

# Academic Administrators Assessment

Faculty Concerns Committee Report 2017-18.

**Faculty Concerns Committee Members:** Drs. Walt Nelson (Chair), Ashlea Cardin (secretary), Albert Barreda, Mandy Benedict-Chambers, Ching-Wen Chang, Thomas Dicke, Jason Hausback, Shouchuan Hu, Stevan Olson, Benjamin Onyango, Lisa Proctor

**Report compiled by:** Dr. Walt Nelson

## Introduction

The purpose of the Academic Administrators Assessment is to provide a feedback mechanism whereby faculty evaluations of academic administrators can be compiled and reported back in summary form to the faculty and to the university community as necessary. This survey was administered in November of 2017, during the final month of service by deans of department heads. As such, it is likely more useful than the IDEA survey of the same positions taken in January-February 2018. Why? Inconsistent results will plague the IDEA survey as respondents fail to rate a position now occupied by someone new or they do rate the position based on the performance of someone who is now departed. Some persons in administration moved from one position to another, likely adding to the confusion.

## Methods

This survey relied on a questionnaire that included 64 closed- and open-ended questions. Faculty were asked to respond to each question using a scale that ranged between 1 and 5, where 1 indicated “strongly disagree”; 2 was “disagree”; 3 was “neutral”; 4 was “agree”; and 5 was “strongly agree.” The survey was administered during the first two weeks of November 2017. Two hundred twenty-eight (228) faculty members responded.

## Data Summaries

Table 1 compares the average positive responses for each of the positions assessed. That is, the value for the response “Agree” was added to the value for the response “Strongly Agree” to determine the percentage positive response for each of the four positions. Table 1 reveals that only the position of academic dean reports a positive value below 50%. The positive values for president, provost and department head average well above 50%.

Table 1 - Average Positive for Each Administrative Position

	President	Provost	Dean	Head
Average Positive	78%	59%	49%	68%

The utility of the survey results is diminished considerably once the demographics of the faculty respondents is taken into consideration. For example, Table 2 shows that when asked to declare their rank, 36 preferred not to answer. That is, nearly 16% of respondents declined to so identify.

Table 2 - Response by Faculty Rank (N=228)

Declared Rank	Number Responding
Clinical	8
Instructor or Sr. Instructor	31
Assistant	62
Associate	33
Full or Distinguished	57
Prefer not to answer	36
Missing Answer	1

Table 3 - Faculty respondents by college or other unit. Responses were dominated by COAL, COB and CHHS

Table 3.-Distribution of Faculty by College or Unit (N=228)

College or Other Unit	Number Responding
COAL	50
COB	30
CHHS	49
COE	35
CNAS	16
CHPS	18
School of Comm. Studies	1
Graduate	0
School of ACC	1
Darr	2

Library	6
Greenwood Lab	1
Prefer not to answer	19

Therefore, reading through the numeric results and the written comments should be done with this context in mind.

## President

The average of all survey questions regarding the president is 4.2. Faculty believe the president is an effective ambassador (4.42) for the university and that conditions at the university have improved under his leadership (4.36). His “good job” rank is 4.37. Faculty ranked his budget priorities below 4.0 at 3.88. Table 4 shows the results for the president.

Table 4 - Questions and Mean Survey Response for President. Overall Average 4.22

4a MSU Improved undr Pres	4.36
4b Decisions Actions Benefit	4.27
4c Supports Research	3.74
4d Shared Gov	4.07
4e Communication Budget	4.25
4f Ambassador	4.42
4g Support Public Affairs	4.36
4h Supports Diversity	4.33
4i Marketing MSU	4.41
4j Long Range Planning	4.21
4k Good Job	4.37
4l Budget Priorities	3.88

### Written Comments Regarding President

Respondents offered 101 written comments regarding the president.

**Positive Comments.** The positive comments concentrated on two areas: the ability of the president to promote Missouri State University and efforts by the president to improve faculty morale. Various questions in the survey can be loosely organized around these two issues.

**Promotes University.** Forty five individuals commented and thirty four of those individuals provided responses that were completely or in part positive. Nine of these individuals made general positive statements about President Smart, e.g., “I think President Smart has been highly effective” or referred to attributes they found positive, “....he is very accessible and approachable”. Twenty-one of the comments made specific reference to President Smart’s interactions with external entities with many of the comments pertaining to President Smart’s interactions with the state legislature.

Three of the thirty four comments were positive statements regarding his management of the budget and four of the thirty four discussed President Smart's positive interactions with traditional and social media.

Faculty Morale. Of the fifty-six comments offered, thirty four provided responses that were completely or in part positive. Twenty two of these were positive comments about President Smart's overall performance and attributes. Some of these attributes included accessibility, advocacy, positive attitude, dedication, hard work, and caring. Five individuals provided positive feedback regarding the President's management of budget changes/cuts. Five individuals made positive comments about his interactions with students, his social skills and/or use of social media. Two individuals provided positive comments regarding President Smart's support of diversity with one comment specifically discussing his support of people of color (POC) in the community. Finally, there was one comment regarding his assistance with the Ellis Hall renovations.

Negative Comments. Of the 36 opportunities-for-growth comments provided on the survey, nine (25%) focused on increasing faculty salaries. Four comments noted that President Smart was very supportive of students, but seemingly less supportive of faculty. Three comments related to faculty concerns over how the university was dealing with the budgets cuts (i.e., representing MSU's funding needs to the legislature and renovating buildings during a time of budget cuts). Three faculty comments related to low faculty morale. Concerns about dwindling resources and support for faculty research, including resources within the library to promote research productivity, were expressed in two comments. Two additional comments emphasized faculty members' concern about the vision of the university as focused on financial growth and accepting all students rather than on providing a rigorous education and graduating strong alumni. Two faculty, who identified as members of underrepresented groups, expressed concern about President Smart's response to the protests in Charlottesville. Two faculty comments suggested that President Smart engage in more oversight of the Deans, including holding the Deans accountability for supporting and hiring underrepresented groups. Nine of the 36 comments did not relate to other comments shared by faculty. These included concerns about decreasing faculty lines, the online teaching incentive, creating more green spaces on campus, and establishing new traditions for students to enjoy at the institution. Finally, one comment suggested that President Smart create an online "suggestions box" to solicit ideas about how to make the university run more efficiently as one way to manage decreased funding.



## Provost

Faculty ratings for the provost clustered between a mean of 3.73, which is approximately the same as the previous survey of 3.83 in 2015. The highest rated items dealt with supporting the public affairs mission and the “overall” rating of having done “a good job.” The lowest rated items received mean scores of about 3.5 on the scale and involved budgeting shared governance. Table 5 shows the results for the provost.

Table 5 - Questions and Mean Survey Response for President. Overall Average 3.73

1a Program Strength	3.66
1b Strength Grads	3.57
1c Support Improve Teach	3.84
1d Support Improve Res	3.63
1e Communication	3.79
1f Shared Gov	3.59
1g Fair	3.71
1h Supports Diversity	3.9
1i Faculty Recognition	3.8
1j Support Public Aff	3.95
1k Good Job	3.87
1l Budget Appropriate	3.5

### Written Comments Regarding Provost

Comments suggested that the provost has brought stability and trust to the provost office but that he has too low of a profile and too little control over colleges. As one commenter said, “The Provost office is accessible to faculty and interactions with the Provost and Associate Provosts are open without fear of negative reactions or retaliation in response to disagreements about policy or procedure. A stronger presence of the Provost office in oversight of deans might help to ensure this same level of integrity is maintained at the college level.”

The quantitative ratings also support one of the qualitative themes from the comments: declining quality of programs and decreased rigor in classes. Faculty believe the administration, and the provost specifically, push for quantity over quality. This manifests itself in larger classes and more per-course instruction.

## College Deans

As shown in Table 7, survey results for the college deans demonstrate a consistent level of disappointment amongst the faculty who responded to the survey. The most positive result was the strength of the college level support staff.

Table 6 - Questions and Mean Survey Response for College Deans. Overall Average 3.45

9a Effective Leader	3.3
9b Goals Aligned	3.84
9c Sound Plans	3.54
9d Challenges Identified	3.48
9e Collaborative Decisions	3.03
9f Supports Quality Ideas	3.34
9g Favoritism Non Existent	3.22
9h Promotes Fairness	3.15
9i Efficient Administration	3.69
9j Effective College Meetings	3.31
9k Money Spent Wisely	3.4
9l Timely Info to Faculty	3.75
9m Transparency	3.27
9n Strong College Support Staff	3.96

Written Comments Regarding College Deans. Of the 56 written comments, 17 were positive and 25 were negative.

