

**REPORT OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS**

DRAFT, February 16, 2004

(For Presentation to the Academic Senate on February 23, 2004)

For Further Information, Contact:

Dennis Jaehne
Professor and Chair
Department of Communication Studies
San Jose State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0112
408. 924-5373
408. 924-5396 (fax)
djaehne@sjsu.edu

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	6
Chair Job Descriptions and Evaluation Procedures	7
Chair Roles and Relationships With Deans	9
Chair Workload Assignments	10
Chair Training and Development	15
Conclusion	19
Appendices	2

Academic Senate Task Force on Department Chairs Recommendations

Executive Summary

Background

In 2001 the CSU Academic Senate (CSU AS) conducted a systematic statewide survey of Department Chairs and Program or School Directors due to a “long standing concern... about the roles and responsibilities of department and program chairs.” The CSU AS distributed the final survey report to all CSU campuses in 2002. At SJSU, the Academic Senate considered the CSU AS report, along with a subset of SJSU data, and adopted a Senate Management Recommendation (SM-S03-2, March, 2003) calling for the creation of an SJSU Chair Task Force on Department Chairs. The 13 members of the task force represented chairs, deans, faculty and several administrative units; they meet from June, 2003 through February, 2004.

Guided by the goals of the CSU AS report, the Task Force focused on enhancing “...roles, rewards and resources” for Chairs and Directors, and improving “...training, recruitment, and retention of chairs with the end of making them more enduring and effective leaders of their departments.”

The Task Force addressed four major areas: Chair Job Descriptions and Evaluation Procedures; Chair Roles and Relationships with Deans (especially regarding budget authority); Chair Workload Assignments; and Chair Training & Development (including job satisfaction).

Chair Job Descriptions and Evaluation Procedures

The Task Force developed a generic chair position description and recommends that the campus adopt it, adapting it to the specifics of the individual’s assignment. The Task Force also recommends that the campus use this generic job description as the basis for Chair evaluation instruments to be completed by respondents from multiple sources (deans, administrators, other chairs/directors, faculty, staff, and students). The Task Force developed four evaluation instruments for different constituencies and recommends the campus adopt them.

Other key recommendations include the importance of the Dean meeting with each incoming Chair to identify and formalize the specific expectations of the position and of an annual meeting with the Dean for an informal evaluation of the FTE/A funded Chair appointment. The Task Force recommends that we continue with the current policy of formal evaluation and review by the Dean every four years

Chair Roles and Relationships with Deans (especially regarding budget authority)

The Task Force recommends that the campus continue its current practice of fiscal management in which Deans and Chairs have the flexibility to establish modes that work well for the Colleges with specific unit needs. The campus should continue the recent practice of providing an annual fiscal management training session for all new Chairs. Deans should be encouraged to provide Chairs and Directors with discretionary funds where possible to allow Chairs to foster creative initiatives within the unit, to reward deserving faculty, and to improve faculty morale.

Campus communication with and among chairs and other campus units will be improved if the University continues to recognize and support the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD), possibly giving it formal status analogous to the Council of Deans. In addition, the University should conduct an analysis of critical management information flow, networks, and pathways on campus and make recommendations for their improvement.

Chair Workload Assignments

The Task Force found that *SJSU under allocates FTE/A, particularly for larger departments*. This is true both in comparison with a reference institution (CSU Sacramento) and with respect to the effort required in actual workload. Non-chair faculty members also perform a significant amount of administrative work, paid with FTEF (assigned time) instead of FTE/A. This practice distorts an understanding of the actual administrative workload burden across the university and, because it assigns instructional dollars to pay for non-instructional administrative responsibilities, it also affects the calculation of unit SFR, which has budget implications. The campus should investigate the extent and implications of this practice.

Although no formula will perfectly capture all of the dimensions of workload, the CSUS formula adequately accounts for the significant differences among departments based on the multiple factors of each department's profile. In overall allocation, *CSUS Chairs are assigned more FTEA than SJSU Chair for the same work*. The report includes the CSUS formula and its application to current SJSU institutional data. FTES and FTEF alone are not reasonable measures of workload. Factors such as number of majors, faculty headcount, and responsibility for program accreditation must also be considered. *The currently allowable maximum FTEA for a unit is set at 1.0, which is too low for some large and complex units. The University should raise the maximum allocation for those units.*

Specific workload recommendations include: replacing the current SJSU allocation formula with the CSUS weighting methodology; including FTE/A allocation to support accreditation and reporting requirements; conducting an Academic Senate review of FTEF/FTEA assignments and workload; and modifying the allocation formula at SJSU to increase FTEA to 1.5 or higher for large and complex departments.

In order to deal with the growing responsibilities for paperwork emanating from faculty recruitment, staff recruitment and evaluations, and the implementation of new campus technology, the Task Force recommends allocation of FTEA for “Associate Chair” assignments. Adding such a role would also assist with succession planning and summer coverage for Chairs and Directors.

Chair Training & Development

The Task Force recommends the formalization of the campus role of the Chair-in-Residence position following an evaluation of the position. The Task Force recommends the development of a formal Chair training program, under the direction of the Chair-in-Residence, that identifies training appropriate to the Chair’s evolution in the position, and the training needs of both new and experienced Chairs. The report outlines specific training modules and topics, on and off campus training opportunities, and collaboration with campus entities that support the work of Chairs. In addition, the report recommends additional resources for Chairs (including a book of “best practices,” a UCCD Website and listserve, and the development of a Chair Calendar and Timeline), and assistance with ongoing relationships with the faculty members in their Departments. Specific recommendations regarding rewards for Chairs include an “Outstanding Chair Award,” a sabbatical leave following a term as Chair, and lottery money for Chair professional development. In general terms, the campus should work with the campus community to make the role and work of Chairs/Directors transparent to the constituencies they serve. Much of the high rate of turnover and reported job dissatisfaction comes from a generally inadequate understanding of what chairs actually do, what they have responsibility for, and the limited authority they have to make changes.

Academic Senate Department Chair Task Force Recommendations

(Note on usage: the word “chair” should be understood throughout as shorthand for “chair and/or school director.”)

Background

In 2001 the CSU Academic Senate (CSU AS) focused its attention on a “long standing concern...about the roles and responsibilities of department and program chairs.” Specifically, the CSU AS was aware that “at many campuses there is a rapid turnover of chairs and many chairs feel overworked and under-rewarded.” In the context of planning for future development of the CSU, the CSU AS appointed a seven-member faculty Task Force on Roles and Responsibilities of Chairs. That group conducted a systematic statewide survey of department chairs and program or school directors and submitted a report and recommendations in 2002. (The CSU AS report is available at: <http://www.geolog.com/FAC/ChairsTF.htm> and will not be reproduced here.) The CSU AS distributed copies of the report to the local campus Senates and recommended, among other steps, that “each campus establish a committee on the ‘status of chairs’ to develop an action plan to address the findings” of the report. At SJSU, the Academic Senate considered the CSU AS report, along with a subset of SJSU data, and adopted a Senate Management Recommendation (SM-S03-2, March, 2003, available at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/SM-S03-2.pdf>) calling for the creation of an SJSU Chair Task Force on Department Chairs, charged with:

- Reviewing campus data in consultation with the SJSU participants in the CSU study and a person well versed in data analysis;
- Soliciting additional input from the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD);
- Discussing the issues raised in the CSU task force reports (as well as by SJSU chairs); and
- Preparing a report with recommendations for the SJSU Academic Senate.

The SMR specified the composition of the task force (Appendix). AS Chair Annette Nellen convened the Task Force on June 23, 2003, at which meeting Dr. Dennis Jaehne (Chair, Communication Studies) was elected to chair the group. The 13 members of the task force represented chairs, deans, faculty and several administrative units; they met from June, 2003 through February, 2004.

The Task Force began by considering the CSU report’s recommendations. The overall goal of the CSU effort was to “enhance roles, rewards and resources” for Chairs and Directors, and “to improve training, recruitment, and retention of chairs with the end of making them more enduring and effective leaders of their departments.” We then organized ourselves into four work groups that focused on the various themes we identified among the state task force’s recommendations. Those sub-groups examined:

1. Chair Job Descriptions and Evaluation Procedures;
2. Chair Roles and Relationships with Deans (especially regarding budget authority);
3. Chair Workload Assignments; and
4. Chair Training & Development (including job satisfaction).

