

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON HEADS/CHAIRS

Members: John Chuchiak, Jeffrey Cornelius-White, Ardeshir Dalal, Paula Kemp, Pauline Nugent (Chair), John Satzinger, Rose Utley

STATEMENT OF CHARGES

Charge #1: This committee was charged with making recommendations concerning three (3) items contained in the Senate Resolution brought to the floor during the July Special Senate Meeting, plus additional items added by the Executive Committee as follows:

- a. That MSU immediately move from the current Head/Director model of department/school administration to the Chair model. Chairs of Departments/Schools will be chosen by the ranked faculty of the unit to represent the faculty for a term of 3 years, renewable one time by a majority vote of the ranked faculty in Department/School.
- b. That Department/School Chairs will be members of the ranked faculty with all privileges of ranked faculty while serving as Department/School Chairs.
- c. That no academic administrator at MSU is to be paid at a CUPA ratio higher than the average CUPA ratio of the faculty under their administration. Note: CUPA ratios equal the ratio of the faculty/administrators¹ MSU salary to the CUPA mean for faculty/administrators at in a similar rank/position in a given discipline/academic unit.

Charge # 2: This committee should also examine the issue of Chair and Heads models more broadly, summarizing potential strengths and weaknesses of each, and suggesting whether, and in what circumstances, a Chair model might be appropriate at MSU.

Charge # 3: Finally, committee shall examine ways to improve department-level governance by 1) outlining ways faculty can be given a more meaningful voice in the hiring, evaluation, and termination of Heads/Chairs and 2) by understanding that a one-size-fits-all approach may not work, and outlining ways to improve the flexibility of administrative models so that departments have more flexibility to do what is best in their particular situation. The committee is encouraged to make other recommendations, as they see fit, and that come about as part of their examination of these issues.

INTRODUCTION & RESPONSE

There are no definitive descriptions of the Head or Chair model. In practice, it is hard to assess whether a university is using a Head or a Chair model based solely on the title being used. Generally speaking, a Head is an administrator who is appointed by and serves at the discretion of the dean. By contrast, a Chair remains a faculty member and is elected by the faculty to serve in an administrative capacity for a specific period of time. There are a number of key dimensions where a departmental administrator at MSU could be defined along a continuum between the two titles to reflect the needs and wants of faculty here. Therefore, the committee identified dimensions of importance and made recommendations to move the University in the direction of the Chair model by modifying the current practice at MSU.

Charge #1: Responses to the Three Items in the Proposed Senate Resolution

a. For the first item in the charge, this committee did not see compelling reasons to immediately change from a structure that utilizes Heads to one that utilizes Chairs. Indeed several faculty members raised concerns about lack of clarity in what the two terms meant and long-term data from the Faculty Concerns Committee do not support the notion that faculty are generally dissatisfied with the performance of their Heads. The committee felt that recommendations could be made to improve practices without stating whether Heads or Chairs were necessary as titles or without fully defining the variants that are implied by the terms. The committee is open to having departments self-select the term "Chair", as deemed possible and prudent, to define their administrative leader rather than using Head.

b. For the second item in the charge, this committee recognizes that Department Heads are unique administrators within the university with special faculty advocacy roles in addition to roles and status within the administration. Without switching all Heads to Chairs, the idea that Heads remain strictly faculty does not seem practical. Furthermore, there does not seem sufficient rationale to change the existing rights and privileges of Heads as administrators with faculty rank.

c. For the third item in this charge, our Committee reached a split decision regarding compensation for the Head/Chair: some hold that there should be an added premium for faculty during the period of administrative service in addition to the 2/11ths; others that the

additional 2/11ths is sufficient. But we unanimously agreed that administrators returning to faculty should be compensated at a level comparable to their rank and discipline within the School/Department. Our Committee recognizes that another Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee is exploring the issue of administrative salaries as a more direct focus of their charge and therefore was reluctant to proceed with this discussion.

