

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

Wednesday September 10, 1980

2:00 p.m.

SSC-107

*Pat Somers  
Ann Waddell*

CONSENT CALENDAR

✓ AS 80-51/C on C COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Policies Committee: PHYLLIS SEMAS, At-large, 1983  
DONALD ZINGALE, At-large, 1983  
THOMAS KANTZ, Arts/Sciences, 1983  
STELLA SERRANO, Senator, 1982  
NATHAN SMITH, Senator, 1982

Affirmative Action Committee: MOLLY BOHNEN, At-large, 1983

Curriculum Committee: MARY JO KENNY, At-large, 1983  
CAROLE BARNES, Arts/Sciences, 1983  
STANLEY FROST, Senator, 1981

Faculty Affairs Committee: JOHN HENRY, At-large, 1983  
DAVID LUCAS, Arts/Sciences, 1983  
BAQAR ZAIDI, Sch./Div., 1983  
GERALD McDANIEL, Senator, 1981

Fiscal Affairs Committee: JOHN ZICKEL, At-large, 1983  
JO-ANN NICOLA, Arts/Sciences, 1983  
GERALD GARTHE, Senator, 1982  
JACK GILLESPIE, Senator, 1982

Graduate Policies/Programs Committee: JAMES SIMES, At-large, 1983  
ELGIE FUSON, Prof. Services, 1983  
ROBERT KLOSS, Senator, 1981

✓ AS 80-52/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Policies Committee: ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1983 (replacement  
for D. Zingale)  
PATRICIA HACKETT, Staff, 1982

Affirmative Action Committee: LEO MAESTAS, At-large, 1982 (replacement  
for B. Rugeley)

Curriculum Committee: JOHN STOCKMAN, Sch./Div., 1982 (replacement for  
R. Segura)

*Charles Plummer, at-large, 1983 (repl for M. Kenny)*  
Fiscal Affairs Committee: JERRY WILSON, At-large, 1982 (replacement for  
A. Watson) *John Stockman  
repl to GEC  
M/K*

DAVID BRECHT (Fall 1980 replacement for  
K. Stoffers, Sch./Div., 1981)

General Education Committee: SALLY FECHTMEYER-BOLAR, Sch./Div., 1981  
(replacement for R. Arellanes)

\* Commencement Committee: LARRY CHASE, 1983 (reappointment)  
*Charles Moore, Arts/Sci., 1981 (repl for R. Jmeter)*

\* Hornet Foundation Board: GERALD McDANIEL, 1983 (reappointment)  
RICHARD BROCK, 1981 (replacement for R. Segura)

\* Layoff Committee, Academic closely-related: JOSEPH KRAMER, 1981  
(replacement for B. Rugeley)

\* Layoff Committee, Academic: DONALD ZINGALE, 1981 (replacement for M. Lee)  
WILMA KREBS, 1983 (replacement for H. Thornton)

\* University Planning Committee: RICHARD HILL, At-large, 1983 (replacement  
for E. Gale)

\* University Union Board: SARA GREEN, 1981 (reappointment)

Election Committee: ROBERT FOREMAN, Chair; JANELL ANDERSON, TIM HALLINAN



AS 80-53/Ex. ELECTION OF SECRETARY AND ~~PARLIAMENTARIAN~~, 1980-81

Secretary: LOU DELL MOORE

Parliamentarian: ~~ALAN WADE~~

INFORMATION/CONSENT

*and Student Input*



\* AS 80-54/Ex. POST-AUDIT PROCEDURES - ARTP

On August 27, 1980 the Executive Committee approved the attached "Post-Audit Procedures" on behalf of the Academic Senate. (Attachment A)

REGULAR AGENDA

*✓*  
*MSU*

AS 80-50/F1r. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of meetings of April 30, May 7, and May 14, 1980.

*✓*  
*\**

AS 80-55/Ex. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS / ~~STUDENT INPUT~~

The Academic Senate approves the policies and procedures on "Evaluation of Administrators" (Attachment B).