We organize our findings and recommendations according to these categories, citing the original CSU task force recommendations where applicable.

Chair Job Descriptions and Evaluation Procedures

The CSU survey found that two-thirds of all CSU chairs had “zero hours of formal preparation before they assumed their positions.” Further, once on the job, chairs lack clear expectations for their performance. Indeed, in many cases they were surprised to learn what they spent their time doing. In this regard, the CSU report made four recommendations that guided our inquiry and response in this area:

1. *Campuses should provide chairs with job descriptions and other details of their duties so they are fully informed of what is expected of them before they assume their roles.*
2. *Campuses should have reasonable expectations of chairs given the amount of time and resources available to them.*
3. *Campuses should review the tasks that chairs are expected to perform to assure they are appropriate and manageable within the constraints of the chair’s administrative appointment.*
4. *Campuses should evaluate and reward chairs based on their job descriptions.*

Our data indicated that many chairs had never seen a job description. Although we were able to obtain a generic description from Faculty Affairs (1991; see Appendix), which a few chairs had seen, and some from other CSU campuses, it became clear that there was no standardized position description. We then developed a standardized generic position description for SJSU chairs and directors (Appendix). We recognize that no chair can effectively perform all of the functions on the position description, and that different units have different needs arising at varying times, as conditions change. We therefore view the position description as a flexible guide that will help the Dean and unit faculty give specific direction to the unit’s chair and fully to inform an incoming chair what is expected of her/him. We recommend that:

- 1.0 the Senate should adopt the proposed chair position description as the generic standard for chairs and directors;
- 1.1 the chair position description should be used as a guide at the local unit level in setting specific expectations for unit chairs according to unit conditions, college needs, etc.; and
- 1.2 the Dean should meet with unit faculty and the incoming chair to identify and formalize the specific expectations for unit chairs.

We considered recommending a category weighted performance evaluation process, such as SJSU Human Resources uses for staff performance evaluations, but decided that there are too many variables for a generic weighting scheme. We concurred that some Deans and department faculty may wish to establish general category weights (e.g., for administration or faculty development) as part of setting specific expectations, which would then guide performance evaluation. This should be a local unit decision.

We then developed generic chair evaluation forms for use by four constituencies (Deans, chairs and administrators; faculty; staff; and students). We recognize that current policy governing selection and evaluation of chairs (S90-4) calls explicitly only for the first three, but the supplemental guidelines for implementing that policy also refer to “all relevant groups” (Appendix). Thus, in many units where the chair has significant interactions with students it may also be appropriate to solicit an evaluation from them. In some cases it may also be appropriate to solicit evaluation from alumni or other off campus groups. We did not feel it would be useful to develop a generic form for this, as unit needs and expectations vary.

Regarding chair evaluation, then, we recommend that:

- 2.0 the chair position description, as specifically formalized for a chair, should be used as the basis for evaluation of chair performance;
 - 2.1 the proposed generic evaluation forms (Appendix), as tailored to specific unit needs, be used to guide the chair evaluation process;
 - 2.2 specific evaluation expectations be linked to the position description and set forth clearly by the Dean and the unit faculty at the time of a chair’s initial appointment;
 - 2.3 the Dean meet annually at the end of each academic year to review the chair’s performance;
 - 2.3.1 this annual meeting be a formal expectation, but that the review itself be informal (i.e., will not result in an official personnel action);
 - 2.3.2 the purpose of the annual review will be to analyze the unit’s needs and potentially productive directions, the chair’s strengths and weaknesses, and to identify areas for training and/or improvement;
 - 2.4 chairs continue to be formally evaluated at the end of their four-year term;
 - 2.5 chair evaluation instruments should use five point, Likert-type scale items, with an option for “N/A” or “Not Enough Information;”
 - 2.6 chair evaluation instruments should contain space for non-scripted, open-ended responses (e.g., “comments ”).
 - 2.6.1 evaluation forms prescribe that evaluators must provide explanatory comments for any item scored below the median; and
 - 2.7 chair evaluations be based solely on the responsibilities of the chair assignment for that portion of their work that is funded by FTEA. Thus, as recommended in the CSU Task Force report, normal faculty evaluation

criteria (e.g., teaching and research standards) should not be used to evaluate the chair's performance in the chair role.

Chair Roles and Relationships with Deans

A major recommendation in the CSU task force report is that “campuses need to give chairs the resources they require to be effective leaders.” The elements contemplated here include giving chairs *more authority and control over budget* (and other financial resources), *more training* (and support for training), and *more access to information from administration*.

The control of fiscal resources emerged as a problem in the CSU survey based on the frustrations of chairs who experience the burden of high expectations for the development of their units and their faculty, but are given few resources, or control over resources, to accomplish this. Some respondents believed that if chairs were given control of department salary and supplies budgets, they could make cost-saving, efficiency decisions that would yield surplus funds to invest in department development.

The CSU report thus recommended that chairs be given “dollar-based budgets” and the ability to “roll funds forward from year to year,” with discretionary control over “saved dollars.” This seemed to be less of an issue for the SJSU chairs in the survey. We conducted a survey of current fiscal procedures in all of the colleges and determined that there is great commonality among colleges in how they handle fiscal management. We started from the understanding that the Dean, as an MPP appointment, has statutory responsibility for the fiscal management of the college; chairs, who are not MPPs, do not have such responsibility. Fiscal management in the colleges has evolved in terms of local college cultures and the relationships between Deans and chairs in a college. In some cases, the Dean retains centralized control over salary dollars; in other colleges, the Dean turns over salary management to some, or all, of the chairs in the college. In all colleges, Operating Expense and Equipment (OE&E) funds are allocated directly to departments and managed there. At the same time, we recognized that departments vary enormously in their fiscal needs and complexity. At one extreme, departments purchase little beyond telephone, copying, and basic office supplies; at the other extreme are departments with labs, performance programs, and other special needs. Furthermore, some departments have accumulated CE Trust or other discretionary foundation endowment funds, which provide some fiscal flexibility, while other departments have few if any such funds. Based on these considerations we recommend that:

- 3.0 the campus continue to allow Deans and chairs the flexibility to establish modes of fiscal management that work well for the colleges in the context of specific unit needs; i.e., that we do not attempt to impose a uniform fiscal management model on these procedures;
 - 3.1 we continue the recent practice of providing a fiscal management training session for all new chairs; and

- 3.2 Deans be encouraged to provide chairs and directors with discretionary funds where possible to allow chairs to foster creative initiatives within the unit, reward deserving faculty, improve faculty morale, etc.

Chairs' Access to Information from Administration. Although the campus has identified some general “communication problems,” we believe that chairs generally have access to the kinds of management information necessary to lead their units; this did not appear to be a major issue in the SJSU survey data. Indeed, there is perhaps too much information, coming from too many sources. The recently activated University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD) provides a monthly forum for university officials to brief chairs on major campus developments. Deans, Associate Deans, and college financial administrators also communicate directly with chairs. Other campus administrators work through the UCCD mailing list to provide relevant system information. In this regard, then, we recommend that:

- 4.0 the university continue to recognize and support the University Council of Chairs and Directors, possibly giving the UCCD formal status analogous to the Council of Deans; and
- 4.1 the university conduct an analysis of the critical management information flows, networks, and pathways on campus and make recommendations for improvement.

Chair Workload Assignments

The CSU survey found wide disparity in both workload assignments and workload compensation for chairs across the system. The CSU report treated those concerns under a general recommendation for equitable treatment of chairs “regarding their conditions of appointment.” A primary recommendation called for all chairs to have the option of a 12-month appointment (or appropriate compensation for unpaid work). At SJSU, however, all but three chairs of small departments (of the 56 total chairs and directors) are already in 12-month appointments. More germane is the CSU report’s recommendation to “establish an advisory committee to review the means used to determine the percent of administrative appointment and the length of the chair’s contract.” We therefore accepted this as part of our task force mandate.

Chair terms at SJSU are four years, compared with three years at most CSU campuses. Ideal term length involves a balance between the training and start up costs related to frequency of turnover, and the stability gains associated with the longer term. Some say that it takes the first three years to learn the role fully. Others point to the shorter term as providing more opportunities for new ideas, “new blood,” and new leadership opportunities to emerge. We decided that, absent significant complaint at SJSU, there is no need to change the length of chair term at this time.