Charge # 2: Strengths and Limitations

The Chair model generally involves faculty to a greater extent in the administration of the department. The Faculty has a role in choosing the Chair and often take turns serving as Chair. Increased faculty involvement is a positive aspect because it yields greater understanding both of the responsibilities involved in administration and of the procedures and rules followed at MSU. Faculty commitment and job satisfaction afford a greater degree of control over the work environment and allow for input into administrative issues.

With the Chair model faculty would need to be more engaged in the routine tasks of the department, and some might resist these additional responsibilities. The Chair model could be less efficient insofar as it diverts faculty attention away from the primary tasks of teaching and research. At MSU, there are some departments that would not work so well under a Chair model because the Head has special responsibilities and accreditation rules to observe. Moreover, some departments do not have sufficient qualified faculty who could serve as Chair, and many departments are happy with the way things are and see no need for change.

One of the main strengths of the Head model is that it insulates faculty from being involved in the variety of time-consuming, routine tasks that occur almost on a daily basis. Perhaps the main weakness of the Head model at MSU is the lack of faculty involvement in selection, reappointment, and evaluation of the Head. This provides less of an incentive for Heads to be answerable to the faculty and to be an advocate for faculty, and more of an incentive for Heads to acquiesce in and provide support for policies instituted by Deans that may not have general faculty support. Another weakness of the MSU model is the absence of term limits. Even if a Head is generally acknowledged to be doing “a good job”—and this ought to be the rule rather than the exception—after eight years (the generally applicable term limit proposed by this committee), it may be beneficial to seek out new ideas and alternative approaches.

Charge # 3: Recommendations to Improve Departmental Level Governance and Administration Practices

Pursuant to the discussion stated above, the committee deliberated further and agreed to make specific recommendations regarding the selection, initial appointment, reappointment, external search, and evaluation of Heads at MSU.

The committee had difficulty reaching a consensus on who should be considered “faculty” for purposes of selection, reappointment, and evaluation. It is clear that ranked faculty would definitely be included. However, the committee also discussed including senior instructors and possibly instructors who have served for some minimum length of time (e.g. 5 years) but who have not become senior instructors. This does not address the issue of clinical faculty; it was our opinion that perhaps the rules for inclusion of clinical faculty ought to be left up to those departments for which this is a relevant issue. While the specifics of voting may be subject to further discussion, the essential aim and intent is the need to include faculty in the selection, reappointment and evaluation process of their departmental administrator.

1. **Selection:** Selection of Heads or Chairs should be made by majority vote of faculty with approval from the dean. The American Association of University Professors (2011) statement on Governance notes, “The Chair or Head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members’ judgment.”¹
2. **Initial Appointment:** The initial appointment should be four (4) years. The three-year-term specified in Charge #1, is viewed by the Committee as being too short to interest external candidates in the position or to allow internal candidates to master the requisite procedures and excel in their execution. Additionally, the reappointment to a second term would allow only six (6) years total—a period of time too short for many departments, especially those in which stability is important for accreditation purposes (e.g. many health sciences).
3. **Reappointment:** Reappointment for one additional term, not to exceed four (4) years, is permitted, provided that such reappointment is supported by a majority vote of faculty with approval from the dean. Exceptions may be made if faculty agrees by at least a 2/3-majority vote that there are compelling reasons for the Head/Chair to continue in the role for more than two (2) four-year terms. The committee thought it important to encourage a balance between long-term stability and flexibility/growth within a unit.
4. **External Search:** An external search should be recommended only if there is no willing and acceptable internal candidate.

¹ American Association of University Professors (2011). Policy Documents and Reports (“The Redbook”). Retrieved October 26, 2011 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/>

- 5. Evaluation:** Annual evaluation should be similar to the process used for faculty members. The Head/Chair should be evaluated by the dean and by the department, which should utilize the same procedure and criteria used for evaluating faculty. However, individual department should have the latitude to develop alternative procedures and/or criteria for evaluation of the Head/Chair, if such procedures/criteria are approved by two-thirds majority of the faculty.