*✓*

AS 80-56

*MSCU*

Commemoration of Marguerite Denton

*first on agenda*

*New # on Oct 8*

*\**

Reconsideration of AS 80-54

Post-audit Procedures - ARTA

*Oct mtg*  
*Parliamentary*

POST-AUDIT PROCEDURES *and Student Input*  
(FACULTY MANUAL Amendment)

4.05.01 Summary of the Consultative Process Model

- H. ~~After appropriate review of the University ARTP Committee's analysis, the secondary level ARTP committee forwards its recommendations and all substantive material upon which they were based to the President or his designee, who also receives a final post-audit of the allocation process from the University ARTP Committee.~~ (Change I to H)

4.05.05 Primary Level (Department or Equivalent) ARTP Committee

A. Composition

1. ~~The primary level ARTP Committee shall consist of a minimum of three (3) elected members, and the department chair (or equivalent) as an ex-officio non-voting member.~~ *Leave in*

The primary ARTP Committee may consist of all tenured faculty or all tenured faculty of a specified rank and the department chair if the department policy so indicates. In such instances the primary level committee need not be elected, provided the procedures for constituting the Primary ARTP Committee are affirmed by vote of the faculty of the primary unit at any time such vote is requested by a department faculty member.

B. Duties and Procedures

6. The chair of the primary level committee and the department chair shall forward to the secondary committee a written statement, approved by a majority vote of the primary ARTP committee, certifying that procedures of the primary committee have been followed. This statement shall accompany each set of primary level evaluations.

4.05.06 Secondary Level (School/Division) ARTP Committee

B. Duties and Procedures

10. The chair of the secondary level committee and the dean/division chair shall forward to the UARTP Committee a written statement, approved by a majority vote of the secondary ARTP committee, certifying that procedures of the secondary committee have been followed. This statement shall accompany each set of secondary level evaluations.

4.05.07 University ARTP Committee

B. Duties and Procedures

- 1., b. ~~Reviews the recommendations on retention and tenure to determine whether correct criteria and procedures were used in the evaluation, and reports directly to the President and the appropriate ARTP unit.~~ (Change c to b)
- d. ~~Analyzes the proposed plan for promotions submitted by each secondary level ARTP committee and submits a post-audit report and recommendations to the President and to appropriate ARTP committees.~~ (Change e to d)

4.05.07

~~F.--The University ARTP Committee shall provide the President with any evidence of failure of primary and secondary reviews to conform to adopted procedures.~~

4.13.08 Criteria for Retention and Tenure

B., l., c. ~~Input from students in terms of (a) the results of the application of standardized departmental/school/or division procedures which provide student opinions and/or evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance and (b) oral testimony, if any.~~

Standardized written student evaluation questionnaires are required for all faculty annually in all courses. The faculty of the primary evaluating units are responsible for the development and administration of evaluation questionnaires, and for ensuring that the distribution and collection of questionnaires maintain student anonymity. Summaries of the results of the questionnaires shall be placed in the ~~professional and/or~~ personnel action files of the faculty, as deemed appropriate by the faculty of the primary evaluating units.  
All open-ended written testimony, either as part of a standardized evaluation questionnaire or presented directly to the primary committee, must not be summarized but must be maintained in its original form. The results of the student evaluations shall be given to the instructor and department chair after grades have been assigned.

*R. Smith*

The faculty of the primary evaluating units shall be responsible for devising methods for soliciting additional student input. At a minimum, names of faculty under evaluation shall be posted near the appropriate office with established day(s) and time(s) for the primary level ARTP committee to receive oral or written testimony from students regarding professional performance of an individual faculty member. The primary level committee shall summarize oral testimony and provide a copy of all summaries or written testimony to the individual member of the faculty. Summaries of oral testimony shall be signed by the chair of the primary committee.

The absence of <sup>written or oral</sup> student reports in a faculty member's file shall not be considered as either positive or negative evidence during RTP considerations. Students presenting evaluative material to a department chair shall be advised by the chair that to be considered in the ARTP process, the student must present his/her comments to the primary level committee either orally or in writing.

Students may not participate in the evaluation process except in the manner described above.

