

**University of West Georgia
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes**

**February 15, 2013
Approved March 8, 2013**

1. Meeting convened in room 1-303 of the Technology-enhanced Learning Center and called to order by Jeff Johnson, Chair

2. Roll Call

Present

Basu-Dutt, Blair, DeFoor, Deng, DeSilva, Erben, Farmer, Gant, Geisler, Gezon, Halonen-Rollins, Hasbun, Haynes, Jenks, Keim, Kilpatrick, Kramer, Leach, Lloyd, Mayer, Moffeit, Morris, Luken (substitute for Noori), Packard, Parrish, Pencoe, Ponder, Popov, Tietjen (substitute for Riker), Ringlaben, Robinson, Rutledge, Samples, Sanders, Schroer, Simmonds-Moore (substitute for Skott-Myhre), Smith, Thompson, Van Valen, Vasconcellos, Welch, Willox

Absent

Banford, DeNie, Hooper, Kassis, Pitzulo, Yeong

3. Approval of the minutes of the December 7th meeting

Minutes approved as read by unanimous consent

4. Committee Reports

Committee I: Undergraduate Programs (Chair, Jim Mayer)

Action Items:

A) College of Arts and Humanities

1) Department of Music

a) Bachelor of Music with a major in Theory and Composition

Request: Modify

Action: Approved

Item approved by voice vote

2) Department of History

a) HIST 4010

Request: Add

Action: Approved

Item approved by unanimous consent

- B) College of Social Sciences
 - 1) Department of Anthropology
 - a) ANTH 4130
Request: Add
Action: Approved
 - b) ANTH 4201
Request: Add
Action: Approved
 - c) ANTH 4202
Request: Add
Action: Approved

Items approved by voice vote

Information Items:

- A) College of Arts and Humanities
 - 1) Department of English and Philosophy
 - a) Minor in American Studies
Request: Terminate
Action: Approved

Committee II: Graduate Programs (Chair, Mark S. Parrish)

Action Items:

- A) College of Social Sciences
 - 1) Department of Psychology
 - a) PSYC 9002 Doctoral Qualifying Seminar
Request: Add
Action: Approved

Item approved by unanimous consent

Information Items:

- A) College of Social Sciences
 - 1) Department: Political Science Department
 - a) Program: Master of Urban and Regional Planning
Request: Deactivate, see attachment
Action: Approved

Comments from committee: The originator of this deactivation request presented it as a dilemma. Whereas curricular decisions are best addressed by faculty, the responsibility for resource allocation lies with the administration. This discussion led

to a broader consideration of the Senate's intent regarding the Revised Shared Governance Procedures that were developed by the Rules Committee and approved by the Senate in April, 2012. Per the revised procedures, the decision to deactivate/terminate a program now resides at the college/school and departmental levels, and the decision is reported to the Senate as an information item. The Graduate Programs Committee requests that the Rules Committee clarify the intent of the procedural changes that specify action items, information items, review items, and items not considered by the Senate.

Floor Discussion: Question was raised as to how these difficult decisions are made; what are the deciding criteria used to make such determinations. Horvath responded that decisions concerning program deactivations are being made in order to be proactive on rising demands on university funding, identity, and goals. Recommendations for deactivations have been made at the College/Division Level.

Members of the Political Science responded with their premise that the program is growing and paying for itself.

It was asked if the information item could be changed to an action item and it was determined that this would be out of order.

Sethna reiterated Horvath's statement about decreasing state support. We have previously counted on increased enrollment and in turn, increased tuition revenue. We need to be able to manage the budget needs and that includes looking at how funds are allocated. Horvath added that although it does not save in the short term but could save money in the future.

Questions about who we are as a university were raised. Horvath said cannot continue to try to be all things to all people. By reducing the total number of programs, we can clarify our identity as a university and focus on programs that are strong and viable..

Motion was made requesting that the Provost reconsider the deactivation of the Master of Urban and Regional Planning Program in light of budgetary information and strategic goals addressed by the members of the Faculty Senate.

The motion was seconded.

Motion passed by voice vote

B) College of Education

1) Department: Leadership and Instruction

a) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary English Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)

Request: Deactivate

Action: Approved

- b) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Chemistry Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- c) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Biology Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- d) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Mathematics Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- e) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Earth/Space Science Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- f) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Economics Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Originator: Frank Butts
Action: Approved
- g) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary History Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- h) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Physics Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- i) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Political Science Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate
Action: Approved
- j) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Broad Field Science Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)
Request: Deactivate

Action: Approved

k) Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in Secondary Business Education (Non-degree Initial Certification)

Request: Deactivate

Action: Approved

2) Department: Clinical and Professional Services

a) Program: Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification in School Counseling (Non-degree Initial Certification)

Request: Deactivate

Action: Approved

b) Program: Endorsement - English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

Request: Deactivate

Action: Approved

C) Richards College of Business

1) Department: Marketing and Real Estate

a) Program: Master of Business Education (Master of Education)

Request: Terminate

Action: Approved

b) Program: Ed.S. with a major in Business Education (Ed.S.)