**Resolution to Implement the Recommendations of the
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Department Chairs/Heads**

Whereas, the Senate approved in July 2011 the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Heads/Chairs, which was charged with reviewing relevant policies on this and related issues; and

Whereas, the committee has made several recommendations in its report, the implementation of which will require changes in university policy; therefore,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee disseminate the committee's report to all the relevant bodies (e. g. AAA, Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, Provost's Office, etc.) and work with them and the Faculty Senate to determine the best way to implement the changes recommended in the report.

TO: The Faculty Senate
Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri

FROM: Paula A. Kemp, Chair
Honorary Doctorate Committee

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Awarding an Honorary Degree in May 2012

Resolution Conferring Honorary Doctorate upon Mr. Shawn Askinosie

WHEREAS, Mr. Shawn Askinosie, J.D. has distinguished himself by his extraordinary contributions to the area of public affairs; and

WHEREAS, after being a successful lawyer, he founded Askinosie Chocolate, a bean to bar chocolate manufacturer on Commercial Street in Springfield, Missouri, sourcing 100% of the beans directly from the farmers; and

WHEREAS, he has worked tirelessly with Boyd Elementary and Pipkin Middle Schools inspiring the children about social entrepreneurship and about a global world beyond Springfield; and

WHEREAS, Cocoa Honors, a neighborhood outreach of Askinosie Chocolate, is an 18 month-long cooperative learning project for high school juniors who learn about the “bean to bar” philosophy and gain exposure to different cultures and global business experiences; and

WHEREAS, he was co-founder of the Lost & Found Grief Center that provides education and support to people who have lost a loved one; and

WHEREAS, he has helped develop a computer lab for the Missouri Hotel Homeless Shelter, which houses about 80 children who now have a place to study, research, and create; and

WHEREAS, women from the Victory Mission Women’s Shelter, a shelter and educational program housing women in need, are employed by Askinosie Chocolate and they use the money made for field trips and to create special projects to help others in need; and

WHEREAS, he is a community leader, an entrepreneur, a role model, and an inspiration to students and others,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Missouri State University, meeting on this eighth day of December in the year two thousand eleven, recommend to the Board of Governors of Missouri State University that the degree of

Doctor of Public Affairs (A.P.D.) be conferred upon Mr. Shawn Askinosie at the Commencement Ceremony in May two thousand twelve in recognition of his extraordinary achievements in the area of public affairs.

Faculty Senate Action to Suspend Implementation of Senate Action 24-09/10

Whereas, the Faculty Senate passed, and the administration subsequently approved, an Action (Senate Action 24-09/10) that requires “that after a General Education class has passed two CGEIP assessment reviews (without substantial changes that require Faculty Senate approval), such assessment be limited to the submission of course policy statements & syllabi, and enrollment data;” and

Whereas, two reasons given for the Action were that “the additional workload placed on the CGEIP committee due to the impending assessment of Public Affairs would place additional burdens on the committee members” and that “any improvement to General Education courses at MSU diminishes rapidly with successive assessments;” and

Whereas, the expedited process approved in Senate Action 24-09/10 was put forward without consultation with members of CGEIP; and

Whereas, the members of CGEIP agree that the Senate Action will not significantly lessen the workload of the committee and will in fact make it more difficult to give an accurate and useful assessment of any course involved in the expedited process; and

Whereas, the members of CGEIP agree that courses—even excellent ones—do change significantly over the course of time and that ongoing assessment is essential to both a strong General Education program and to accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission; and

Whereas, the General Education program is in the process of global revisions that will almost certainly involve new assessments even of long-standing General Education courses; therefore,

Be it Resolved, that the implementation of Senate Action 24-09/10 be suspended until:

1. The revisions to the General Education program are completed and the new program is in place.
2. The Committee on General Education and Interdisciplinary Programs makes more specific recommendations about how an expedited process could work best in the new General Education Program.