A summary (paraphrase) of **positive** comments:

The dean is described as: excellent, very effective, fantastic, efficient, fair, supportive, improved demeanor

Characteristic actions include: communicates clearly, communicates budget information, goals and priorities are clearly communicated, maintains transparency, devoted to the goals of MSU, faculty felt supported during budget crisis



Demonstrated leadership skills include: provides strong leadership and vision, addresses concerns, recognition of faculty accomplishments, participates in faculty meetings, meets with all assistant professors

Comments about interim/new dean: ability to listen, great job of stepping in and managing/supporting, too early to answer questions

A summary (paraphrase) of **negative** comments:

The dean is described as: vindictive, talks negatively about people in front of others, ineffective leader, very difficult to work with and to work for, unsupportive, cannot be trusted, no one trusts dean, micro-manager, difficult, socially awkward, judgmental, terse, rude, critical, obstructionist, appetite for power, harmful, nitpicks

General issues include: favoritism, has reduced morale, doom and gloom mentality, provides vague ideas but expects specific results, inequality, bully's faculty especially junior faculty who avoids dean at all cost, does not consider input from faculty, does not communicate deadlines, prone to making constant microaggressions, makes comments that undermine female faculty, gets mired in details and lose sight of the big picture, top down decision maker who is unresponsive to faculty issues and concerns, has less than 15% support from the faculty in the college, constantly churns up tension with faculty and staff, caught up in minutiae such as the apparel of staff and faculty, responsible for a visually stunning waste of space (building addition) while classrooms and technology are outdated and unreliable, and the HVAC system and elevators have been neglected, reputation for saying one thing and doing another, frequently makes disparaging comments, does not uplift or recognize faculty

Leadership issues include: reactive, no focus on long-range planning, only cares about new initiatives that make them look good, does not advance any positive agenda, is not a collaborative leader, persistent and pernicious lack of respect, a manager but not an academic leader, never heard as many negative comments about a leader, ineffective leader, does what they want no matter what the faculty think, never provides encouragement or support of faculty initiatives, we only see the Dean when something is wrong, poor leadership skills, relationship of department with dean is atrocious, dean does not allow for a faculty appeal to grievances lodged against a faculty member

## Department Head

The average overall score on the survey for department heads was 3.86. Department heads scored well for issues such as “goals aligned” (4.13) and strong department administrative staff (4.21). However, collaborative decision-making (3.68) and transparency (3.71) are areas where department heads appear to need to make improvement. See Table 6, nearby.

Table 7 - Questions and Mean Survey Response for Department Heads. Overall Average 3.86

7a Effective Leader	3.73
7b Goals Aligned	4.13
7c Sound Plans	3.75
7d Challenges Identified	3.83
7e Collaborative	3.68
7f Supports Quality Ideas	3.9
7g Faculty Recognition	3.83
7h Favoritism Non-existent	3.79
7i Promotes Fairness	3.81
7j Efficient Administration	3.94
7k Effective Faculty Meetings	3.73
7l Money Spent Wisely	3.92
7m Timely Info to Faculty	3.95
7n Transparency	3.71
7o Strong Support Staff	4.21

Written Comments Regarding Department Heads. Comments cut across many departments across university. The summary therefore do not reflect a particular unit in any specific college. For the purposes of our summary, the comments are divided into positive and negative mainly and on the fringe there are comments we classified as neutral, out of place and questionable practices.

Positive comments refer to a department head/leader who is transparent, communicates decisions timely, fair, has strong organizational skills, enforces policy objectively, mentors and supports faculty and staff. Additionally the department

head/leader takes constructive criticism well and implements remedial measures. The department head must have vision for the department and encourages collective participation for overall welfare of the faculty.

Our tally shows that there was a total of 59 comments with 18 (31%) positive, 24(41%) negative, 12(20%) were out of place, 3 (5%) neutral and 2(3%) questionable practices.

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge Three**  
**16 February 2018**

**Rules Committee members:** John Heywood (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Stephen Haggard, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Hurst (*ex officio*)

**CHARGE THREE**

**Charge:** Should the role of the Committee on Faculty Concerns change given the university's use of the IDEA surveys? Consider the appropriateness of the committee using their alternative years to investigate other faculty issues, potentially ones that have arisen from the faculty morale survey.

**Summary of Findings (see pages 3-5 for details):**

1. From 1999 to 2007, the administrative assessment was conducted by Faculty Concerns. The scope of the assessment, composition of the committee, and the resources necessary to meet assessment objectives provided formidable obstacles for Faculty Concerns. For that reason, in 2006, the Senate Executive Committee petitioned President Nietzel to compose a presidential task force to design and assist in the implementation of a college dean and department head assessment.
2. In 2008, the task force completed its charge and the assessment was implemented. The assessment consisted of three parts 1) the IDEA evaluations of department heads and college deans, 2) a department climate assessment, and 3) a summative review process for which faculty took part in the 5-year review of academic administrators. Only the IDEA assessments were carried forward after MSU experienced change in the President and Provost Offices. The current President, in consultation with the Provost, denied a Senate Action to reinstate the full assessment process.
3. IDEA assessments alone greatly weaken faculty input into leadership evaluation when compared to the approach that was a product of the Senate's collaboration with University Leadership. While the prior assessment protocol held academic leaders partially accountable to the people they lead, the current practice of assessment holds academic leaders primarily accountable to superordinate academic leaders.

**Conclusions:**

1. The Academic Administrators Assessment survey conducted by the Faculty Concerns Committee is currently the only source of data from which the faculty can extract consensus views on administrator performance and thus generate objective and constructive input into leadership evaluation. We believe it would be premature to revise the charge to Faculty Concerns before the assessment protocol developed by the President's committee has been fully implemented.

2. It is important that the Senate preserve a history of the extensive efforts made to develop an effective administrator evaluation process that was truly the product of shared governance. That effort included faculty, department head, college dean, and Provost Office collaborations. To that end, the remaining pages of this report include a detailed history of these efforts and a series of appendices containing key documents. This history was prepared by Tom Kane who chaired the President's Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee that produced the *Academic Leader Assessment Manual*, which was adopted by the previous administration.

**Proposed Changes to the Bylaws:** None

**Recommendations to the Senate Chair:**

1. The Senate should continue to appeal to President Smart and Provost Einhellig to fully implement the leadership assessment protocols that were developed in 2008 by the President's Committee on Leadership Priorities and Assessment (LPAC) under the guidance of the Provost Office (i.e., reinitiate the climate assessment and implement the summative review process).
2. Based on what transpires, reconsider the role that the Faculty Concern's Administrative Assessment should play in asserting *faculty voice* into the assessment and strengthening of academic leadership.

**Detailed Findings:**

Relevant text from the Bylaws of the Faculty [ART I SEC 9B(2), lines 688-693]:

(The Faculty Concerns Committee) Shall conduct an Academic Administrators Assessment survey of all full time faculty during the fall semester of odd numbered years. A report to include analysis of survey results and any appropriate recommendations arising from the survey shall be distributed to the Faculty Senate members in time to be included on the agenda for the February session. To facilitate comparison with earlier surveys, data for department heads and deans shall be tabulated, analyzed and reported separately.

Addressing this Rules Committee charge entails taking into account Faculty Senate and Faculty Concerns Committees' efforts to provide feedback about the quality of administrative leadership since 1999. A decision about how to move forward with regard to this issue might best be made if the Senate understood the history of the Faculty Concerns' Administrative Assessment and how the Administrative Assessment process has evolved over time. A timeline describing key incidents in that history appears in Appendix 1.

The Faculty Senate, for a long period of time, has attempted to find avenues to improve the quality of academic leadership and assert a *faculty voice* into the process of leadership evaluation and development. Early efforts, led by the Faculty Concern Committee, met with limited success because the assessment process was a faculty invention, not an administrative one. The first assessment, for instance, produced a report that was highly critical of administration, and that report was rejected outright as producing a valid faculty perspective. From that point forward, efforts have been made by the Faculty Concerns Committee and the Senate to produce a constructive process to provide faculty input about the quality of academic leadership at MSU.

In 2007, the Senate, under the leadership of Mark Richter, reached agreement with the University President and Provost to convene the Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee. The LPAC was convened at a time when the University was developing assessments for the purposes of the merit-based compensation system. The LPAC, which was comprised of faculty with relevant expertise, the Associate Provost, a College Dean, and a Department Head, completed its charge in 2008. The committee designed a process that heavily weighted faculty feedback in the evaluation and development of academic leadership. The assessment process targeted College Deans and Department Heads and was comprised of the following components:

- 1) A climate assessment to evaluate conditions in departments that support departmental productivity and morale;
- 2) A standardized assessment instrument (IDEA) developed and managed by Kansas State University; and
- 3) Summative evaluations of department heads and deans conducted each five years, which involved elected faculty representatives in departments on the evaluation committees.

The process developed by the LPAC was presented to the Faculty Senate and Faculty Concerns Committee because it was relevant to the administrative assessment activities conducted by the faculty. A data sharing agreement was reached between the Provost Office and the Faculty Senate (via the Faculty Concerns Committee). The arrangement was included in the last section of the *Academic Leader Assessment Manual* (Appendix 2).

At the direction of Provost McCarthy, the IDEA and climate assessments were conducted in 2009-2010, and the resulting report is reproduced in Appendix 6. However, before the summative review processes were initiated, Associate Provost Craig, Provost McCarthy, and President Nietzel left the university. Evidence of the nature of the collaboration between the Faculty Senate and University Administration is contained in the introduction to the 2010 report:

*In 2007 and 2008, the Faculty Concerns Committee coordinated its leadership assessment procedures with the formal assessment activities occurring on campus. Those procedures included standardized evaluations of Department Heads and College Deans conducted by the IDEA Center at Kansas State, and a Departmental Conditions Evaluation (DCE), which was originally developed by the Faculty Concerns Committee and expanded to include input from Deans, Department Heads, and the Provost Office. This report introduces the purposes of these assessments and summarizes the results at the university-level (2010 Faculty Concerns Administrative Assessment Report).*

In October of 2016, the Faculty Senate approved a Senate Action to request that the University Administration fully implement the Academic Administrative Assessment process designed by LPAC (Appendix 3). President Smart, in consultation with Provost Einhellig, declined that action.

In 2017, Tom Kane, Deputy Provost Craig, and Provost Einhellig were asked by President Smart to discuss the Senate Action that was declined. The Provost Office declined to initiate the summative review process as part of the evaluation of Deans and Department Heads, though they were amenable to reinstating a climate assessment and continuing the IDEA evaluations. That is, they were willing to discuss the implementation of the climate survey and share data with the Faculty Concerns Committee aggregated at the University level.