*R. Smith* strike

## 4.20.00 Minimum Criteria for Promotion

## A. Competent Teaching Performance

3. ~~Input from students in terms of (1) the results of the application of standardized departmental/school/or division procedures which provide student opinions and/or evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance and (2) oral testimony, if any.~~

Standardized written student evaluation questionnaires are required for all faculty annually in all courses. The faculty of the primary evaluating units are responsible for the development and administration of evaluation questionnaires, and for ensuring that the distribution and collection of questionnaires maintain student anonymity. Summaries of the results of the questionnaires shall be placed in the professional and/or personnel action file of the faculty, as deemed appropriate by the faculty of the primary evaluating units. All open-ended written testimony, either as part of a standardized evaluation questionnaire or presented directly to the primary committee, must not be summarized but must be maintained in its original form. The results of the student evaluations shall be given to the instructor and department chair after grades have been assigned.

The faculty of the primary evaluating units shall be responsible for devising methods for soliciting additional student input. At a minimum, names of faculty under evaluation shall be posted near the appropriate office with established day(s) and time(s) for the primary level ARTP committee to receive oral or written testimony from students regarding professional performance of an individual faculty member. The primary level committee shall summarize oral testimony and provide a copy of all summaries or written testimony to the individual member of the faculty. Summaries of oral testimony shall be signed by the chair of the primary committee.

The absence of student reports in a faculty member's file shall not be considered as either positive or negative evidence during RTP considerations. Students presenting evaluative material to a department chair shall be advised by the chair that to be considered in the ARTP process, the student must present his/her comments to the primary level committee either orally or in writing.

Students may not participate in the evaluation process except in the manner described above.

## EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

The University conducts periodic and formal evaluation of its administrators. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide a fair and systematic appraisal which will lead to the improvement of administrative performance. The evaluation process is designed to provide broadly based input from the campus.

**A. Procedures for Evaluation of Area Managers (Academic Vice President, Administrative Vice President, Dean of Students)**

1. An evaluation of area managers shall be conducted every three years.
2. An Evaluation Coordination Committee shall be appointed as follows:
  - 5 faculty* two members shall be selected by the Faculty Senate and the President shall appoint seven *Academic* members, two representing each of the three administrative areas (exclusive of the area managers), and one representative of the President's Office.
3. The Evaluation Coordination Committee shall:
  - a. establish a timetable for evaluation
  - b. develop an evaluation questionnaire appropriate for the particular position, and make copies available to the Faculty Senate for information
  - c. develop a valid sampling pattern appropriate to the particular position which includes at least 5% of all full-time faculty and 5% of all full-time staff
  - d. establish procedures for handling the results of the evaluation
  - e. review responses, aggregate them, and conduct follow-up interviews as appropriate
  - f. prepare a written evaluation report, including recommendations for improvement
  - g. discuss the evaluation process, report, and recommendations with the President
4. The President shall discuss the evaluation with the individual involved and inform the Evaluation Coordination Committee that the evaluation has been completed.
5. Respondents for each position will vary but shall include:
  - a. members of the President's Cabinet
  - b. persons within the area who report directly or indirectly to the individual being evaluated
  - c. members of appropriate campus committees
  - d. appropriate Chancellor's Office representatives
  - e. faculty, staff, and students
  - f. appropriate community representatives
6. Questionnaires and Other Information submitted to the Evaluation Coordination Committee
  - a. Objective questionnaires shall be developed based on the job description for the position submitted to the committee by the President.
  - b. Prior to its distribution, the Evaluation Coordination Committee shall submit the questionnaire to the President for his/her review.

- c. Responses to objective questionnaires shall be anonymous. Respondents may be asked to identify themselves by category: faculty, staff, student, administrator, community representative, Chancellor's Office representative.
  - d. Written comments may be submitted with the questionnaire or submitted separately to the Evaluation Coordination Committee. All written comments must be signed.
7. The evaluation review is confidential; access to responses, written reports, and recommendations is limited to the individual involved, members of the Evaluation Coordination Committee, and the President.

