THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Summit College

Department of Associate Studies

Criteria and Procedures for: Department Chair Review

Approved by Department Faculty on	
Reviewed and approved by faculty of Associate Studies:	
Sukanya Kemp, Co-Chair, Review Guidelines Committee	$\frac{3/9/1)}{\text{Date}}$
Amy Dreussi-Shriver, Co-Chair, Review Guidelines Committee	Date
Reviewed and approved Stanley Silverman Dean, Summit College	Date 3/9/2011
Reviewed and approved Dr. William M. (Mike) Sherman Senior Vice President, Provost & C.O.O.	Date 3/28/11

Procedure for Chair Evaluation Associate Studies Department

During the semester prior to the evaluation semester:

1. By the 4^{th} week, the bargaining unit faculty shall meet to select a review committee in accordance with the contract:

"An evaluation of the chair's performance shall be conducted by a committee of four (4) members of the bargaining unit of the department; two elected by the bargaining unit faculty, one appointed by the dean, and one appointed by the Provost."

During the evaluation semester:

- 1. By the beginning of the 4th week, the review committee will distribute the approved evaluation instrument to the bargaining unit faculty.
- 2. By the end of the 5^{th} week, bargaining unit faculty will return the completed evaluation instruments to the review committee.
- 3. The review committee will meet and draft a report that compiles the data from the evaluation instrument and includes a summary of the chair's strengths and areas for development.
- 4. By the end of the 7th week, the review committee shall send all bargaining unit faculty members a copy of the draft evaluation report.
- 5. By the end of the 9^{th} week, bargaining unit faculty shall meet to discuss the report.
- 6. By the end of the 10^{th} week, the report will be forwarded to the chair and to the dean.
- 7. By the end of the 12th week, the faculty will invite the chair seeking reappointment to meet with them and discuss a vision statement for his/her upcoming term in office.
- 8. All documents, including committee minutes, reports, the survey/evaluation instrument and individual faculty comments are considered public record and must be forwarded with the committee's recommendation.
- 9. No tally of the committee recommendation is to be taken.

Chair Evaluation Instrument

Five areas of concern are addressed: Administrative, Interpersonal, Leadership, External Factors and Student-focused, with questions as follows:

1. Administrative

This section seeks information about the duties and responsibilities involved in the day to day management of the department.

The coding (and point values) for this section:

Very Poor (1) / Poor (2) / Neutral (3) / Good (4) / Outstanding (5) / Not applicable or cannot judge (CJ)

- Deals with essential administrative details, including class scheduling, and RTP issues
- Works with the Summit College Dean to develop annual departmental goals
- Communicates department needs (budgetary, space and personnel) to dean
- Supports scholarly activity within the department
- Acquaints new faculty and staff with departmental procedures, priorities and expectations
- Facilitates curriculum development
- Deals effectively with departmental conflicts; or acts to prevent them
- Facilitates the development of/changes to departmental priorities
- Demonstrates innovation with administrative issues
- Communicates performance standards to faculty
- Provides feedback (both positive and negative) to faculty

2. Leadership

This section seeks information about the chair's abilities in terms of guiding the department.

The coding (point values) for this section:

Very Poor (1) / Poor (2) / Neutral (3) / Good (4) / Outstanding (5) / Not applicable or cannot judge (CJ)

- Encourages teaching excellence within the department (use of technology, course restructuring, dealing with student feedback)
- Enhances departmental image both on-campus and within the community at large
- Motivates faculty
- Recognizes and rewards faculty for their departmental contributions
- Allocates faculty responsibilities fairly
- Supports and protects academic freedom
- Maintains the department's best interest in the face of opposition or resistance from other parties
- Maintains steadiness in crisis
- Explains expectations to faculty
- Explains the basis for his/her decisions
- Considers faculty suggestions
- Encourages teamwork among faculty/staff
- Is accessible to faculty

3. Interpersonal

This section seeks information on how well the department chair performs in less formal, one- to-one dealings with faculty.

The coding (point values) for this section:

Almost never (1) / Infrequently (2)/Neutral (3) /Somewhat often (4) / Frequently (5)/Not applicable or cannot judge (CJ)

- Encourages cooperation/collegiality among faculty
- Establishes trust with faculty
- Works to create and maintain a positive work environment
- Treats faculty respectfully

Keeps faculty apprised of performance issues (positive and negative)

4. Student-focused

This section seeks information about the chair's dealings with students.

The coding (point values) for this section is:

Very Poor (1) / Poor (2) / Neutral (3) / Good (4) / Outstanding (5) / Not applicable or cannot judge (CJ)

5a. Leadership:

• Is a good advocate for our students

5b. Interpersonal:

- Effectively communicates with students
- Effectively handles student concerns

5. Summary assessment

The coding (point values) for this section:

Definitely false (1)/probably false (2)/neutral (3) /probably true (4) /definitely true (5)/not applicable or cannot judge (CJ)

- I believe the department would be better off if we replaced the current chair
- I have confidence in the chair's ability to provide departmental leadership

6. Open-ended questions:

What are the major strengths of the department chair?

What are the weaknesses of the chair?

What changes would you suggest he/she make to improve effectiveness?