### **Significance of the Climate Assessment**

Appendix 4 contains the climate assessment advocated by the University President's Leadership Priorities & Assessment Committee. A primary role of academic leadership, whether the source of that leadership is from departmental faculty or formal academic leaders, is to foster conditions that support the success of the University in terms of educated students, research products, and service provided to communities internal and external to MSU. Items contained in the climate assessment were generated by faculty and administrators on the LPAC to reflect 'ideal conditions' that supported the effectiveness of departments. The list of *effectiveness conditions* was reviewed and revised according to feedback from faculty, department head council, and academic leadership council. The LPAC envisioned the assessment being used to evaluate the health of departments, both strengths and challenges, and to encourage faculty and formal academic leaders to work in partnership to strengthen departmental conditions. Department Heads would be instructed to hold faculty meetings where issues could be raised, discussed, and collectively addressed.

### **Significance of the Summative Review Process to Faculty**

The summative review process that was drafted by the President's committee is contained within in the *Academic Leader Assessment Manual* (Appendix 2) and has been extracted into Appendix 5. The refusal of the Provost Office to honor the summative review protocol greatly weakens the faculty voice in shaping the nature and quality of academic leadership at the University. Without it, all feedback provided by faculty about the quality of administration is controlled and interpreted by the supervising administrator. Logically, the perspectives of faculty and supervising administrators differ with respect to

a Department Head or College Dean being evaluated. The application of the summative review process, with elected faculty involved in the process, ensures that the feedback from faculty is consolidated, evaluated, and communicated from a faculty perspective. As well, the summative review process would produce feedback that prioritized the improvement of academic leadership as it impacts the professional lives of faculty in the department or college.

It should be emphasized that the Provost requested the LPAC to design the summative review process. The value implied by the inclusion of the summative review was that effective academic administrative leadership required the support and respect of those who are led.

### **Meeting with Faculty Concerns Chair:**

A member of the Rules Committee, met with the Chair of the Faculty Concerns Committee, Walt Nelson. It seems that the opinion of the committee, expressed by the chair, is that the Administrative Assessment Charge is very time-consuming and may keep the committee from investigating and addressing other substantive issues that affect the quality of life of MSU faculty. In addition, records kept by prior Faculty Concerns Committees were not complete, assessment report templates were not readily available, and prior data with which to compare new data collected were not well archived. Of special concern is lack of clarity about the intended goals of assessment and whether the assessment efforts by the committee over the years has produced positive outcomes for faculty. Of note, these concerns were important original considerations of the Faculty Senate when it petitioned the University President to form the Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee.

### **Rules Committee's Resolution of its Academic Administrator Assessment Charge**

The LPAC's development of the Administrative Assessment protocol included feedback, review, and agreement between the Provost Office and the Faculty Senate. The resulting system was a Senate initiative to work with University Administration to construct a single protocol through which University Objectives for strengthening academic leadership could be attained. Faculty and Academic Administrators jointly developed the system, and the system was put in place in 2009. Also in 2009, data from the climate assessment and IDEA assessments were shared with the Faculty Concerns Committee. The system was connected to the Faculty Concerns Committee's administrative assessment charge, not only because of a data-sharing agreement with the Provost office, but also because the inclusion of a strong faculty voice in the assessment process was an overarching objective of the original assessment initiative. The Provost Office's opposition to the summative review protocol changed the nature of that agreement and weakens faculty input in the assessment process. Such removal changes the evaluation of Deans and Heads from a process that strengthens shared leadership/governance to system for which data are collected, interpreted, and used at the sole discretion of upper administration. As a consequence, an assessment system designed to hold academic leaders jointly accountable to both faculty and upper administration was replaced by a system that holds academic administrators accountable only to the perspectives of the supervising administrator. Had the system that was designed been implemented in its entirety, then the Faculty Concerns Committee's Administrative Assessment Charge might be viewed as redundant and unnecessary. However, because the agreement has been altered, the Rules Committee recommends the following to the Senate:



## Appendix 1.

### Abbreviated History of Administrative Assessment

1999: First administrative assessment was completed by the Faculty Concerns Committee (FCC). It was controversial and widely condemned by administration. Qualitative comments published publically precipitated rejection of the assessment by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

2001: While the objectives of the 2001 assessment were not found, the use of the report appeared to prioritize the Senate's desire to hold administrators publicly accountable to faculty evaluation.

2001: Faculty Concerns revised the assessment and re-evaluated the purpose and use of the assessment. Objectives of the assessment were communicated in a report to the 2002 Faculty Senate:

1. Communicate what faculty desire from administrative leadership.
2. Provide data about how administrative activities supported (did not support) conditions that foster departmental success.
3. Provide feedback to administrators pertinent to academic leaders' support of faculty morale and productivity.
4. Raise awareness of administrators about what constituted high and low quality leadership in academic units (i.e., through qualitative comments).
5. Make recommendations for strengthening SMS (MSU) leadership.

2001: The *2001 State of SMSU Leadership: Faculty Report* identified two issues of primary concern: 1) fostering a stronger faculty voice and participation in issues and governance, and 2) maintaining quality personnel. The report and findings were presented to the University President and VPAA by the Senate and FCC chairs.

2002: Faculty Concerns evaluated the low response rate of the administrative assessment (32%) and the most common reason for non-participation was 'it will not make a difference.'

2003: The Executive Summary of the *2003 State of SMSU Administrative Leadership: Faculty Report* stated that "Faculty members are ideally situated to provide meaningful feedback to SMS administrators pertinent to the impact that leadership actions have on conditions that support *faculty* effectiveness. Hence, the primary purpose of the *2003 State of SMSU Administrative Leadership: Faculty Report* is to provide information that can be used to strengthen the leadership of SMSU Department Heads, College Deans, Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) and University President."

2003: The Faculty Concerns Committee made the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate: "After reviewing the *2003 SMS Administrative Leadership: Faculty Report* and after thorough discussion, the Faculty Concerns Committee determined it to be in the best interest of faculty if an ad-hoc subcommittee selected by the Faculty Senate be convened to, first, identify a set of recommendations based on the content of this report. Second, we recommend that the subcommittee fully consider ways to encourage avenues that invite a constructive administrative response to the issues raised in this report at all levels of SMS leadership. We urge the Senate Subcommittee to share their report with the broader faculty body."

2006-7: The Senate Executive Committee reached agreement with President Nietzel to form a joint faculty administrative committee, the Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee, to design an

administrative assessment instrument and process amenable to both faculty and administration. The Committee, comprised of faculty with relevant expertise, Associate Provost Chris Craig, a College Dean, and a Department head, worked with the Provost Office to develop the process, acquire feedback from faculty committees (Senate and Faculty Concerns), department heads, and deans throughout the process.

2007: The October Report to the Board of Governors contained the following entry under ‘Senate Priorities’: “Thanks to the collaborative approach embraced by President Nietzel and Provost McCarthy, the president has launched a leadership assessment committee to take advantage of campus expertise in leadership development and organizational behavior. An assessment process is being developed with the purpose of identifying department strengths and concerns so that both faculty and academic leaders can work together to strengthen conditions at the university that support the quality education of students, the scholarly productivity of faculty, and the positive impact that Missouri State has on the region and the state.”

2007: The presidential committee on Leadership Priorities and Assessment (LPAC) was convened.

2008: LPAC completed its charge. The objectives of the assessment and a philosophy statement of Academic Leadership were crafted.

2010: The 2010 Faculty Concerns MSU Leadership Report was constructed based on IDEA data shared by the Provost Office (Appendix 6).

## Appendix 2

### Academic Leader Assessment Manual

#### Purpose of Assessment

Effective leaders in organizations and universities:

- Foster a shared vision that, if accomplished, strengthens their respective units;
- Create alignment of their units with broader institutional goals that lead to the success and growth of the institution;
- Build commitment among personnel and other organizational leaders to pursue the common mission of the unit, to work hard, and to improve over time.

*In performing these functions at Missouri State University, academic leaders creatively synthesize university objectives, the collective input of unit personnel, and accessible resources to establish compelling direction and improve the efficiency and strength of academic units. They advance a climate of cooperation and mutual trust that engages participation and commitment toward improving University services in the form of educated students, scholarly products, and services to the local and state communities. Effective academic leaders draw their power and influence via ethical, trustworthy and just conduct; operate according to values of *transparency and shared governance*; and work hard to improve working conditions that support the morale, commitment, and productivity of faculty, staff and other leaders.*

Assessments of *academic leaders* provide **feedback** that can be used to strengthen the quality and impact of academic units over time. The assessment tools, survey procedures, data reporting, and performance appraisal/feedback processes described within this *Academic Leader Assessment Manual* were designed to attain this purpose.

### **Philosophy of Leadership Development at Missouri State University**

Academic leaders at Missouri State University develop when the following takes place:

- They work with units to construct and pursue *challenging yet realistic unit objectives*,
- They receive constructive *feedback* about successes and challenges associated with the attainment of unit objectives, and
- They receive sufficient *support* for developing leadership skills, obtaining resources, and constructing quality leadership strategies.

Leading others in the pursuit of challenging, yet realistic, objectives stretches the skills of academic leaders and stimulates the development of leadership capacities among all who reside within academic units. Constructive feedback provides information about the impact that unit decisions, policies, and actions have on unit personnel and desired objectives. From such feedback, academic leaders learn about successes and challenges relevant to leading units, collaboratively devise ways to overcome obstacles, and identify professional development goals. Provided in various forms, support includes training, internal and external professional development opportunities, supervisor mentoring and counseling, discourse about common experiences and challenges with peers, and a variety of other resources that assist the professional development of academic leaders.