Salary dollars for Chair assignments are paid from a separate allocation of General Fund monies set up to cover unit administration and accounted as Full Time Equivalent Administrative (FTEA) time. The Provost makes FTEA allocations to the colleges

according to campus-specific “legacy” formulae (i.e., there is no CSU system allocation formula) that depend mostly on Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) in the unit. FTEA is accounted separately from FTEF to give an accurate picture of actual administrative workload and to make a measurable distinction between administration and instruction. The current formulae are somewhat insensitive to differences in workload complexity across units that may seem by some measures to be of equal size. To compensate, Deans have the discretion to use more or less than the allocated FTEA amount. However, there is no campus level mechanism to ensure equity across the many units.

With IPAR’s help we were able to examine the actual FTEA allocations of all campus chairs in relation to the profile data for each unit, based on the latest available data from Fall 2002 (Appendix). We processed and analyzed this data to give a clear sense of the relationship between a department’s FTEA allocation and the “weight” of the chair’s responsibility in terms the categories recommended in the CSU report: FTEF, FTES, number of majors, and number of staff supervised. Our analysis leads us to conclude that FTEF as a raw number masks important workload information related to the number of faculty (headcount) actually supervised, which often includes many part-time faculty, creating a significant workload for staffing, appointments, and evaluations for some chairs. Further, the FTES number alone masks workload information since the number of majors can create additional advising burdens for chairs. Thus, we re-processed the data using several weighting schemes to come up with a more accurate and sensitive formula for assessing workload

Although in most instances the Deans allocate FTEA to units as dictated by the IPAR formula, there are some instances in which the colleges allocate additional FTEA to some units and less than the IPAR allocation to others. The Task Force found that *SJSU under allocates FTEA, particularly for larger departments*. This is true both in comparison with a reference institution (CSU Sacramento) and with respect to the effort required in actual workload. Non-chair faculty members also perform a significant amount of administrative work, paid with FTEF (assigned time) instead of FTEA. This practice distorts an understanding of the actual administrative workload burden across the university and, because it assigns instructional dollars to pay for non-instructional administrative responsibilities, it also skews the calculation of unit SFR (since FTEF assignments are figured into SFR, but FTEA assignments are not). Thus, faculty members performing necessary administrative work (e.g., graduate admissions, or an assignment to develop the teaching schedule) skew SFR calculations because they are counted against teaching for that portion of their assignment where they are assigned not to teach. And, of course, SFR numbers are key variables in budget allocations and FTES targets for departments. It seemed beyond our charge to determine the extent of this practice, or its effects on SFR and other aspects of workload; however, we recommend that the campus make this the object of a further inquiry into workload and compensation issues. Pending the findings, such an inquiry should also determine whether there is sufficient FTEA allocated to account for the administrative work being done by chairs (and in some cases by other faculty). Our estimate is that there is not.

The current formula for allocating FTEA is based largely on FTEF (though “complexity” is a term used in the IPAR document), as follows:

- .2 FTEA for 10 or less FTEF
- .4 FTEA for 10.1 to 20 FTEF
- .6 FTEA for 20.1 to 30 FTEF
- .8 FTEA for 30.1 to 40 FTEF
- 1.0 FTEA for 40.1 or more FTEF

The neat linear relationship between the FTEA allocated and the 10 unit increments of FTEF supervised is not arbitrary; but neither is it sensitive to actual conditions. The relationship suggests accurately that there is a commensurate increment of workload with an increase in the size of the unit, as measured by faculty allocation (FTEF). However, in practice it is not uncommon for a chair to supervise twice as many individual faculty members as the FTEF number. Thus, one department has an FTEF of about 11 with 15 individuals; another has an FTEF of about 11 with 27 individuals. Such disparities have significant workload implications. Similar imbalances result when we factor in and compare numbers of majors, programs and support staff, as well program accreditation responsibilities.

After we concluded our initial analysis, which included creating and testing new, more sophisticated allocation formulae, we learned that CSU Sacramento (CSUS) had undertaken a similar exercise. We were able to obtain a copy of the allocation formula and rationale that they currently use (see Appendix). We were then able to apply their formula to our unit data and make a comparison. By the CSUS formula, we would have 8 large departments funded at 1.0 FTEA each or 8.0 FTEA total. However, 6 of our 8 largest departments are actually allocated less FTEA. For the group, we under-allocate by 1.2 FTEA and we under-use 1.8 FTEA. A similar, but less extreme, situation occurs in the second tier (.8 FTEA) departments, where we both allocate and use less FTEA in 6 of the 7 departments in this group (.55 less FTEA used; 1.4 less FTEA allocated). We begin to approach closer parity with the CSUS allocations in the middle tier of .6 FTEA departments, with only 3 of 11 departments allocated or using less FTEA than CSUS would allocate. The CSUS formula, then, generally confirms the results of similar analyses done by the task force, using our own formula and supports the conclusion that *SJSU under allocates FTEA in our larger departments.*

We also believe that the CSUS weighting for number of majors seems low (60 to 40 % majors to FTES). We believe that majors represent a significant element of workload for chairs (because of advising responsibilities). Therefore, we tested the sensitivity of the CSUS formula to the weighting factor for majors, running scenarios with majors to FTES ratios of 50-50, 70-30, 80-20, and 100-0 (see spreadsheets in Appendix). We learned that across all of the scenarios, only 7 departments were affected, and then only to the extent of .2 FTEA. Though the number of majors does make a difference, especially for a few departments with relatively high numbers of majors, we believe the necessary adjustments can be made locally, within the colleges.

In summary, we learned the following from our workload analysis:

- Though no formula will perfectly capture all of the dimensions of workload, the CSUS formula adequately distinguishes the significant differences between departments, based on the multiple factors of each department's profile;
- In overall allocation, CSUS chairs are assigned more FTEA than SJSU chairs for the same work;
- We need to continue to make, and refine, the distinction between what chairs actually do (workload) and how they are compensated (workload/FTEA allocation). Compensation is based on formulae that attempt to capture and quantify workload. Though not arbitrary, these formulae are also not perfect and require careful analysis;
- FTES and FTEF alone are not reasonable measures of workload. Other factors must be included, such as number of majors, faculty headcount, and responsibility for program accreditation. The CSUS formula uses seven weighted measures. Until we develop a more accurate measure, we endorse the CSUS formula;
- A maximum allocation of 1.0 FTEA for the largest departments is not reasonable, in comparison with workloads in the smallest departments; and
- The currently allowable maximum FTEA for a department is set at 1.0, which is too low for some large and complex departments;

Based on our analysis of the unit profiles of FTEA and related workload variables, we recommend that:

- 5.0 The current FTEA allocation formula should be modified to account for and accommodate the most egregious disparities;
 - 5.1 Allocation formulae should ideally factor in weighted values for FTEF, number of faculty, number of majors, as well as number of double majors, minors, and programs (assuming such data are readily available);
 - 5.2 Until SJSU develops its own precise local FTEA allocation formula, we should at minimum use the model that CSUS already uses;
 - 5.3 Where appropriate, the formulae should also factor in constraints and requirements of outside accrediting bodies (e.g., nursing, credential programs) and/or other program accreditation responsibilities that require coordination with other departments or programs on or off campus;
 - 5.4 FTES should remain the primary factor to measure the workload impact of the student dimension of chair duties; however, within the FTES number, the number of majors should be the most significant dimension and should have the heaviest formula weight (e.g., 90-10 ratio, majors to FTES);
 - 5.5 The Senate should undertake an investigation of the amount of administrative work that is actually funded by FTEF (assigned time) and make

- recommendations to rationalize (categorize and standardize) administrative assignments and to separate them from true faculty instructional assignments;
- 5.6 The Senate should undertake a more detailed “time/motion” study of actual chair workload, determine the full range of actual administrative activity, and determine whether sufficient FTEA is allocated to support that workload;
 - 5.7 The Senate study should also clarify the activities in 5.6 above to determine which activities are appropriately “Instructional Support” and which are administrative; and
 - 5.8 The FTEA allocation scale should be increased to allow for 1.5 or even 2.0 FTEA assignments when warranted by the workload profile of large and complex departments.

While most of our concern focused on disparities and inequities in the FTEA allocations to large and complex units, we also considered small (.2 FTEA) departments and noted that CSUS treats the smallest departments as .4 AY assignments, as opposed to the SJSU practice of making all but three of our departments 12-month assignments, even at .2 FTEA. We urge that the Senate consider the differences in assumptions and efficacy between the two approaches.