Request: Terminate

Action: Approved

Committee V: Faculty Development Committee (Chair, Michael Keim)

Action Item

A) Motion: The Faculty Development Committee proposes that the Senate approve editorial changes to the Faculty Handbook 103.06. ([See Addendum I](#)):

Preamble: Under Section 100 - BASIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY TO FACULTY, we propose to discontinue the use of 103.0602 - Self-Evaluation of Teaching Methods and Effectiveness form and submit the resulting editorial changes to 103.06.

Motion approved by voice vote

B) Motion: The Faculty Development Committee proposes changes to the Faculty Handbook in the following sections ([See Addendum II](#)):

1) 104.0601 General Policy Statement, F. 2. Components of the Evaluation, 2. Evaluation Report, & G. Post-Evaluation Conference with the Faculty

Motion approved by voice vote

2) 104.0602 Dean Evaluation Questionnaire

It was decided to change the number “8” (unable to judge) to “0.” Responses of “0” will be thrown out.

Motion approved by voice vote

Committee VI: Strategic Planning Committee (Chair, Rob Sanders)

Action Item:

A) Motion: To adopt the new revised Quality Enhancement Plan Concept Statement and Learning and Operational Outcomes as recommended by the Strategic Planning Committee.

Discussion: Recommendations to come out of this plan will be to identify writing intensive courses. Currently there are no commitments to change courses or programs.

Two edits were recommended:

- In the previously approved QEP, an end parenthesis is missing and should follow “outcomes.”
- In the proposed QEP, the single bulleted item should be removed and incorporated into the sentence.

Quality Enhancement Plan Concept Statement and Learning Outcomes

University of West Georgia

In its quest to become a destination institution, the University of West Georgia will implement a well-constructed and heavily integrated quality enhancement plan (QEP). The focal point of the QEP is *undergraduate student writing*. Once this plan is implemented, all undergraduate students at the University of West Georgia will demonstrate an increased ability to write in standard academic English.

This **learning outcome** will be assessed by institution-wide sampling, and the increase or decrease in students’ ability to perform these learning outcomes will be measured and reported. In addition, the institution has identified a number of operational outcomes that will support this initiative.

By the end of the QEP, these initiatives will result in the following **operational outcomes**. UWG will:

1. Integrate writing into the existing Core
2. Implement a system to support the development of writing for online students
3. Increase investment in faculty development in the area of writing instruction

4. Develop and implement a rubric for the assessment of writing in standard English
5. Develop and implement a second-year writing experience

Words of appreciations were extended to MacComb for her work on this project.

Motion approved by voice vote.

5. Announcements

Senators are encouraged to go and meet the candidates for university president.

Smith, Facilities and Services Chair, gave an update on their current work. The issue of required training is in discussion. Sethna expressed his support of this discussion and welcomes input from everyone. Some of the issues raised have already been addressed.

6. Without objection the meeting was declared adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Harmon McCord, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Addendum I

103.06 Instruments for Evaluating Teaching

Evaluation of a faculty member's work should be continual because evaluation aids a faculty member in becoming more effective in the performance of his or her duties as well as offers evidence for promotion and/or tenure.

Although evaluation of classroom success is necessarily somewhat subjective, three modes of evaluation can, to a significant degree, objectively measure teaching effectiveness: self-evaluation, evaluation by the department chair, and student evaluation. Because the University of West Georgia believes that teaching is the most important function of a faculty member, the focus of evaluation instruments shall be on teaching and related duties.