### **Academic Leader Assessments**

Assessment activities in the performance evaluation process include ***The Department Conditions Evaluation; the Department Head Assessment Process; and the College Dean Assessment Process.***

## **Part I. Biennial Department Conditions Evaluation**

### **Overview**

Consistent with the LPAC's assessment philosophy, the biennial *Department Conditions Evaluation* (DCE) is designed to: 1) help departments (department heads and faculty) identify strengths/challenges facing their departments; 2) stimulate joint planning among faculty and academic leaders for strengthening departments; and 3) provide data so that conditions that support department effectiveness can be reviewed over time.

### **Development of the Department Conditions Evaluation**

Before generating DCE items, the LAPC developed written statements about the assessment purpose, a philosophy of leadership development, and the idealized role of academic leaders at Missouri State

University (see page one). These statements framed the generation and selection of survey items, the development of an assessment plan, and the construction of policy for analyzing, distributing, and using assessment results.

The LPAC developed a list of department conditions with the intent of describing an optimal environment that supports department effectiveness. A draft conditions list was generated by the committee from various sources, including prior administrator assessment instruments used by deans, job analyses data collected on department heads (from a prior project), assessment instruments implemented by faculty, and documents provided by the Office of the Provost. A draft list of conditions was circulated to academic and administrative councils and the Faculty Concerns Committee for feedback. Based on that feedback, survey items were developed and additional feedback from department heads, deans, and faculty was solicited.

### **Structure of the Survey**

The *Department Conditions Evaluation* assesses seven groupings of department conditions that support department effectiveness (see Table 1). In addition to the seven conditions, the evaluation also contains an eighth set of questions that assesses faculty motivation, job satisfaction, commitment to Missouri State, and turnover pressures, which were selected from organizational surveys validated in other settings. Procedures for protecting respondent confidentiality were approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

---

Table 1. Departmental Condition Categories

---

1. Quality Direction & Planning
  2. Motivation and Work Satisfaction
  3. Appreciation and Support of Diversity
  4. Effective Conflict Resolution
  5. Support for Students and Majors
  6. Effective Day to Day Administration
  7. Faculty Development and Productivity
  8. Commitment, Collaboration, and Cohesion
- 

### **Use of Data**

The *Department Conditions Evaluation* enables administrators and faculty to jointly discuss conditions that exist within departments at least once every two years. The data are analyzed at the university level to produce customized *Departmental Conditions Reports (DCR)* for each department, which are distributed to the focal department's faculty, department head, college dean, and the Provost Office. The *DCRs* only include summary statistics; whereby, interpretations of the data occur in department meetings. Department heads are expected to convene a meeting among all department faculty to discuss the *DCR* report, identify department strengths and areas to improve, generate goals for

improving departmental conditions, and discuss future department initiatives. The goals, priorities, or plans that result from these discussions are recorded to produce the *Department Futures Summary (DFS)*. This summary may be presented as a formal report drafted by the department head or faculty committee, or the DFS may be the documented departmental discussion that are recorded in the minutes of department meeting. The DFS is to be reviewed and approved by majority vote of ranked faculty and full-time instructors in the department.

The *DCR* and *DFS* will help college deans identify challenges and strengths that are common across college departments. Such data are collected to stimulate college-level dialogue related to strengthening departments and department leadership. Also, a university level report will be generated by the Faculty Concerns Committee to track the perceived strength of university conditions across time.

It is important to stress that the *Department Conditions Evaluation* is not designed to assess *department heads*. Rather, its purpose is to assess a variety of conditions in departments that emerge from interacting factors, including, college policy, university policy, university budget, external conditions that affect academic disciplines, the composition of departmental personnel, and factors within and outside the direct control of departmental faculty and academic leaders.

## **Part II: Department Head Assessment Process**

### **Sources of Data used by Deans for Department Head Annual Review**

**Department Chair Feedback System.** Part of the Department Head Annual Review employs the *Department Chair Feedback System* managed at Kansas State's IDEA Center. The assessment is administered to all full-time faculty and, in addition, staff considered by college deans to be in a position to provide relevant feedback about the department head's job-related activities. Five parts of the assessment include: 1) Department Head Responsibilities; 2) Department Head Leadership Capacities; 3) Department Head Activities, 4) Obstacles Impeding the Effectiveness of the Department Head; and 5) Qualitative Comments.

**Dean's Observations.** The college dean's observations of department head leadership are generated from a variety of sources including professional interactions with department heads; discussions with department staff, faculty and students; communication with relevant community members; and other sources relevant to the professional activities of department heads.

**Department Futures Summary.** The DFS is a record of the goals, priorities, initiatives, and/or plans developed as a result of the *Department Conditions Report* discussed in a departmental meeting or meetings.

**Annual Department Report.** As part of the *Annual Department Report*, department heads submit additional evidence of personal scholarship and leadership effectiveness. Evidence may differ by college or the unique duties of individual department heads, but can include recorded progress toward departmental goals, initiatives, or priorities; department productivity indicators; actions taken to strengthen departmental conditions; professional and leadership development experiences; evidence of personal scholarship; and teaching effectiveness. Department heads also submit personal professional development goals and department priorities as part of the Annual Department Report for discussion with college deans.

### **Department Head Annual Review Process**

The Department Head Annual Review is conducted by the supervising college dean in the Spring Semester. Department heads complete the Annual Department Report within five weeks after receiving the *IDEA Department Chair Feedback System* report in the spring semester. Other requirements for the department head's annual review are to be determined by policy constructed in specific colleges.

The discussion between department heads and college deans during the Department Head Annual Review is expected to be a participative process that culminates in the identification of priorities or goals for improving departments and/or the department head's professional development. Yearly goals are documented, and progress toward attaining yearly goals is reviewed in subsequent years. The dean documents the Department Head Annual Review meeting and sends a copy of that documentation to the department head for his/her review and signature. A copy of the Department Head Annual Review is placed in the department head's personnel file.

### **Department Head Five-Year Summative Review Process**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from departmental faculty, departmental staff, and external constituencies identified by the department head and dean. These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The department head's summative review is conducted by the Department Head Summative Review Committee (DHSRC). This committee includes at least three faculty members, one from each rank in the department when possible (i.e., professor, associate, assistant, and instructor), selected by the dean from two nominees at each rank elected by the faculty. Additional members placed on the committee should reflect the diversity of department programs. The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or the department head, appointed by the dean, from another department in the college.

The department head being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Department Head Annual Reviews, Annual Department Reports, a summary of major accomplishment over the prior four years, and written departmental goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DHSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Department Head Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University. The *IDEA Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty feedback and the generation of a feedback report. Other information may be collected by the DHSRC from faculty, staff, and external constituencies. The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the dean. The report is provided to the department head and the dean only.

The dean will review all materials, consult with the provost and make a determination as to reappointment. A memo prepared by the dean reporting the outcome of the review will be distributed to department faculty and staff.

## **Part III: College Dean Assessment Process**

### **Sources of Data Used by Provost for Dean Annual Review**

**Dean Feedback System.** Deans are evaluated with the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* (IFDS) managed by the IDEA Center at Kansas State University. The IFDS is administered to all faculty members, department heads, and other personnel deemed relevant by the provost to evaluate the college dean. The five parts of the assessment include: 1) The College's Major Programs; 2) Developing Resources for the College; (3) Attention to Organizational Matters; (4) Program Leadership; and (5) Personnel Management.

**Provost's Observations.** The provost's observations of a dean's leadership are generated from a variety of sources including professional interactions with the dean; discussions with college department heads, staff, faculty and students; communication with relevant community members and alumni; and other sources relevant to the professional activities of deans.

**College Annual Report.** The College Annual Report should be a part of the dean's performance review and used for setting objectives for the upcoming academic year(s).

**Dean Annual Performance Review Report.** Based on the dean's performance evaluation conducted by the provost in the preceding year, the deans prepare summary materials to document activities, progress, and achievements related to college goals, desirable college outcomes, and professional development goals. Data from the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* and *College Annual Report* can be used as evidence where applicable.

#### **Dean Annual Review Process**

The yearly performance review of deans is conducted by the provost in the Spring Semester. Prior to the review, deans write a *self-assessment* within five weeks after the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* report is received in the Spring Semester.

In preparation for the annual review conducted by the provost, the dean uses a variety of data sources to write self-assessments that focus on: 1) college leadership, 2) college accomplishments, and 3) professional development. Data sources may include, but are not limited to the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System*, *College Annual Report*, college performance data collected annually, and evidence of activities, progress, or accomplishments in relation to goals set during performance reviews from prior years. As a function of the Dean Annual Review, goals for the following year are set by the dean for college leadership, college planning, and professional or leadership development. A final evaluation report is written by the provost and presented to the dean for his or her review and signature.

#### **Dean's 5-Year Summative Review**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from the associate dean, department heads, faculty, and staff in the college, other deans, and external constituencies as desired by the dean and provost. These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The dean's summative review is conducted by the Dean Summative Review Committee (DSRC). This committee includes a tenured faculty member from each department in the college, selected by the provost from two nominees from each department elected by the faculty. The committee also includes at least three department heads in the college and the associate dean. At the provost's discretion, other committee members may be appointed. The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or a department head.