We also considered program accreditation issues, as raised by other chairs who commented on our initial draft. Accreditation assignments often rest with the chair, especially in small departments. Further, accreditation is an ongoing process, not simply an extra burden during the final, reporting semester. Therefore, we recommend that:

- 5.9 An additional .2 FTEA be allocated to all units that have direct responsibility for program accreditation at their unit level. Thus, with the minimum .2 FTEA allocation for administering the unit, the minimum FTEA allocation for a department which also has program accreditation responsibilities should be .4 FTEA. (It is understood that this FTEA for accreditation may be assigned to a person other than the chair.)

A related workload concern focuses on the dissatisfaction that comes from chairs feeling that too much of their time is “squandered on routine administrative functions” or “the bureaucratic grind” with a loss of time for creative activities (including strategic management or attention to department development). The CSU report recommends, as in 5.5 above, that there be a workload analysis such that work could be reduced or redistributed to enable more time for creative activity, such as strategic planning. Several other recommendations support this: a reduction in “bureaucratic paperwork,” a provision of assigned time for chairs to undertake department development activity, and a conscientious diversion of some “routine” work from chairs to clerical personnel. Such recommendations would entail more detailed workload analysis than our current task force can provide. To support this goal, we recommend that:

- 6.0 The Senate should undertake a detailed analysis of the sources and types of “bureaucratic paperwork” on campus and determine ways to make this work more

efficient, including ways to distribute it appropriately between chairs, faculty, and clerical staff;

- 6.1 The Provost should make available an additional allocation of FTEA to support “Associate Chair” assignments in some departments from time to time. This would accommodate a “sharing of the burden” that would allow chairs time for creative (e.g., strategic planning) work. It would also be valuable for training incoming chairs, or taking advantage of the experience of outgoing chairs;
 - 6.1.1 Associate Chairs could be set up to cover summer chair duties so that chairs could have sustained time for research and/or renewal;
 - 6.1.2 The Chair in Residence, working with the UCCD, should survey chairs to determine the demand for such support and recommend a distribution program that would provide it; and
- 6.2 The Senate should undertake an analysis of the level of clerical support and office costs in terms of unit size and complexity and make recommendations to improve cost efficiency. We noted in our analysis that some units seem simply too small to be set up as independent departments, when all of the costs are considered. Though it is beyond our charge to make recommendations for specific changes, we believe the Senate should investigate whether such independent disciplinary groups warrant the institutional costs incurred by department status.

The tendency to blame “bureaucracy” for workload is endemic to modern organizations. Nonetheless, much of the bureaucratic paperwork is necessitated by programs and initiatives and procedures that are themselves set up and regulated by statutes that call for procedural regularity, oversight, fiscal responsibility, etc. It is not possible to make all of this “go away” simply because it is time-consuming and not enjoyable or creative. There does seem to be sufficient frustration, however, to warrant a more careful examination of what units are expected to do and how that might be improved. One theme that recurred in our discussions was the increasing complexity and paperwork involved in hiring and evaluating clerical staff, as well as in conducting faculty searches.

Chair Training & Development

Among the recommendations in the CSU report is the clear goal that campuses and the CSU provide chairs with “more training prior to and after they assume the role of chair” so that chairs have the resources they need to be effective unit leaders. Training is envisioned to include “more opportunities, resources, and time to attend campus, CSU-supported, and other professional development workshops.”

We note that prior to the SJSU Senate charge to the task force the UCCD had already begun to improve communication both among chairs and between chairs and other campus units. Working with Faculty Affairs, the Center for Faculty Development and Support, and IPAR, the UCCD sponsored a fiscal management training session for chairs (Fall 2002). In Spring 2003, UCCD leaders, with Faculty Affairs, the CFD, and IPAR, produced a day-long training event for new and prospective chairs, which the dozen

attendees evaluated as successful. Growing out of that effort the Provost endorsed the Chair-in-Residence concept and funded it as a trial at .2 FTEA per semester for AY 2003-04. The purpose of this experimental position is to coordinate and implement training, development, and information initiatives for SJSU Chairs and Directors and to serve as a chair resource on campus. The Task Force applauds those training and support efforts and recommends that:

- 7.0 such training efforts continue for as long as they prove to be both necessary and effective; and
 - 7.1 pending a successful evaluation of the Chair-in-Residence program, the University continue to support that position with appropriate FTEA time and formal status.

The training and development component of chair support is the least developed and has the greatest potential for improvement. We have many practical recommendations here. Morale problems and job dissatisfaction reported by chairs seem to result from under preparation for the job and under appreciation for their work as chairs by their faculty colleagues. We recommend that:

- 8.0 the University develop a formal chair training program that both identifies training appropriate to the chair's evolution in the position, and the training needs of new versus experienced chairs;
 - 8.1 the Chair in Residence, working with the UCCD, Faculty Affairs, IPAR and Human Resources, oversee the planning and implementation of this program;
 - 8.2 these various campus units make available appropriate resources to support this training effort (e.g., expertise, technology, planning and logistical support, and development and implementation of training modules); and
 - 8.3 training be modularized and tailored to immediate practical chair needs (e.g., how to fulfill the Chair's role in RTP; how to conduct a faculty search; how to evaluate staff, etc.)

The Task Force was concerned about the cultivation and selection of new chairs. On the one hand, it is not appropriate for units outside of the department and college to intervene in the selection of department chairs. Chair selection is, both traditionally and contractually, a prerogative of the unit faculty in collaboration with the Dean. On the other hand, early identification of faculty who might be interested in becoming chairs could lead to effective preparation for them decide to seek election. We recommend that:

- 8.4 part of the annual training be advertised broadly to faculty who might wish to become chair at some point and that the training specifically address topics and issues that will prepare them to seek the position with good knowledge of what is expected and of what chairs do;
- 8.5 the Chair in Residence, working with UCCD and others, develop a chair mentor program model; and

- 8.6 the Provost continue to support the travel and registration costs for new chairs to attend the CSU Chair Training Workshops, typically held in Southern California.

For further professional development of the chairs we recommend that:

- 8.7 the campus provide two chair training days each year, one in Spring (to cultivate potential chairs and help new chairs prepare for their first year) and one in August, to bring chairs up to speed with institutional changes. These training days should be organized in modules and held on campus;
- 8.8 HR provide for chairs a suitably adapted version of its “time management and planning skills” workshop for managers;
- 8.9 HR continue to provide for chairs suitably adapted versions of its manager training series (e.g., “Tool Time”). HR could deliver these workshops at meetings of college chairs;
- 8.10 the Chair in Residence work with Faculty Affairs to survey the range of chair training and development activities on other CSU campuses;
- 8.11 the Chair in Residence, working with Faculty Affairs and HR, identify specific elements of chair responsibility where chairs work as “managers.” HR should provide appropriate management training for those elements of the chair’s responsibility (e.g., staff performance review; harassment and discrimination issues); and
- 8.12 the Chair-in- Residence work with other units to begin the process of creating a Bay Area Chairs network to build a constituency for regionally-delivered training from CSU, and to serve as a forum for other chair issues.

Based on the CSU Chair Survey data it is clear that chairs have the sense that they are under-resourced. We recommend that:

- 8.13 the Chair in Residence work with relevant units to compile a book of “best practices” for chairs;
- 8.14 the Chair in Residence work with appropriate campus units to develop and maintain a current UCCD Chair list serve and Website (along the lines of the model that UCCD Co-Chair Dr. Abdel El-Shaieb initiated in Spring 2004) as information resources for chairs. Appropriate support should be provided to design and maintain the website; and
- 8.15 the Chair in Residence work with relevant campus units to oversee the development of an annual Chair Calendar and Time Line (based on the models provided by H&A and Dr. Carol Ray) and a Chair Resource Guide and Operating Manual (based on the model provided by the College of Science). These resources will be made available on the UCCD website recommended above.

