she would be available to serve as chairperson beyond the four year period.

If the chairperson does thus indicate his/her future availability, a committee will immediately be constituted consisting of four members elected--three from within the department and one from outside the department--by full-time faculty within the department, and one member appointed by the dean of the college from outside the department and within the university. This committee will assess all the previously mentioned data, and utilizing also personal interviews and such other information as it may deem appropriate, will advise the college dean as to the desirability of continuing the chairperson in his present capacity.

This will apply immediately to those chairpersons who will have served at least three and one-half years at the end of the fall 1974 semester. Exception will have to be made in the initiation of this program for the College of Arts and Sciences, where--in the order of greatest seniority of chairpersonship first--evaluations will be made of about one-third of the fourteen presently most senior chairpersons each year over the first three years.

Programmatic evaluations of departments will be administered at four-year intervals concurrent with chairperson evaluations.

11. This proposal will be implemented beginning the fall semester 1974. At the beginning of the fall semester 1975 all faculty, chairpersons, and administrators will be polled for their evaluation of this system.