The dean being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Dean Annual Reviews, Annual College Reports, a summary of major accomplishments over the prior four years, and written college goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Dean Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University. The *IDEA Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty and department head feedback and the generation of separate feedback reports. Other information may be collected by the DSRC from faculty, staff and external constituencies. The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the provost. This report will be provided to the dean and the provost only.



The provost reviews all materials, consults with the president, and makes a determination as to reappointment. A memo prepared by the provost summarizes the outcome of the review, which is distributed to college faculty and staff.

## **Part IV: University Leadership Report**

The Faculty Concerns Committee is responsible for preparing the biennial *University Leadership Report* for presentation to the Faculty Senate and distribution to the university community and the Missouri State University Board of Governors. Early in the Spring of even-numbered calendar years, the Provost Office shares data aggregated at the university level with the Faculty Concerns Committee. The Faculty Concern's *University Leadership Report* contains summary statistics of the assessment data, data from the President and Provost Leadership Assessments, summary statistics collected from prior years, and a summary of leadership strengths and concerns based on deliberations within committee. The report is distributed to the Faculty Senate and Provost Office prior to the April Faculty Senate Meeting. The Faculty Concerns Committee presents the report at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

### **Appendix 3.**

#### **Proposed Senate Action on Leadership Assessment Practices**

Approved by the Faculty Senate, October 2016  
Disapproved by President Smart

**Whereas**, in 2008, the President's Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee (LPAC) completed its charge to develop assessment protocols for department heads and college deans by completing the Academic Leader Assessment Manual (ALAM);

**Whereas**, the LPAC was constituted to represent the university community and was comprised of six faculty, the Faculty Senate Chair, a department head, a college dean, and Associate Provost;

**Whereas**, ALAM procedures, including the annual on-line IDEA assessments of department heads, IDEA assessments of college deans, and department head summative reviews were implemented by the university after the committee culminated its work;

**Whereas**, the ALAM assessment protocols include commitments to be made by the university to the Faculty Concerns Committee to share university level data;

**Whereas**, turnover in Provost Office administration and senate leadership left some of the procedures and data-sharing prescribed by the LPAC unfulfilled;

**Whereas**, the values driving this assessment were constructed by the joint contributions of faculty and University Administration at all levels:

*Effective leaders in organizations and universities:*

- *Foster a shared vision that, if accomplished, strengthens their respective units;*
- *Create alignment of their units with broader institutional goals that lead to the success and growth of the institution;*
- *Build commitment among personnel and other organizational leaders to pursue the common mission of the unit, to work hard, and to improve over time.*

*In performing these functions at Missouri State University, academic leaders creatively synthesize university objectives, the collective input of unit personnel, and accessible resources to establish compelling direction and improve the efficiency and strength of academic units. They advance a climate of cooperation and mutual trust that engages participation and commitment toward improving University services in the form of educated students, scholarly products, and services to the local and state communities. Effective academic leaders draw their power and influence via ethical, trustworthy and just conduct; operate according to values of transparency and shared governance; and work hard to improve working conditions that support the morale, commitment, and productivity of faculty, staff and other leaders.*

**Be it resolved,** that Missouri State University institute the summative review processes for department heads and college deans as defined in the Academic Leader Assessment Manual;

**Be it further resolved,** that the data-sharing agreements between the Provost Office and Faculty Concerns Committee be re-instituted for the next leadership assessment performed by the Faculty Concerns Committee.

**Be it further resolved,** that a good faith effort is put forth to conduct the Biennial Department Conditions Evaluation, that departments receive the results of that data, and that departmental discussion ensue as prescribed in the ALAM.

**Be it further resolved,** that changes in the way that the University evaluates department heads and college deans is communicated to the Faculty Senate.

---

## History

In 2007, the Senate and University President agreed that it was in the best interest of the University to design a leadership assessment process to support Department Head and College Dean performance management and merit allocations.

The Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee (LPAC) comprised of representatives from the Provost Office, Academic Council, Department Head Council, the Academic Development Center, and six additional faculty members, was charged by President Nietzel to:

- 1) Develop a leadership assessment instrument that generates constructive feedback for professional development and that is useful for identifying concerns to be addressed through effective leadership.
- 2) Detail a process of delivering the assessment, collecting and managing data, and analyzing the results.
- 3) Develop a mechanism that ensures that the results are used to promote the individual development of administrator/leaders, strengthen university leadership at large, and resolve problems experienced at the departmental, college, and university levels.

The LPAC was formed, completed its charge, and the evaluation was put in place, including the use of the IDEA assessments for department heads and college deans. However, with the turnover that occurred in upper University Administration and in Senate Leadership, the summative review and evaluation processes have not been fully implemented or followed. As well, the sharing of University-level data with the Faculty Concerns Committee and the implementation of the Department Conditions Assessment has not been fully followed as well.

LPAC Committee members:

Chuck Barke' (replaced Karl Kunkel)

Chris Craig

Janice Greene

Pete Richardson

Roger Sell

Gary Brinker

Tim Knapp

Tom Kane (Chair)

Carol Shoptaugh

Lorene Stone

## Appendix 4.

### Departmental Conditions Assessment (Climate Assessment)

**Table 1. Effectiveness Conditions Supporting Faculty Morale and Productivity**

---

#### **1. Conditions that support job motivation**

- a) *The department/college/university culture” supports effective teaching, research, and service.*
- b) *Mutual faculty support is a norm.*
- c) *Faculty achievements are publicized in and outside of the department.*
- d) *Faculty are confident that quality efforts and ideas receive support and reinforcement, while unproductive and low quality efforts do not.*
- e) *Faculty pursue challenging goals for teaching, scholarly, and service accomplishments.*

#### **2. Conditions that support job satisfaction**

- a) *Faculty governance permits input into decisions affecting the department.*
- b) *Faculty have discretion in course schedules and classes taught.*
- c) *Tasks assigned to faculty are meaningful.*
- d) *Faculty are equitably treated with regard to pay structures, reassigned time, perquisites, and so on.*
- e) *Faculty pay and benefits compare favorably to other Universities.*

#### **3. Conditions that support effective conflict resolution**

- a) *Faculty governance, when possible, resolves conflicts concerning important issues.*
- b) *Faculty disputes are resolved according to the department’s best interest and the merit of ideas.*
- c) *Faculty views are fully heard before decisions are made.*
- d) *Disputes are resolved directly rather than covertly.*

- e) *Faculty approach conflict constructively. Personal attacks are rare.*
- f) *Once decisions are made, faculty work together cohesively.*

#### **4. Conditions that support relevant marketing and promotion of programs**

- a) *The department identifies opportunities to obtain available space, money, and personnel.*
- b) *The department has good working relations with college and university administrators.*
- c) *Departmental activities warrant campus-wide respect.*
- d) *Departmental activities warrant the respect of others in the SMSU community.*

#### **5. Conditions that support student achievement and well-being**

- a) *The physical classroom environment effectively supports student learning.*
- b) *Student organizations attract majors, enjoy quality supervision, and enable meaningful student experiences.*
- c) *The department recruits and retains quality majors.*
- d) *Majors receive quality advisement for both academic and career oriented decisions.*
- e) *Effective relations are maintained with alumni.*
- f) *Alumni donate time and money to the department.*

#### **6. Conditions that support adequate resources for faculty productivity and development:**

- a) *Activities to improve teaching, research, and service are supported and funded.*
- b) *Conference travel and dissemination of research at national and local conferences is supported.*
- c) *Relevant in-service training is available and flexibly scheduled to enable participation.*
- d) *Faculty are fully aware of criteria for tenure and promotion decisions, and the specific criteria that are used.*
- e) *New faculty receive mentoring, are involved collaboratively with other productive faculty, and receive guidance and support related to tenure and promotion.*
- f) *Performance appraisal procedures are fair and conducive to faculty development.*
- g) *Faculty know about internal and external funding opportunities specific to their research/practice/teaching needs.*
- h) *Faculty are aware of budget priorities, rationale for distributing and spending money, and where monies go.*
- i) *Faculty actively involved in conference governance (e.g., officers, programs chair) receive adequate travel support.*
- j) *Classroom and lab space sufficiently support teaching and research excellence.*
- k) *Up to date technology (computers, classroom equipment) meets faculty needs.*

#### **7. Conditions that support quality direction & planning.**

- a) *Clear and compelling direction characterizes departments, the college and SMS.*
- b) *Those who possess appropriate expertise are consulted before taking action or setting direction.*
- c) *Faculty input is sought and respected when initiatives for change directly affect the structure or functioning of the Department/College/University.*
- d) *Direction is consistent with the ideas and concerns expressed through faculty governance.*
- e) *Faculty share high levels of commitment in moving toward organizational goals at all levels.*
- f) *Quality information is gathered and shared prior to establishing plans that affect a department/college/SMS.*
- g) *Faculty are asked to evaluate proposed goals critically, input is valued, and faculty ideas are fully considered.*
- h) *Alternative plans are developed and debated prior to selecting any single strategic option.*

- i) *Feedback is sought from faculty concerning the success and possible improvement of strategic initiatives.*
- j) *Assessments of required resources are accurate in relation to department/college/SMS goals/mission.*
- k) *Faculty forum are held for identifying issues and solving problems with respect to moving SMS toward valued goals.*

**8. Conditions that support professionalism and appreciation of diversity:**

- a) *The department values diversity (e.g., racial, ethnic, gender) among students, faculty, staff, and administrators.*
- b) *Policy, research, and practice support the accommodation of those with disabilities.*
- c) *Activities or policies that discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, physical handicap, age, and sexual orientation do not occur.*
- d) *University pay structures are equitable with regard to gender.*
- e) *Employees treat each other respectfully.*

## **Appendix 5.**

### **Summative Review Processes Developed by the Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee.**

**Dean's 5-Year Summative Review**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from the associate dean, department heads, faculty, and staff in the college, other deans, and external constituencies as desired by the dean and provost. These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The dean's summative review is conducted by the Dean Summative Review Committee (DSRC). This committee includes a tenured faculty member from each department in the college, selected by the provost from two nominees from each department elected by the faculty. The committee also includes at least three department heads in the college and the associate dean. At the provost's discretion, other committee members may be appointed. The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or a department head.