With the exception of USG ecore courses the instruments of evaluation are standard forms for all departments. For ecore courses, evaluations will be completed through the common instruments designed for that purpose, and made available by the University system for all such courses. In June of 1996 the Faculty Senate passed a policy of centralizing the form and procedure for course evaluation. As of that date, all faculty must use the Scantron form titled University of West Georgia / Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for any class that has an enrollment of five or more students. Courses that have fewer than five students must be evaluated but may use an alternative evaluation instrument, appropriate to the course upon approval of the department and dean of the college. All classes must be evaluated in the final week of each semester. Any college, department, or area, however, may add questions to the self-evaluation form or the department chair's form which make the forms apply to the unique qualifications of the specific area. In addition, a department or area may devise, administer, and tabulate the results of an evaluation form which is especially applicable to the specific area. The department chair shall use the results of the evaluation as a factor in determining annual merit raises and shall include the results of such an evaluation form in the dossier of each department member being considered for contract renewal, promotion, tenure, pre-tenure or post-tenure review. (In the case of a department chair being reviewed for promotion and/or tenure, the appropriate next highest supervisor shall assume responsibility for including the results of such evaluations in the dossier of the candidate.) In place of the standard forms, non-teaching areas may devise their own forms to evaluate fulfillment of duties.

The faculty member should receive the forms shortly after mid-semester from the department chair. They will be sorted by class and section number, with the correct number of forms per section, and placed in a manila envelope and marked with an identifying label. The labels are provided by the office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The evaluation instrument is to be delivered during the last week of class, and it should be administered by a student or faculty proxy, not by the faculty member teaching the class. The instructions for the proctor are included in the envelope. Once the forms have been completed, the proctor shall turn them back in to the departmental office. If the class is being taught at a remote site, the instructor should provide the proctor with a stamped envelope addressed to the departmental office that the

student can drop in the mail. The completed evaluation forms are not to be delivered to the instructor of the class. (If the office is closed during this time, the office and the instructor shall make arrangements for receiving the forms.)

At the end of the semester, these Scantron forms will be sent to Instructional Technology Services (ITS) for processing and returned to the department to file. Once the grades have been turned in by the instructor, he or she may review the data and open-ended comments of the evaluations. The department chair will then file both parts of the evaluation in the departmental office and keep for complete records to support applications of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

Student evaluation forms shall be an official part of the administrative evaluation process. The department chair's evaluation in company with the published or unpublished student evaluations shall be in the department chair's care and the cumulative file shall be available only to the faculty member, his or her department chair, college dean or area supervisor, the provost and vice president for academic affairs, and the president except when the faculty member is being considered for promotion or tenure. When the faculty member is being considered for promotion or tenure, the entire file shall be made available to the appropriate review and/or advisory committee. If the department chair's evaluation is computerized, code symbols shall be used to ensure anonymity.

Copies of the forms for student evaluation (103.0601) and the evaluation by the department chair (103.0602) are given on the next pages. **103.0601 Instructor/Course Evaluation Questionnaire (Not Available)**

103.0602 (Revised May 27, 1983, by Faculty Senate) EVALUATION BY DEPARTMENTCHAIR

Addendum II

104.04 Evaluation of Academic Deans

104.0401 General Policy Statements

The Provost shall conduct annual reviews and periodic evaluations of academic Deans.

A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to:

1. Guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units, and to facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
2. Ensure that faculty and staff participate in the evaluation of their academic Deans.
3. Ensure Deans are afforded due process in the evaluation.
4. Afford all appropriate constituencies the opportunity to provide input.
5. Clarify the process of assembling the Review Committee, and the procedures for how it shall conduct the periodic evaluation.
6. Guide the Review Committee in producing an Evaluation Report of its findings, and delivering it to interested parties.

B. Definitions

1. For the purposes of this policy, an Academic Dean is one who carries a title of Dean, bears responsibility for an academic unit containing faculty members, and reports to the Provost.
2. In Sections 104.04, 104.05, and 104.06, a unit refers to a college, school, or the library.

104.05 Annual Reviews of Deans

104.0501 General Policy Statement

The Provost shall review the performance of Deans reporting to him or her annually. The following characteristics of that process shall be common to all units.

104.0502 Procedures

- A. Interval of Annual Review: before the conclusion of each fiscal year.
- B. Purpose and Objectives: the purpose of annual reviews of Deans is to improve the effectiveness of the unit administered, including its contribution to the effectiveness of other units and the institution as a whole. The overall objectives are:
 - 1. To review goals and accomplishments of the Dean and unit supervised, especially as these relate to the continuing mission and strategic goals of the institution.
 - 2. To review the Dean's job description and responsibilities, as well as the organization of the unit.
 - 3. To review the level of resources and other support provided to the Dean and unit.
 - 4. To discuss concerns and opportunities and to plan for changes that may be warranted or desirable.