Another area of concern expressed by chairs is that of relationships with their faculty colleagues. We recommend that:

- 8.16 to encourage faculty appreciation of chair work, all new faculty have a chair-related training session as part of new faculty orientation activities. (This was attempted for the first time with the orientation of new faculty in August, 2003.);
- 8.17 chairs be trained to initiate cooperative relationships with faculty such that chair communication and work style preferences are clearly communicated (e.g., “open door policy,” “turnaround time,” “setting boundaries”);
 - 8.17.1 the Chair in Residence develop a “chair appreciation” module for chairs to use at fall faculty meeting;
 - 8.17.2 the Chair in Residence poll chairs on violations of respect and then develop training in response to this;
 - 8.17.3 chairs receive specific training in how to deal with challenging and difficult faculty. We believe that, overall, a small number of difficult faculty cause a disproportionate amount of the problems chairs face;
- 8.18 UCCD sponsor occasional chair/faculty conversations to increase appreciation for chair work and to identify mutual frustrations with faculty/chair relationships; and
 - 8.18.1 a statement of chair responsibilities should be distributed to all faculty in order to improve faculty understanding of what chairs do.

Finally, there are currently no institutionalized ways to reward chairs nor to enhance their professional development after they leave the chair position. We recommend that:

- 8.19 chairs be given clear institutional messages of what constitutes achievement for chairs. Such achievements should be linked to rewards;
- 8.20 chair appreciation be increased with the institution of a campus wide annual “Outstanding Chair” Award. The Chair in Residence, working with UCCD, would plan such an award with the support of the Senate, Provost and President;
- 8.21 the UCCD investigate the degree to which chairs are awarded sabbatical leaves upon completion of their term as chair in order to enable them to retool and become current in their disciplines as they return to full time faculty status. The Senate should investigate whether the sabbatical policy can be amended to ensure that outgoing chairs are included. Such a leave (or other form of assignment) would also create “free space” in the department for a new chair to establish her/himself; and
- 8.22 the Senate investigate the possibility of setting aside some portion of lottery funds each year to support the professional development of chairs and/or to help them to maintain contact with their disciplines during their years of chair service when they may not have time to create, present or publish new work.

Conclusion

The Task Force responded to the report's general sense of frustration, low morale, job dissatisfaction, and high turnover among chairs with an overarching recommendation that the campus community should make the role and work of Chairs/Directors more transparent to the constituencies they serve. Much of what needs to be improved for Chairs/Directors starts with a generally inadequate understanding of what chairs actually do, what they have responsibility for, and the limited authority and resources they have to make changes. The tension between high responsibility and low authority is particularly acute.

Chairs and Directors have come to occupy a critical position in the administration and management of the modern university. The size, scale, and imperatives of the CSU system add even greater complexity to their work. While SJSU chairs normally serve slightly longer terms than the CSU norm, and while they generally report less dissatisfaction with the job, there is still a significant turnover, causing the added expenses of re-training and errors made while learning the job. At the same time, the legal, regulatory, fiscal and administrative contexts that shape us are changing quickly. Amidst this change is an increasing sense that the both the CSU system, and the campus, allocate insufficient resources to meet the demands of the job. Assuring the efficiency and success of our campus as we make the paradigm transition from a state-supported to a state-assisted institution will require vigilant attention to the way we implement our mandates and accomplish our mission at the operational level. In that arena, nothing could be more critical than ensuring that our corps of Chairs and Directors has both the resources and support they need to fulfill their responsibilities and the assurance that creative, committed, and talented colleagues will be prepared to step forward and replace them when the time comes.

The SJSU Academic Senate has taken a major step toward improving conditions by establishing this Task Force on Department Chairs. Now they must act quickly on the recommendations.

**Report of the
Academic Senate Task Force on Department Chairs**

Appendices

- A. SJSU Academic Senate Management Recommendation (SM-S03-2)
- B. Roster of Task Force Members
- C. Chair Roles and Responsibilities
- D. Chair Evaluation Forms
 - Deans, Chairs, and Administrators
 - Faculty
 - Staff
 - Students
- E. CSU Sacramento FTEA Allocation Formula
- F. FTEA Allocation Spreadsheets
 - 60/40 Weighting Ratio of Majors to FTES (CSUS norm, Applied to SJSU Data)
 - 70/30 Weighting Ratio of Majors to FTES (Applied to SJSU Data)
 - 100/0 Weighting Ratio of Majors to FTES (Applied to SJSU Data)

Appendix A
Senate Management Recommendation SM-S03-2
Creation of Task Force on Department Chairs

This recommendation can be found at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/SM-S03-2.pdf>

SM-S03-2

At its meeting of March 17, 2003, the Academic Senate passed the following Senate Management Recommendation presented by Bethany Shifflett for the Executive Committee.

SENATE MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION
CREATION OF TASK FORCE ON DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Whereas: The report (<http://www.geolog.com/FAC/ChairsTF.htm>) from the CSU Task Force on the Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs highlights a number of issues that need review; and

Whereas: The CSU Academic Senate has called on campus senates to take the lead in facilitating discussions among chairs and administrators to tackle the issues raised; and

Whereas: The SJSU Academic Senate has heard a report that presented campus data in comparison to the CSU data and which suggests there is a need to examine closer the concerns raised by chairs; therefore be it

Resolved: That a chairs task force be constituted to review the campus data in consultation with the SJSU participants in the CSU study and an individual well versed in data analysis, solicit additional input from the Council of Chairs, discuss the issues raised in the CSU task force reports as well by campus chairs, and prepare a report with recommendations for the Senate to consider no later than the November 2003 senate meeting; and be it further

Resolved: That the task force be comprised of

- 5 department chairs - selected by the Council of Chairs
- 2 college deans - selected by the Council of Deans
- 2 faculty from the Academic Senate - selected by the Executive Committee
- 1 representative from each: Faculty Affairs, Institutional Planning and Research, and Human Resources
- The lecturer affiliated with the office of Faculty Development

Effort should be made to ensure that representation is as broad as possible; and be it further

Resolved: That the council of chairs identify an individual (from among their representatives to the task force) to chair the task force and that the SJSU Academic Senate Chair convene the first meeting and discuss the charge to the task force; and be it further

Resolved: That the task force will be dissolved following presentation of their report to the Academic Senate.

Appendix B

**Academic Senate
Task Force on Department Chairs
June 2003 through February 2004
Members**

Department Chairs:

Howard Combs, *Marketing*

Dennis Jaehne, Task Force Chair, *Communication Studies*

Sigurd Meldal, *Computer Engineering*

Robert Milnes, *Art & Design*

Carol Ray, *Sociology*

Deans:

Michael Ego, *Applied Sciences and Arts*

Gerry Selter, *Science*

Senators:

Gilda Pour, *Computer Engineering*

Dominique Van Hooff, *Foreign Languages*

Other Administrative Unit Representatives:

Joan Merdinger, *Faculty Affairs*

Sandy Dewitz, *Institutional Planning and Academic Resources*

Deborah Weakland, *Human Resources*

Beth Von Till, *Lecturers, Center for Faculty Development & Support*

Appendix C

Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs and Program and School Directors

Chairs/Directors are contractually members of the Unit Three faculty who also have an administrative role at the school/department/program level. Because they are members of Unit Three, there are many areas of responsibility where the Dean is the contractual authority. In particular, the Dean is the authority of record for many faculty-related responsibilities.

The purpose of this description is twofold: (1) it informs incoming chairs and directors about what is expected of them, and (2) assists deans and unit committees in the evaluation of chairs. No individual can be expected to engage in all of the duties listed below. Rather, prior to each appointment term, each Dean, in consultation with the chair, will select from the following description those responsibilities that, from the point of view of each, are pertinent to the unit and are important for its welfare. There are no research/scholarship expectations associated with the chair/directors' appointment time fraction; however, incumbents normally need to meet such expectations in their role as members of the faculty. It is crucial to acknowledge that chairs are elected by their faculty colleagues and are primarily accountable to them. The University is obligated to work with chairs and directors to ensure that they are prepared for the position.

LEADERSHIP

The chair/director leads the faculty in the direction that the faculty define as important. S/he provides the vision and strategies to achieve the unit's goals in alignment with college and University goals, communicating effectively in both receptive and expressive modes. S/he champions the unit's welfare, and promotes its faculty, students, and goals to those inside and outside of the University in order to build relationships that strengthen the unit. The chair/director is a liaison between the faculty and the administration—championing the unit's resource needs to administration, and informing the faculty of changing policies, procedures and initiatives from the college or University. As per university policy, the chair/director actively fosters diversity in the unit, promotes diversity in teaching and the curriculum when warranted, and encourages unit participants' respectful interaction with members of diverse groups.