The dean being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Dean Annual Reviews, Annual College Reports, a summary of major accomplishments over the prior four years, and written college goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Dean Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University. The *IDEA Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty and department head feedback and the generation of separate feedback reports. Other information may be collected by the DSRC from faculty,

staff and external constituencies. The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the provost. This report will be provided to the dean and the provost only.

The provost reviews all materials, consults with the president, and makes a determination as to reappointment. A memo prepared by the provost summarizes the outcome of the review, which is distributed to college faculty and staff.

### **Department Head Five-Year Summative Review Process**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from departmental faculty, departmental staff, and external constituencies identified by the department head and dean. These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The department head's summative review is conducted by the Department Head Summative Review Committee (DHSRC). This committee includes at least three faculty members, one from each rank in the department when possible (i.e., professor, associate, assistant, and instructor), selected by the dean from two nominees at each rank elected by the faculty. Additional members placed on the committee should reflect the diversity of department programs. The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or the department head, appointed by the dean, from another department in the college.

The department head being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Department Head Annual Reviews, Annual Department Reports, a summary of major accomplishment over the prior four years, and written departmental goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DHSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Department Head Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University. The *IDEA Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty feedback and the generation of a feedback report. Other information may be collected by the DHSRC from faculty, staff, and external constituencies. The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the dean. The report is provided to the department head and the dean only.

The dean will review all materials, consult with the provost and make a determination as to reappointment. A memo prepared by the dean reporting the outcome of the review will be distributed to department faculty and staff.

## **Appendix 6.**

### **2010 Faculty Concerns MSU Leadership Report Department Conditions, Departmental Leadership, and College Leadership**

In 2007 and 2008, the Faculty Concerns Committee coordinated its leadership assessment procedures with the formal assessment activities occurring on campus. Those procedures included standardized evaluations of Department Heads and College Deans conducted by the IDEA Center at Kansas State, and a Departmental Conditions Evaluation (DCE), which was originally developed by the Faculty Concerns

Committee and expanded to include input from Deans, Department Heads, and the Provost Office. This report introduces the purposes of these assessments and summarizes the results at the university-level.

The Department Head and College Dean IDEA Center Assessments were administered at the beginning of the Spring 2010 Semester and were made available to faculty until 2/5/2010. At the conclusion of the IDEA Center Assessments, the DCE was conducted and made available to faculty from 2/16/2010 until 3/1/2010. Both the IDEA assessments and the DCE are part of the formal procedures used by the Provost Office to conduct performance appraisals and structure the professional development of academic leaders. In addition, individual Departmental Condition Reports are to be made available to faculty members in each department for discussion during a department meeting. Summaries of the discussion of departmental strengths, challenges, and concerns are to be recorded. Overall, this process was developed to coordinate the efforts of faculty, department head, and college-level leadership to strengthen departmental conditions that support productivity.

### **Department Conditions Evaluation**

Table 1 reports mean responses and frequencies of 312 (43.7%) faculty members to 71 questions contained in the DCE. In addition, the mean faculty responses collected in 2008 also appear in Table 1 for comparison purposes. As shown, the strength of departmental conditions improved substantially (approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of a scale-point) for virtually every question contained in the assessment, including faculty evaluations of department cohesion, commitment to the university, job satisfaction, and departmental effectiveness. Conditions were evaluated particularly strongly for faculty evaluations of departmental administrative support staff, faculty evaluations of their colleagues, and evaluations of how well departments served students.

### **Department Head Evaluation**

Table 2 reports mean responses, ranges, and standard deviations for 546 faculty (77%) responses to the IDEA Center Department Head Evaluation. As shown, means on a five-point scale (5 being 'high') ranged from 3.39 (*Facilitates external funding*) to 4.52 (*Department Head accessibility*). Overall, means fell above the neutral point of the scale (3), and every evaluation in 2010 improved when compared to evaluations made in 2008. In 2008, the many of the 'lowest' evaluations of department heads on campus fell below the value of (2); while in 2010, none of the lowest evaluations fell below the value of (2). Response rates to the IDEA Department Head Assessment, by department, appear in Appendix A.

### **College Dean Evaluation**

Table 3 reports mean responses, ranges, and standard deviations for 560 faculty responses (71%) to the IDEA Center College Dean Evaluation. For evaluations of dean behaviors, average faculty responses to all questions fell above the scale midpoint of (3). Most favorably evaluated by faculty were questions about keeping faculty informed (4.10), appropriate tenure and promotion recommendations/decisions (4.09), and implementing affirmative action policies (4.09). Among items the receiving lowest evaluations were arbitrating disputes between faculty and department heads (3.43), actions related to the improved quality of teaching (3.56), and efforts to retain outstanding faculty (3.59). The majority of the 'lowest' evaluations of college deans also fell above the scale midpoint of three for items. Response rates to the IDEA College Dean Assessment, by department, appear in Appendix A.

### **Summary and use of the Data**

In general, faculty perceptions of department conditions, department head leadership, and college dean leadership have improved from 2007/8 to 2009/10. The similar patterns of improvement found for each of the three different evaluations adds credibility to the conclusion that faculty believe that conditions at Missouri State have improved. This assessment does not provide information about why perceived conditions have improved. Possibilities include: improved effectiveness of departmental, college or university-level leadership; changes to personnel who fill academic leadership positions; the effectiveness

of change initiatives implemented at the University; elements of the external educational, political, or economic environments; responsiveness to faculty perceptions of leadership behavior, and other possible factors.

The IDEA College Dean Evaluations are used by the provost as a tool for supporting professional development, and the IDEA Department Head Evaluations are used by college deans for performance reviews and for the professional development of department heads. It is the hope of the Faculty Concerns Committee (FCC) that supervising administrators will find a venue to praise the collective efforts of the department heads and college deans for strengthening functional conditions reported in departments. After all, the most consistently occurring trend in this report is that faculty has more favorably evaluated campus work-conditions and campus leadership in 2009/10 than they did in 2007/8. It should be encouraging at Missouri State that improved evaluations of academic leaders and departmental conditions have occurred during extremely trying fiscal times for higher education and the state of Missouri.

The FCC encourages administrators to attend to and provide professional development support to department heads who consistently fall well below University and/or nationally normed standards. The FCC also encourages Deans and the Provost Office to use the *Department Conditions Evaluation* as a diagnostic: to learn more about departments for which leadership evaluations are particularly low. In circumstances where the faculty evaluates departmental conditions or departmental leadership as severely problematic, successfully improving those conditions benefits faculty, the supervising administrator, students, and an array of university outcomes. Special encouragement might be given to department heads, especially in struggling units, for engaging faculty as partners for diagnosing and addressing concerns. Finally, we encourage University-level administrators to continue their support of using climate assessments and leadership evaluations, provided by faculty, as both a diagnostic tool for addressing concerns and as criteria for improving the university.

(TABLES NOT INCLUDED, BUT ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST)



Xxx

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge Twelve**  
**9 February 2018**

**Rules Committee members:** John Heywood (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Stephen Haggard, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Hurst (*ex officio*)

**CHARGE TWELVE**

**Charge:** Review the CGEIP section of the Constitution and Bylaws because of the Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) degree. Should CGEIP have a standing committee regarding the BGS degree?

**Rationale:** Josh Smith made this suggestion. He also said that if CGEIP needs to give any suggestions to the Rules Committee the committee can talk about this in their first September CGEIP meeting. See Final Policy Statement for CGEIP Committee 9-28-15.

**Findings and conclusions:**

1. In a memo to the BGS faculty committee, dated 14 January 2014, CGEIP recommended the creation of a standing committee with four members who would serve as the BGS Admission Committee and would review and approve each application for admission into the program.
2. Josh Smith provided another document, dated 28 September 2015, containing proposed new language for the Bylaws of the Faculty that would create this standing committee within CGEIP, with the recommendation that it become Article IV Section 12. However, this document was never presented to the Rules Committee as a charge.
3. Despite the fact that no formal action was taken on CGEIP's recommendation, the description of the BGS degree program in the MSU *Course Catalog* already states that "A subcommittee of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs serves as the BGS Admissions Committee to review and act on the application materials."

**Summary of Proposed Changes to the Bylaws:**

1. Add a committee within CGEIP that will be charged with reviewing and acting on BGS applications, to be incorporated into the Bylaws as ART IV SEC 11. Maintain all policies proposed by CGEIP in their "Final Policy Statement" of 28 Sept 2015.
2. Update language elsewhere in ART IV to reflect this added responsibility.