**B. Procedures for Evaluation of University Deans and Directors in the Instruction/Academic Support Area**

1. An evaluation of University Deans and Directors shall be conducted every three years.
2. An Evaluation Coordination Committee shall be appointed as follows:  
two members shall be selected by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Vice President shall appoint five members.
3. The Evaluation Coordination Committee shall:
  - a. establish a timetable for evaluation
  - b. develop an evaluation questionnaire appropriate for the particular position
  - c. develop a valid sampling pattern appropriate to the particular position which includes at least 5% of all full-time University personnel
  - d. establish procedures for handling the results of the evaluation
  - e. review responses, aggregate them, and conduct follow-up interviews as appropriate
  - f. prepare a written evaluation report, including recommendations for improvement
  - g. discuss the evaluation process, report, and recommendations with the Academic Vice President
4. The Academic Vice President shall discuss the evaluation with the individual involved and inform the Evaluation Coordination Committee that the evaluation has been completed.
5. Respondents for each position will vary but shall be broadly based and provide for a wide variety of input.
6. Questionnaires and Other Information submitted to the Evaluation Coordination Committee
  - a. Objective questionnaires shall be developed based on the job description for the position submitted to the committee by the Academic Vice President.
  - b. Prior to its distribution, the Evaluation Coordination Committee shall submit the questionnaire to the Academic Vice President for his/her review.



- c. Responses to objective questionnaires shall be anonymous. Respondents may be asked to identify themselves by category: faculty, staff, student, administrator, other.
  - d. Written comments may be submitted with the questionnaire or submitted separately to the Evaluation Coordination Committee. All written comments must be signed.
7. The evaluation review is confidential; access to responses, written reports, and recommendations is limited to the individual involved, members of the Evaluation Coordination Committee, the President, and the Academic Vice President.
- C. Procedures for Evaluation of School Deans and Division Chairs (amendment to FACULTY MANUAL, section 3.10.00)
- 1. Faculty members periodically shall review and evaluate the performance of their deans and division chairs. The purposes of such reviews are (1) to assist the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Dean or Division Chair to identify strengths and weaknesses and to focus upon appropriate corrective actions; (2) to assist the administrator and faculty to understand, define, and pursue the nature of their mutual undertaking.
  - 2. A review shall be conducted every three years. The review shall be initiated in the Fall by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - 3. A review committee of five members shall be established. The review committee shall be constituted as follows:
    - a. One faculty member selected by and from the governing body of the unit, or, if the unit has no governing body, by and from an appropriate committee as determined by the faculty of the unit
    - b. One faculty member (not necessarily from the unit) selected by the Vice President for Academic Affairs
    - c. Two faculty members from the unit elected by secret ballot by the faculty of the unit at large
    - d. One staff member elected by the staff of the unit.
  - 4. After its selection, the committee shall conduct the evaluation according to the procedures developed by the governing body of the unit, ratified by the faculty of the unit, and approved by the Academic Vice President. Procedures may vary among units; but shall include:

- a. A timetable for evaluation
  - b. An anonymous evaluation questionnaire appropriate for the particular position
  - c. A valid sampling pattern, which includes at least 20% of all full-time school/division faculty
  - d. An opportunity for the following to make a separate comment on appropriate instruments designed by the governing body of the unit:
    - the dean or division chair being evaluated
    - all department chairs in the school/division
    - members of the major school/division committees during the period under review
    - other school/division deans
    - members of the Academic Affairs staff
    - students and staff, as appropriate
  - e. Procedures for handling the results of the evaluation
5. Based on the information provided by the respondents, the committee shall:
- a. Prepare a written evaluation report, including recommendations for improvement, and an evaluation statement regarding the success or failure of the dean/division chair in discharging his/her responsibilities
  - b. Discuss the evaluation process, report, and recommendations with the Academic Vice President
6. The Academic Vice President shall discuss the evaluation and recommendations with the individual involved and inform the committee that the evaluation has been completed.
7. The evaluation review is confidential. ~~Access to responses, written reports, and recommendations is limited to the individual involved, members of the evaluation committee, the Academic Vice President, and the President.~~ *Leave as is*
- D. Evaluation of Administrators in Student Affairs and in Administration and Business Affairs**
1. Evaluation of administrators in positions designated by the area manager shall be conducted every three years.
  2. The appropriate area manager shall appoint an Evaluation Coordination Committee of three members. The Faculty Senate may appoint one additional member. *U.S.A.*
  3. The Evaluation Coordination Committee shall follow the procedures in B3, 5, 6, and 7, except that the Academic Vice President is replaced by the appropriate area manager.