FACULTY AFFAIRS

The chair/director:

1. Leads in formulating long-term plans for recruiting a diverse and current faculty; coordinates recruitment activities according to University policy.
2. Ensures that probationary faculty receive appropriate guidance about the criteria for RTP and the preparation of dossiers, as per S98-8, S91-9, F02-2, S03-3 and other relevant policies.
3. Assigns faculty to teach classes, and to other duties, as appropriate:
4. Supervises the evaluation of permanent faculty; recommends the hiring and ensures the evaluation of lecturers and provides useful feedback to all faculty.

5. Supports and fosters the professional development of faculty.
6. Practices consultative and collaborative decision-making.
7. Assists in maintaining morale and productive and civil relationships among faculty. Works as a mediator between/among faculty if needed.
7. Works with faculty to establish and coordinate appropriate unit committee and non-committee activities.

CURRICULUM/PROGRAM

1. Encourages currency and improvement in the quality of courses, curricula and programs in consultation with faculty.
2. Works with faculty and staff to formulate and execute program plan review processes and outcomes assessments.
3. Produces a schedule of classes that is balanced and responsive to students' needs in consultation with faculty.
4. Supervises the operation of curriculum-related activities as appropriate (e.g., labs, studios, clinics).
5. Works with faculty and staff to ensure the currency and presentation quality of the catalogue.
6. Oversees and works with faculty to promote quality student advising.

STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Works with faculty on student recruitment and retention initiatives, which may include outreach, department orientation, awards, competitions, social events, clubs.
2. Interacts effectively with students; objectively listens to students' concerns and suggestions for improvement and responds appropriately
3. Oversees student petitions and forms.

STAFF

1. Oversees recruitment, recommends hiring, and oversees orientation/training of staff to support unit's goals.
2. Evaluates staff and provides feedback on performance.
3. Supports and supervises staff

4. Encourages staff's professional training and development.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

1. Works with faculty and staff to improve and maintain the department's good image and reputation beyond campus.
2. Works with faculty and staff to develop resources for unit.
3. Works with faculty and staff to promote and develop discipline-based contacts with relevant off-campus groups.
4. Works with faculty and staff to develop and maintain relationships with alumni.

BUDGET

1. Administers the unit's budget and resources equitably, as assigned.
2. Administers the unit's budget and resources efficiently.
3. Administers the unit's budget and resources transparently.
4. Informs faculty and staff of the unit's financial status.

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. Demonstrates knowledge of University policies and procedures, and represents the University in such matters as the CSU/CFA Agreement, new senate policies, and policies concerning disabled students, sexual harassment, student honesty, students' privacy rights, etc., and conveys these to faculty and/or staff - as appropriate.
2. Works with faculty/staff and college administration to ensure the safe and efficient use of facilities and equipment assigned to the unit.
3. Works with faculty and staff to locate information and prepare reports and memos as requested by various offices on and off campus.
4. Works with faculty and staff to assure the orderly operation of the unit's administrative offices; refines or revises its organizational structure or procedures as appropriate.

Appendix D. 1**CHAIR EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
Chairs and Administrators**

1. Demonstrates knowledge of university policies and procedures
2. Formulates effective strategic plans to achieve her/his unit's goals
3. Displays logical decision-making skills
4. Shows initiative and takes independent action when needed.
5. Champions her/his unit's welfare and goals
6. Listens well
7. Communicates concisely and clearly
8. Acts as an effective liaison between the unit and college/University
9. Comprehends and takes into account the larger structures in which her/his unit is embedded.
10. Cooperates productively with college or University colleagues
11. Demonstrates sensitivity to and awareness of diversity issues.
12. Follows through and completes projects in a timely manner
13. Prepares for and contributes effectively to meetings
14. Shows knowledge about and concern for students' educational needs.
15. Responds to requests for information in a timely manner
16. Treats others with civility and respect.
17. Assures safe and efficient use of facilities and equipment
18. Administers the unit's budget and resources equitably.
19. Administers the unit's budget and resources efficiently.
20. Administers the unit's budget and resources transparently
21. Works with faculty and staff to assure the orderly operation of the unit's administrative offices; refines or revises its organizational structure or procedures as appropriate
22. Participates in fundraising activities as appropriate
23. Is accessible

(Note: If you scored any item below 3, please explain below.)

COMMENTS:

Appendix D2**CHAIR EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
Faculty****Program Direction/Leadership**

1. Communicates a vision of long-term program development
2. Collaborates with faculty to formulate effective strategic plans to achieve goals
3. Displays logical decision-making skills
4. Shows initiative and takes independent action when needed; a self-starter
5. Exercises sound judgment
6. Promotes unit's resource needs to higher levels of administration
7. Champions the unit's welfare and goals

Faculty Affairs

8. Fosters a positive unit atmosphere
9. Supports academic freedom
10. Encourages and respects all points of view
11. Is accessible to the faculty
12. Works well with a diverse faculty
13. Seeks consultation with faculty when appropriate
14. Listens well
15. Communicates concisely and clearly
16. Responds effectively to individual or collective faculty concerns
17. Prepares and conducts effective faculty meetings; keeps meetings focused on important issues
18. Works with faculty to establish and coordinate appropriate unit committees and non-committee activities
19. Works with faculty to provide needed resources
20. Supports faculty service to the campus community
21. Evaluates all faculty fairly and equitably
22. Publicly recognizes faculty accomplishments
23. Encourages faculty research and scholarship
24. Supports faculty participation in professional organizations
25. Plans tenure-track faculty recruitment activities collegially and effectively
26. Actively seeks and recruits for a diverse faculty
27. Supplies orientation and guidance to new faculty
28. Supports and mentors (or assigns mentors) to RTP candidates
29. Strives to recruit effective lecturers
30. Shows respect and consideration for lecturers
31. Oversees lecturers' evaluations in a timely fashion; provides feedback

Student Affairs

31. Attends to educational needs and goals of diverse students
32. Engages actively in student recruitment and retention

33. Supports student organization(s)
34. Recognizes student achievement through newsletters or other vehicles
35. Supports or provides opportunities for student and faculty interaction
36. Trains or orients permanent faculty to provide accurate student advising.
37. Mediates objectively in conflicts between faculty and students
38. Is accessible and helpful to students
39. Assures equitable course assignments that are responsive to students' needs

Curriculum

40. Promotes excellent teaching
41. Encourages curriculum improvements and currency
42. Promotes curriculum that reflects student diversity
43. Works with faculty to plan and manage an effective program plan review or credentialing process
44. Works with faculty to plan and oversee labs, clinics, studios, special sessions, or off-campus programs effectively and efficiently
45. Works with faculty to produce effective GE course certification and assessment
46. Updates and re-formulates print and online catalog copy

Administrative

47. Demonstrates knowledge of university policies and procedures
48. Manages support staff with respect and consideration
49. Motivates support staff to show respect for students and student diversity
50. Encourages staff to meet reasonable faculty requests in a timely and efficient fashion
51. Manages faculty and support staff office space efficiently
52. Manages the unit's budget and resources equitably
53. Manages the unit's budget and resources efficiently
54. Manages the unit's budget and resources transparently
55. Keeps faculty and staff informed of the unit's financial status.
56. Mediates objectively in staff/faculty conflicts
57. Works with faculty and staff to assure the orderly operation of the unit's administrative offices; refines or revises its organizational structure or procedures as appropriate

External Relationships

58. Develops or enhances relationships with alumni
59. Promotes unit to relevant local and regional entities
60. Fosters congenial relationships with community organizations
61. Participates in fundraising activities as appropriate

NOTE: If you scored any item below 3, please explain below.