3. The proposed language has been reviewed and approved by Josh Smith.

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Original Language**

*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

**ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS**

**SEC 2 Purpose of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

This Council shall act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, undergraduate courses and programs offered collaboratively by academic departments in two or more colleges, undergraduate degrees offered by two or more colleges, and the general requirements for undergraduate certificates. *[lines 1554-1556]*

**SEC 3 Powers of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

This council is empowered to recommend the approval of curricular proposals or reject and return proposals to the originator. *[lines 1560-1561]*

**SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

*[paragraphs 4A-4G have been omitted for brevity]*

H If so charged by the Senate Chair, CGEIP initiates curricular proposals to add undergraduate degrees, delete undergraduate degrees, modify the requirements for existing undergraduate degrees, and modify the general requirements for undergraduate certificates, or investigates the merits of such proposed changes and initiates a curricular proposal at its discretion. *[lines 1588-1591]*

**SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

The council shall recommend the approval of a curricular proposal or reject and return a proposal to the originator. A proposal may be withdrawn from consideration without motion or vote by the originating units before final disposition by the council upon specific request to the council chair. All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI. *[lines 1678-1681]*

**SEC 11 Appeals of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs Actions**  
*[line 1683]*

### **Proposed Changes**

**Additions in bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, *[comments bracketed and italicized]*

## ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

### SEC 2 Purpose of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

This Council shall act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, undergraduate courses and programs offered collaboratively by academic departments in two or more colleges, undergraduate degrees offered by two or more colleges, and the general requirements for undergraduate certificates. **This Council shall also act on applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.**

### SEC 3 Powers of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

This council is empowered to recommend the approval of curricular proposals or reject and return proposals to the originator, **and to approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.**

### SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

*[paragraphs 4A-4G have been omitted for brevity]*

H If so charged by the Senate Chair, CGEIP initiates curricular proposals to add undergraduate degrees, delete undergraduate degrees, modify the requirements for existing undergraduate degrees, and modify the general requirements for undergraduate certificates, or investigates the merits of such proposed changes and initiates a curricular proposal at its discretion. *[lines 1588-1591]*

**I Reviews and acts upon applications from students for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.**

### SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

The council shall recommend the approval of a curricular proposal or reject and return a proposal to the originator. A proposal may be withdrawn from consideration without motion or vote by the originating units before final disposition by the council upon specific request to the council chair. All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI. **The Council shall also approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.**

## **SEC 11 Committees of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

### **A The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) Admissions Committee.**

- (1) The BGS Admissions Committee shall review applications for admission to the Bachelors of General Studies degree program and shall approve or deny such applications.**
- (2) The voting members and chair of the BGS Admissions Committee shall be appointed by the chair of CGEIP. The voting membership shall consist of a minimum of four ranked faculty from different colleges/entities, one of whom must come from an education preparation program in one of the six academic colleges. Voting members will serve two-year terms that are staggered such that not all terms expire in the same year. Members may be reappointed for multiple terms. If no members of the committee are serving on CGEIP, then the CGEIP chair will sit on the committee as *ex officio* without vote. The Associate Provost for Student Development and Public Affairs and the Bachelor of General Studies Advisor(s) from the Academic Advisement Center shall be *ex officio* members without vote.**
- (3) The committee will schedule a monthly meeting time. A meeting will be convened for any month in which at least one completed application has been submitted no less than two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting time.**
- (4) Approval of an application will require a 75% majority of the voting members.**
- (5) The Associate Provost for Student Development and Public Affairs will keep a written record of each application that is reviewed, including whether the application was approved or denied and, if denied, the reason(s) for the denial. The decision will be conveyed to the student and to the Assistant Director of Interdisciplinary Programs in the Academic Advisement Center.**
- (6) The chair of the BGS Admissions Committee will submit a written annual report to the chair of CGEIP who will forward the report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.**

**SEC 12 Appeals of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**  
Actions [line 1683]

**Final Language**  
*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

## ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

### SEC 2 Purpose of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

This Council shall act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, undergraduate courses and programs offered collaboratively by academic departments in two or more colleges, undergraduate degrees offered by two or more colleges, and the general requirements for undergraduate certificates. This Council shall also act on applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

### SEC 3 Powers of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

This council is empowered to recommend the approval of curricular proposals or reject and return proposals to the originator, and to approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

### SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

*[paragraphs 4A-4G have been omitted for brevity]*

H If so charged by the Senate Chair, CGEIP initiates curricular proposals to add undergraduate degrees, delete undergraduate degrees, modify the requirements for existing undergraduate degrees, and modify the general requirements for undergraduate certificates, or investigates the merits of such proposed changes and initiates a curricular proposal at its discretion.

I Reviews and acts upon applications from students for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

### SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

The council shall recommend the approval of a curricular proposal or reject and return a proposal to the originator. A proposal may be withdrawn from consideration without motion or vote by the originating units before final disposition by the council upon specific request to the council chair. All curricular proposals recommended for approval by the council shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as described in ART VI. The Council shall also approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

## SEC 11 Committees of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

### A The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) Admissions Committee.

- (1) The BGS Admissions Committee shall review applications for admission to the Bachelors of General Studies degree program and shall approve or deny such applications.
- (2) The voting members and chair of the BGS Admissions Committee shall be appointed by the chair of CGEIP. The voting membership shall consist of a minimum of four ranked faculty from different colleges/entities, one of whom must come from an education preparation program in one of the six academic colleges. Voting members will serve two-year terms that are staggered such that not all terms expire in the same year. Members may be reappointed for multiple terms. If no members of the committee are serving on CGEIP, then the CGEIP chair will sit on the committee as *ex officio* without vote. The Associate Provost for Student Development and Public Affairs and the Bachelor of General Studies Advisor(s) from the Academic Advisement Center shall be *ex officio* members without vote.
- (3) The committee will schedule a monthly meeting time. A meeting will be convened for any month in which at least one completed application has been submitted no less than two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting time.
- (4) Approval of an application will require a 75% majority of the voting members.
- (5) The Associate Provost for Student Development and Public Affairs will keep a written record of each application that is reviewed, including whether the application was approved or denied and, if denied, the reason(s) for the denial. The decision will be conveyed to the student and to the Assistant Director of Interdisciplinary Programs in the Academic Advisement Center.
- (6) The chair of the BGS Admissions Committee will submit a written annual report to the chair of CGEIP who will forward the report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

## SEC 12 Appeals of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs Actions

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge Fourteen**  
**22 February 2018**

**Rules Committee members:** John Heywood (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Stephen Haggard, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Hurst (*ex officio*)

**CHARGE FOURTEEN**

**Charge:** Consider revising the language in the Bylaws about the Committee on Honorary degrees. There is a document from Cindy Hail, past chair of this committee, with suggested changes.

**Rationale:** No distinction is currently drawn between the honorary doctorate degree and the honorary undergraduate degree. However, the Committee on Honorary Degrees has used different criteria for evaluating nominees for these two degrees, as clearly is appropriate, and would like for the language guiding their committee to be consistent with their practice.

**Findings and conclusions:**

1. The honorary undergraduate degree has been bestowed upon one individual who was prevented from earning a degree from MSU due to discriminatory practices. Dr. Hail suggested the degree might also be appropriate for an individual who was unable to complete their degree due to active military duty during time of war. The Committee on Honorary Degrees has proposed language to describe the purpose of the honorary undergraduate degree that is deliberately vague so as to allow for these and other, as yet unforeseen, circumstances where the honorary undergraduate degree might be appropriate. The Rules Committee believes that this vague language serves no useful purpose. If it is not possible to list the circumstances under which this degree might be conferred, we suggest leaving it to the discretion of the Committee on Honorary Degrees to evaluate nominees on an individual basis and make the case when they believe the degree to be justified.
2. The proposed language limiting the eligibility of previous MSU employees seemed excessively restrictive to the Rules Committee. We have proposed alternative criteria that have been reviewed and approved by Cindy Hail.
3. The language proposed by the Committee on Honorary Degrees would have allowed for the honorary undergraduate degree to be conferred at either the fall or spring commencement, whereas the honorary doctorate is only conferred at the spring commencement. This difference between the two degrees seemed arbitrary, and with approval from Cindy Hail we have eliminated this difference in our proposed language.
4. The Committee on Honorary Degrees has proposed changes to the wording of purpose #6 in the current language, but Cindy Hail has indicated no intent to change the



interpretation of this passage. There is no consensus within the Rules Committee that the proposed change improves clarity, so we have elected to retain the current language.

5. With the above exceptions, we endorse the changes that have been proposed by the Committee on Honorary Degrees.

**Summary of Proposed Changes to the Bylaws:**

1. Specify that the Committee on Honorary Degrees may recommend no more than two honorary doctorates and one honorary undergraduate degree per year.
2. Clarify the criteria for the honorary doctorate as per the suggestions from Cindy Hail.
3. Indicate that the honorary undergraduate degree will be conferred only rarely, but leave it up to the Committee to determine when this degree may be appropriate.
4. Clarify that most of the selection criteria included in the original language are intended for the honorary doctorate, not for the honorary undergraduate degree.
5. Change the numbering style to be consistent with the rest of ART I SEC 9.

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Original Language**

*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

## **ART I FACULTY SENATE**

### **SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate**

#### **B Standing Committees**

##### **(8) Committee on Honorary Degrees *[lines 850]***

###### **(a) Purpose**

Review nominations and select recipients for University Honorary Degrees according to the following procedures:

- 1 Nominations are to be sought from the entire University Community. Nominations are to be made confidentially and are to remain confidential throughout the selection process.
- 2 No more than two honorary degrees may be conferred annually. The committee should feel no pressure to select an honoree in any given year if it does not receive any nominations it deems worthy of this type of honor.
- 3 The honoree must be living at the time of selection and will receive the honor at the spring commencement. If an honoree dies during the interim between selection and the spring commencement awards ceremony, then the award will be presented posthumously.
- 4 Current members of the MSU staff, faculty, administration, and Board of Governors, as well as elected officials while holding elected office, are not eligible.
- 5 Financial considerations should not be involved in the selection process. Faculty Senate Action 36-00/01 makes it clear that the purpose of this honor is to “recognize extraordinary achievement of distinguished citizens,” not to reward financial support for the University.
- 6 The individual honored should have a strong tie to this community, state, or region. Although individuals with nationwide and worldwide recognition should not be excluded, preference should be given to distinguished candidates who have not been widely recognized and honored.
- 7 Four types of honorary doctorates may be bestowed: the Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.), given to persons who have distinguished themselves in the humanities; the

Doctor of Letters (Litt.D.), given to scholars in particular disciplines; the Doctor of Public Affairs (A.P.D.), given to persons distinguished in general service to the public, to learning and to humankind; and the Doctor of Science (Sc.D.), given to persons who have made distinguished contributions to sciences.