COMMENTS:

Appendix D3

CHAIR EVALUATION INSTRUMENT Support Staff

Unit Direction/Leadership

1. Communicates a vision of long-term unit development
2. Works with staff to formulate effective strategic plans to achieve goals
3. Displays logical decision-making skills
4. Practices participative decision-making.
5. Shows initiative and takes independent action when needed; a self-starter
6. Exercises sound judgment
7. Promotes unit's resource needs to higher levels of administration
8. Champions the unit's welfare and goals
9. Fosters a positive unit atmosphere
10. Encourages and respects all points of view
11. Is accessible to the staff
12. Works well with a diverse staff
13. Seeks consultation with staff when appropriate
14. Listens well
15. Communicates concisely and clearly
16. Responds objectively and promptly to individual or collective staff concerns
17. Effectively manages tensions between staff and faculty

Staff Support

18. Manages support staff with civility and consideration
19. Encourages and responds to support staff's suggestions for improvement
20. Evaluates staff in a fair and timely manner; provides helpful feedback
21. Supports staff professional development

Administrative

22. Demonstrates knowledge of university policies and procedures
23. Updates and reformulates print and online catalog copy
24. Supports technology/equipment improvement and acquisition
25. Works with staff to plan and oversee effective program plan review or credentialing process
26. Works with staff to plan and manage labs, clinics, studios, special sessions, off-campus programs, etc., effectively and efficiently
27. Works with staff to plan efficient tenure-track faculty recruitment activities
28. Manages support staff office space effectively
29. Manages the unit's budget and resources equitably
30. Manages the unit's budget and resources efficiently
31. Manages the unit's budget and resources transparently
32. Keeps faculty and staff informed of unit's financial status
33. Develops or enhances relationships with alumni
34. Participates in fundraising activities as appropriate
35. Works with faculty and staff to assure the orderly operation of the unit's administrative offices; refines or revises its organizational structure or procedures as appropriate

Student Affairs

36. Coordinates a schedule of classes with students' needs in mind

- 37. Attends to educational needs and goals of diverse students
- 38. Is accessible and helpful to students
- 39. Responds to student complaints promptly and appropriately

Faculty Affairs

- 40. Works with staff to seek and recruit a diverse faculty
- 41. Is accessible to faculty
- 42. Manages faculty office space efficiently and fairly
- 43. Balances faculty requests for teaching schedules with students' curricular needs
- 44. Shows respect for all

NOTE: If you scored any item below 3, please explain below.

COMMENTS:

Appendix D4**Chair/Director Evaluation Instrument
Students**

Academic Unit: _____

During the past _____ semesters, have you communicated directly with the chair/director of this department or school in his or her capacity as chair/director (i.e., not as an instructor for one of your classes?)

Yes _____ No _____

(If you have not communicated with the chair or director, please do not respond further.)

If yes, did s/he

1. Make himself/herself reasonably accessible to you?
2. Respond in a timely manner to your questions, problems, and complaints?
3. Provide useful academic and/or career advising?
4. Support student activities or organizations?
5. Mediate objectively in student faculty disagreements?
6. Foster a student-oriented environment in the program?

NOTE: If you scored any item below three, please explain below.

Comments:

Appendix E
CSU Sacramento FTEA Allocation Formula

CSUS Department Chair Support Model
 Prepared by Paul N. Noble
 Associate VP for Academic Affairs
 CSU, Sacramento
 October 31, 2003

In fall, 2002 an ad hoc group consisting of Richard Guarino (Associate Dean, College of Business Administration), Paul Noble, Joseph Sheley (Dean, College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies), William Sullivan (Dean, College of Arts and Letters) and David Wagner (Dean, Faculty and Staff Affairs) examined the department chair fractions assigned to the 48 department chairs at CSUS to determine whether there was consistency between departmental size (faculty, staff and students) and level of support. To minimize perceived bias, the departments were identified only by a randomly assigned sequence number. In general, there was a reasonable correlation between department size and level of support, but some inconsistencies were observed. Accordingly, the group developed a numerical model to generate a standardized composite measure of size.

Seven measures of size were considered: permanent faculty (FTEF), temporary faculty (FTEF and headcount), students (FTES and number of majors) and support staff (FTE and headcount). After considerable discussion, the group agreed to assign 50% weight to faculty, with 70% of this weight for permanent and 30% for temporary faculty; the 30% was split 50-50 between FTEF and headcount. The group assigned 35% weight to students, with 60% of this assigned to number of majors and 40% to FTES. The final 15% weight was then assigned to support staff, split 50-50 between FTE and headcount. Based on data from fall, 2001, departments were ranked for each of the seven measures. Each department was then assigned seven size factors defined as follows:

Size factor = measure for department / measure for largest department

For example, if the largest department had 34.5 FTEF of permanent faculty and the department in question had 21, then its size factor for this measure was $21/34.5 = 0.609$. Once all size factors had been computed, they were entered into the following formula to obtain an overall score as a composite measure of departmental size:

Score = $50[0.7 \times \text{perm FTEF} + 0.3(0.5 \times \# \text{ temp} + 0.5 \times \text{FTEF temp})] + 0.6 \times$
 $\text{majors} + 0.4 \times \text{FTES} + 15(0.5 \times \# \text{ staff} + 0.5 \times \text{FTE staff})$

(The underlined terms represent the seven size factors for the department.)

The scores computed from this formula ranged from 3.6 for the smallest department to 85.6 for the largest. When all 48 departments were entered into a spreadsheet and sorted by score, the following observations were made:

Thirteen of the departments had a score that was significantly larger than the rest. There was a gap of almost 10 points between the smallest of these (score of 48.7) and the largest of the rest (score of 39.5). The chairs of all but one of these 13 departments had a time base of 1.0 for 12 months.

The scores of the next 21 departments ranged from 25 to 40, and the majority of their chairs had a time base of 0.6 for 12 months. However, the support for the remaining chairs ranged from a low of 0.4 time base for the academic year to a high of 1.0 time base for 12 months.

Scores for the next 11 departments ranged from 10 to 24, and most had a time base of 0.4 (either 12-month or academic year). However, the support for the group as a whole ranged from 0.4, academic year to 1.0, 12 months.

Scores for the smallest three departments ranged from 4 to 8, and all had a time base of 0.4 for the academic year.

Size data were also run through the model for the preceding two years (fall, 1999 and fall, 2000), and a remarkable consistency in departmental size rankings was observed. Based on these observations, it was agreed to standardize department chair support as follows:

Score range

Less than 10

10 to 24

25 to 40

More than 48

Support level

0.4, AY

0.4, 12-month

0.6, 12-month

1.0, 12-month

Academic year assignments were eliminated for all but the very smallest departments, on the basis of increased activity for the past several years in year-round operation. It was agreed that department chairs whose level of support would be lowered by the new model could retain their current level of support until the next chair election was held. Chairs whose level of support would be increased would have the choice of accepting the higher level of support, effective with the following academic year, or remaining at the lower level until the next election was held. In exceptional cases, college deans would be able to ask the Vice President for Academic Affairs to increase the support for a chair by one level, on the basis of unusual circumstances not recognized in the formula. These recommendations were submitted to President Gerth and received his approval in October, 2002.

Also among the recommendations approved by the President was a review of the size data each fall. Attached to this document is a spreadsheet based on size data from fall, 2002 (the most recent fall for which we have complete data). The size rankings are consistent with those based on data from fall, 2001, and no departments have moved from one level of support to another. The spreadsheet also indicates those departments for which support level has been changed to match the model, those that still have changes pending the next chair election, and those that were granted exceptions by the VPAA. By fall, 2004, support for all but a very small number of chairs will follow the model.

Appendix F
SJSU FTEA Allocation Spreadsheets
 (With selective weighted ratios of Majors to FTES)

These three spreadsheets apply the CSUS formula for allocating FTEA (described in Appendix E) to SJSU's unit data from IPAR's 2002 numbers. The three spreadsheets employ different weightings in the ratio of number of majors to FTES. The Task Force believes that workload is more sensitive to the number of majors than the CSUS formula allows, especially in units with high majors. However, this factor affects only a small number of units, as the spreadsheet indicates.