- 8 The Committee on Honorary Degrees will review nominations and complete its deliberations by November 15, when it will then present its recommendation, if any, to the Faculty Senate for its December session. Upon approval of the Senate, the recommendation will be forwarded to the President and to the Board of Governors.

### Proposed Changes

Additions in bold, deletions struck through, [comments bracketed and italicized]

## ART I FACULTY SENATE

### SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate

#### B Standing Committees

##### (8) Committee on Honorary Degrees [*lines 850*]

###### (a) Purpose

Review nominations and select recipients for University Honorary Degrees according to the following procedures:

- 1~~(aa)~~ Nominations are to be sought from the entire University Community. Nominations are to be made confidentially and are to remain confidential throughout the selection process.
- 2~~(bb)~~ ~~No more than two honorary degrees may be conferred annually.~~ **An honorary degree is a symbol of recognition and respect; it is not recognized as an earned degree.** The committee should feel no pressure to select an honoree in any given year if it does not receive any nominations it deems worthy of this type of honor.
- 3~~(cc)~~ The honoree must be living at the time of selection and will receive the honor at the spring commencement. If an honoree dies during the interim between selection and the spring commencement awards ceremony, then the award will be presented posthumously.
- 4~~(dd)~~ **The honorary doctorate degree recognizes the extraordinary achievements of distinguished citizens (SA 36-00/01).**
  - 5~~(i)~~ **No more than two honorary doctorate degrees may be conferred annually.**
  - 6~~(ii)~~ Current members of the MSU staff, faculty, administration, and Board of Governors, as well as elected officials while holding elected office, are not eligible. **Any individual who has worked for the MSU system as a full-time employee at any time during the past 20 years is not eligible. If a nominee worked for the MSU system prior to 20 years ago, the nominee must warrant recognition for achievements attained after leaving the MSU system.**
  - 7~~(iii)~~ Financial considerations should not be involved in the selection process. ~~Faculty Senate Action 36-00/01 makes it clear that the purpose of this honor is to “recognize extraordinary achievement of distinguished citizens,”~~ **not The honorary doctorate should not be used** to reward financial support for the University.

- 6(iv) The individual honored should have a strong tie to this community, state, or region. Although individuals with nationwide and worldwide recognition should not be excluded, preference should be given to distinguished candidates who have not been widely recognized and honored.
- (v) **Nomination materials must clearly document contributions outside of the nominee's job expectations.**
- 7(vi) Four types of honorary ~~doctorate~~ **doctorates** may be bestowed: the Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.), given to persons who have distinguished themselves in the humanities; the Doctor of Letters (Litt.D.), given to scholars in particular disciplines; the Doctor of Public Affairs (A.P.D.), given to persons distinguished in general service to the public, to learning and to humankind; and the Doctor of Science (Sc.D.), given to persons who have made distinguished contributions to sciences.
- (ee) **The honorary undergraduate degree is only awarded in rare and exceptional circumstances. No more than one honorary undergraduate degree may be conferred annually.**
- 8(ff) The Committee on Honorary Degrees will review nominations and complete its deliberations by November 15, when it will then present its recommendation, if any, to the Faculty Senate for its December session. Upon approval of the Senate, the recommendation will be forwarded to the President and to the Board of Governors.

**Final Language**  
*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

## **ART I FACULTY SENATE**

### **SEC 9 Committees of the Faculty Senate**

#### **B Standing Committees**

##### **(8) Committee on Honorary Degrees**

###### **(a) Purpose**

Review nominations and select recipients for University Honorary Degrees according to the following procedures:

- (aa) Nominations are to be sought from the entire University Community. Nominations are to be made confidentially and are to remain confidential throughout the selection process.
- (bb) An honorary degree is a symbol of recognition and respect; it is not recognized as an earned degree. The committee should feel no pressure to select an honoree in any given year if it does not receive any nominations it deems worthy of this type of honor.
- (cc) The honoree must be living at the time of selection and will receive the honor at the spring commencement. If an honoree dies during the interim between selection and the spring commencement awards ceremony, then the award will be presented posthumously.
- (dd) The honorary doctorate degree recognizes the extraordinary achievements of distinguished citizens (SA 36-00/01).
  - (i) No more than two honorary doctorate degrees may be conferred annually.
  - (ii) Current members of the MSU staff, faculty, administration, and Board of Governors, as well as elected officials while holding elected office, are not eligible. Any individual who has worked for the MSU system as a full-time employee at any time during the past 20 years is not eligible. If a nominee worked for the MSU system prior to 20 years ago, the nominee must warrant recognition for achievements attained after leaving the MSU system.
  - (iii) Financial considerations should not be involved in the selection process. The honorary doctorate should not be used to reward financial support for the University.
  - (iv) The individual honored should have a strong tie to this community, state, or region. Although individuals with nationwide and worldwide recognition should

not be excluded, preference should be given to distinguished candidates who have not been widely recognized and honored.

- (v) Nomination materials must clearly document contributions outside of the nominee's job expectations.
- (vi) Four types of honorary doctorate may be bestowed: the Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.), given to persons who have distinguished themselves in the humanities; the Doctor of Letters (Litt.D.), given to scholars in particular disciplines; the Doctor of Public Affairs (A.P.D.), given to persons distinguished in general service to the public, to learning and to humankind; and the Doctor of Science (Sc.D.), given to persons who have made distinguished contributions to sciences.
- (ee) The honorary undergraduate degree is only awarded in rare and exceptional circumstances. No more than one honorary undergraduate degree may be conferred annually.
- (ff) The Committee on Honorary Degrees will review nominations and complete its deliberations by November 15, when it will then present its recommendation, if any, to the Faculty Senate for its December session. Upon approval of the Senate, the recommendation will be forwarded to the President and to the Board of Governors.

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge Seventeen**  
**22 February 2018**

**Rules Committee members:** John Heywood (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Stephen Haggard, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Hurst (*ex officio*)

**CHARGE SEVENTEEN**

**Charge:** Please review the term limits for representatives on CGEIP and consider a removal of the number of terms an individual can serve.

**Findings and conclusions:**

1. The Bylaws do not limit the number of terms on CGEIP, but they do require a lapse of at least one year between successive three-year terms (ART IV SEC 5).
2. It can be difficult to find individuals willing to serve on CGEIP. When there is a conscientious member who is willing to continue serving, there seems to be no justification for forcing them off of the committee after three years. As long as elections for a seat on CGEIP are held every three years, an ineffective or obstructive member can be removed as long as the chair of CGEIP communicates adequately with the relevant College Council.

**Summary of Proposed Changes to the Bylaws:**

1. Remove the requirement for a one-year hiatus between terms on CGEIP.

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Original Language**

*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

**ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS**

**SEC 5 Membership of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

The Council shall comprise the following: two persons from each undergraduate college; one person from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>; and the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate, *ex officio* without vote. Members shall serve for a term of three (3) years and may not be reelected for a succeeding term until after the lapse of an intervening year. At the first organizational session, one (1), two (2), and three (3) year terms shall be drawn by lot, so that one-third of the council has each term length. Thereafter, members shall serve staggered three (3) year terms, so that one-third of the membership shall be replaced each year. The Provost or a designee of the Provost shall be an *ex*



*officio* member without vote. The Director of the Center for Assessment and Instructional Support shall be an *ex-officio* member without vote. [lines 1595-1602]

### Proposed Changes

**Additions in bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [comments bracketed and italicized]

## ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

### SEC 5 Membership of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

The Council shall comprise the following: two persons from each undergraduate college; one person from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>; and the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate, *ex officio* without vote. Members shall serve for a term of three (3) years and may ~~not~~ be reelected ~~for a succeeding term until after the lapse of an intervening year~~. At the first organizational session, one (1), two (2), and three (3) year terms shall be drawn by lot, so that one-third of the council has each term length. Thereafter, members shall serve staggered three (3) year terms, so that one-third of the membership shall be replaced each year. The Provost or a designee of the Provost shall be an *ex officio* member without vote. The Director of the Center for Assessment and Instructional Support shall be an *ex-officio* member without vote. [lines 1595-1602]

### Final Language

[comments bracketed and italicized]

## ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAMS

### SEC 5 Membership of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

The Council shall comprise the following: two persons from each undergraduate college; one person from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>; and the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate, *ex officio* without vote. Members shall serve for a term of three (3) years and may be reelected. At the first organizational session, one (1), two (2), and three (3) year terms shall be drawn by lot, so that one-third of the council has each term length. Thereafter, members shall serve staggered three (3) year terms, so that one-third of the membership shall be replaced each year. The Provost or a designee of the Provost shall be an *ex officio* member without vote. The Director of the Center for Assessment and Instructional Support shall be an *ex-officio* member without vote.

**Information for New Gen Ed Course: MTH 136 Precalculus I is in separate attachment no. 6.**