In each spreadsheet, the CSUS FTEA column indicates how much FTEA CSUS would allocate a department with the given profile. That column ranks the departments by the formula's assessment of size and complexity. That column remains unchanged across the spreadsheets. In the first spreadsheet (60/40 ratio) a line is drawn where the allocations change (that is, the 1.0 FTEA units are clustered, then the .8 FTEA units, and so on). In the subsequent spreadsheets, we assume that the number of units in each category should remain the same (to hold the model "cost neutral" with CSUS). Here, however, the inversions are marked in bold face type; this indicates the places where a unit gains or loses FTEA under the CSUS formula (moves up or down a size from its current SJSU ranking). Also marked in bold are those departments that should have a different allocation under the CSUS formula than they are currently receiving at SJSU. This secondary adjustment follows the CSUS size thresholds of

>50 = 1.0 FTEA
 35-50 = 0.8 FTEA
 25-35 = 0.6 FTEA
 10-25 = 0.4 12-month FTEA
 < 10 = 0.4 AY (10 Month Academic Year) FTEA

COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT PRO

Fall Semester 2002

Weights:	Reg	70%	
	TMP	30%	50%
	FTE staff		15%
	#Majors	60%	
	FTES	40%	35%

Department	Faculty		Faculty						FTEA/C			FTE		Majors		FTE	
	#	FTEF	Reg FTEF	Normal	Reg #	Temp FTEF	Normal	Temp #	Used	Allocated	Normal	Staff	Normal	Majors	Normal	FTE	
Dept #1	103.00	57.810	31.250	0.944	32.00	26.560	0.910	71.00	0.75	1.00	12	1.000	12.000	1.000	1,836	0.953	1017.
Dept #2	60.00	39.400	28.400	0.858	31.00	11.000	0.377	29.00	0.60	0.80	12	0.408	2.000	0.167	1,617	0.840	951.
Dept #3	58.00	36.814	21.500	0.650	24.00	15.314	0.525	34.00	1.00	0.80	12	0.479	5.000	0.417	1,926	1.000	770.
Dept #4	84.00	56.607	33.100	1.000	36.50	23.507	0.805	47.50	1.00	1.00	12	0.669	1.000	0.083	167	0.087	1355.
Dept #5	98.00	56.089	26.900	0.813	30.00	29.189	1.000	68.00	0.75	1.00	12	0.958	3.500	0.292	371	0.193	919.
Dept #6	86.00	34.480	20.170	0.609	24.00	14.310	0.490	62.00	0.80	0.80	12	0.873	5.000	0.417	1,365	0.709	673.
Dept #7	58.00	34.039	26.400	0.798	31.00	7.639	0.262	27.00	0.70	0.80	12	0.380	10.000	0.833	651	0.338	583.
Dept #8	43.00	30.200	14.400	0.435	17.50	15.800	0.541	25.50	0.60	0.60	12	0.359	4.000	0.333	1,604	0.833	760.
Dept #9	71.00	36.681	16.571	0.501	23.00	20.110	0.689	48.00	0.80	0.80	12	0.676	2.000	0.167	956	0.496	599.
Dept #10	44.00	28.900	18.100	0.547	21.00	10.800	0.370	23.00	0.60	0.60	12	0.324	2.000	0.167	1,043	0.542	729.
Dept #11	54.00	26.326	13.670	0.413	16.00	12.656	0.434	38.00	1.00	0.40		0.535	2.500	0.208	1,535	0.797	394.
Dept #12	58.00	28.140	17.750	0.536	18.00	10.390	0.356	40.00	0.75	0.60	12	0.563	8.500	0.708	247	0.128	448.
Dept #13	59.00	30.180	14.950	0.452	18.00	15.230	0.522	41.00	0.75	0.60	12	0.577	6.750	0.563	428	0.222	585.
Dept #14	48.00	31.806	16.120	0.487	18.50	15.686	0.537	29.50	0.75	0.60	12	0.415	4.000	0.333	927	0.481	363.
Dept #15	32.00	19.950	15.500	0.468	21.00	4.450	0.152	11.00	0.40	0.60		0.155	3.000	0.250	712	0.370	544.
Dept #16	42.00	25.570	15.560	0.470	21.00	10.010	0.343	21.00	0.60	0.60		0.296	7.000	0.583	156	0.081	358.
Dept #17	29.00	20.750	14.750	0.446	16.00	6.000	0.206	13.00	0.75	0.60		0.183	3.750	0.313	766	0.398	363.
Dept #18	49.00	29.280	15.900	0.480	16.50	13.380	0.458	32.50	0.60	0.60	12	0.458	4.000	0.333	68	0.035	434.
Dept #19	34.00	18.669	9.600	0.290	12.00	9.069	0.311	22.00	0.70	0.40		0.310	7.500	0.625	367	0.191	362.
Dept #20	41.00	24.800	14.100	0.426	15.50	10.700	0.367	25.50	0.80	0.60		0.359	2.000	0.167	251	0.130	465.
Dept #21	31.00	17.230	12.430	0.376	13.00	4.800	0.164	18.00	0.40	0.40		0.254	2.000	0.167	656	0.341	255.
Dept #22	32.00	14.460	6.500	0.196	10.00	7.960	0.273	22.00	0.50	0.40		0.310	1.000	0.083	1,133	0.588	350.
Dept #23	28.00	20.250	12.150	0.367	12.50	8.100	0.278	15.50	0.60	0.40		0.218	2.000	0.167	425	0.221	436.
Dept #24	52.00	30.300	7.600	0.230	9.00	22.700	0.778	43.00	0.60	0.60	12	0.606	1.500	0.125	131	0.068	581.
Dept #25	38.00	20.030	10.400	0.314	15.00	9.630	0.330	23.00	0.00	0.00		0.324	2.500	0.208	480	0.249	310.
Dept #26	40.00	23.240	11.750	0.355	13.50	11.490	0.394	26.50	0.75	0.40		0.373	2.000	0.167	138	0.072	313.
Dept #27	30.00	19.850	12.250	0.370	12.50	7.600	0.260	17.50	0.65	0.40		0.246	1.500	0.125	64	0.033	482.
Dept #28	31.00	14.826	9.750	0.295	12.50	5.076	0.174	18.50	0.45	0.40		0.261	1.400	0.117	595	0.309	236.
Dept #29	22.00	15.300	11.100	0.335	13.50	4.200	0.144	8.50	0.40	0.40		0.120	1.000	0.083	408	0.212	434.
Dept #30	25.00	14.450	10.650	0.322	14.50	3.800	0.130	10.50	0.40	0.40		0.148	2.000	0.167	292	0.152	384.
Dept #31	25.00	14.500	11.400	0.344	14.00	3.100	0.106	11.00	0.40	0.40		0.155	2.000	0.167	265	0.138	301.
Dept #32	33.00	16.769	8.150	0.246	10.00	8.619	0.295	23.00	0.35	0.40		0.324	2.500	0.208	198	0.103	312.
Dept #33	15.00	11.450	7.750	0.234	8.50	3.700	0.127	6.50	0.35	0.40		0.092	1.500	0.125	528	0.274	297.
Dept #34	14.00	12.400	11.600	0.350	11.50	0.800	0.027	2.50	0.40	0.40		0.035	2.000	0.167	150	0.078	345.
Dept #35	27.00	13.670	7.600	0.230	9.50	6.070	0.208	17.50	0.40	0.40		0.246	1.000	0.083	445	0.231	251.
Dept #36	18.00	10.600	6.300	0.190	8.50	4.300	0.147	9.50	1.00	0.40		0.134	1.000	0.083	615	0.319	268.
Dept #37	21.00	10.790	7.930	0.240	9.00	2.860	0.098	12.00	0.40	0.20		0.169	2.500	0.208	348	0.181	154.
Dept #38	24.00	12.590	0.270	0.008	1.00	12.320	0.422	23.00	0.00	0.00		0.324	0.000	0.000	814	0.423	392.
Dept #39	28.00	13.030	9.000	0.272	12.00	4.030	0.138	16.00	0.40	0.40		0.225	1.000	0.083	304	0.158	160.
Dept #40	22.00	13.440	9.300	0.281	10.50	4.140	0.142	11.50	0.50	0.40		0.162	3.000	0.250	37	0.019	195.
Dept #41	27.00	11.290	7.060	0.213	8.00	4.230	0.145	19.00	0.40	0.40		0.268	3.000	0.250	198	0.103	129.
Dept #42	14.00	9.538	7.900	0.239	10.00	1.638	0.056	4.00	0.60	0.40		0.056	3.000	0.250	277	0.144	129.
Dept #43	15.00	9.580	7.600	0.230	9.00	1.980	0.068	6.00	0.40	0.40		0.085	3.000	0.250	254	0.132	121.
Dept #44	22.00	10.210	6.150	0.186	7.50	4.060	0.139	14.50	0.35	0.40		0.204	2.000	0.167	202	0.105	225.
Dept #45	13.00	8.590	5.200	0.157	4.00	3.390	0.116	9.00	0.40	0.20		0.127	1.000	0.083	462	0.240	146.
Dept #46	14.00	10.370	6.700	0.202	8.00	3.670	0.126	6.00	0.40	0.20		0.085	1.000	0.083	178	0.092	314.
Dept #47	17.00	10.850	5.950	0.180	7.50	4.900	0.168	9.50	0.35	0.20		0.134	1.000	0.083	225	0.117	218.