C. Components of the Annual Review:

- 1. *Feedback.* The Provost shall direct the annual review process. Faculty members and staff, whenever possible, may be asked to provide input.
- 2. *Self-report.* Each Dean under review shall provide the Provost a brief written report:
 - a. Listing initiatives and professional activities undertaken during the review period.
 - b. Listing achievements, areas in need of improvement, and efforts related to those areas, as well as future plans and goals for the unit.
 - c. Indicating any changes that seem warranted in the Dean's job description.
 - d. Including a contextualization of the operation of the unit within the larger framework of the university.
- 3. *Conference with the Provost.* The conference will be an occasion to discuss the feedback received, the Dean's and the Provost's views, and future plans and goals for the unit.
- 4. *Dean's Annual Review Letter.* The Annual Review Letter shall be shared with the Dean and placed in his or her personnel file. The Dean may issue a written response to this document, which shall also be retained in the file.

104.06 Periodic Evaluations of Deans

104.0601 General Policy Statement

Procedures for the periodic evaluation of Deans shall be guided by three essential principles: shared governance, impartiality, and transparency. The procedures enumerated below seek to realize these principles.

A. Interval of Periodic Evaluation:

The first periodic evaluation of an academic Dean shall cover a full three-year period occurring in the Dean's fourth year of appointment. Thereafter, periodic evaluations shall cover a full four-year period and occur every five years. All periodic evaluations begin in the Fall semester and conclude in the Spring semester of one academic year. Credit for service as an Interim Dean shall be determined by the Provost in consultation with the Dean at the time of permanent appointment. After the first periodic evaluation the Provost may initiate an evaluation of a Dean at any time, but shall explain its necessity and appropriateness. Refer to Table 1 below for a sample periodic evaluation sequence.

Table 1. Sample Periodic Evaluation Sequence.

Appointment Year	Academic Year	Evaluation Year	Evaluation Review Period
1	2011-2012		
2	2012-2013		
3	2013-2014		
4	2014-2015	2014 – 2015	Evaluates Fall 2011 - Summer 2014
5	2015-2016		
6	2016-2017		
7	2017-2018		
8	2018-2019	2018 – 2019	Evaluates Fall 2014 - Summer 2018

B. Purpose and Objectives:

1. To provide the faculty and administration with information on the performance of academic Deans who report to the Provost, both annual reviews and periodic evaluations shall be practiced.
2. The periodic evaluation will help guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units and facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
3. To this end, a Review Committee shall be charged with collecting information about the performance of an academic Dean. Findings of the Review Committee shall supplement information from other sources (e.g., Annual Review Letters,

unit financial documents) to provide the Provost with a comprehensive record of the Dean's performance.

C. Timeline of Evaluation:

1. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the pending evaluation and appoint the Chair of the Review Committee in the Fall semester.
2. Within five working days of receiving the Provost's notification, the Dean under evaluation notifies the faculty and staff of his or her unit of the pending evaluation.
3. Within five working days of receiving the Provost's appointment, the Chair of the Review Committee shall call for the election of six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean. Refer to section 104.0601(D)(3) for guidance on the manner in which the Review Committee members shall be elected.
4. The Review Committee will provide its Evaluation Report to the Dean no later than February 28th of the academic year during which the evaluation is conducted.
5. The Dean has the right to review and respond to the Review Committee's Evaluation Report no later than March 28th.
6. The Review Committee's Evaluation Report and the Dean's response shall be forwarded to the Provost no later than March 30th.
7. The Chair of the Review Committee presents the results of the Dean's Evaluation Report to the faculty of the Dean under evaluation (minus the appendix) no later than April 30th.
8. In the event that the dates in this timeline fall on a weekend or holiday, the documents are due the following business day.

D. Composition of Review Committee:

1. The Review Committee will be composed of seven members.
2. A Review Committee Chair, who is a senior faculty member from outside the unit led by the Dean being evaluated. The Provost shall appoint the Review Committee Chair. The Chair of the Review Committee shall receive one course reassigned time.
3. Six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean, one of which must be a department chair. The faculty governance body from the unit led by the Dean under evaluation determines the manner in which the committee members shall be elected. In the case of a unit that does not have an elected faculty governance body, the faculty at large of the unit determine the manner in which the committee members shall be elected.

4. The Provost and the Dean under evaluation shall have the right to object to the inclusion of a member of the committee. Both parties shall each be allowed only one objection.
5. No person with a conflict of interest may serve as a member of the Review Committee. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to and reviewed by the Review Committee Chair prior to the selection of faculty to serve on the Review Committee. Such conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude dispassionate, disinterested, correct, complete, and unbiased participation in these matters. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the Dean are explicitly prohibited from participation.

E. Review Committee Procedures:

1. The Review Committee meets with the Provost and then with the Dean to be evaluated. At these meetings, the Review Committee:
 - a. Outlines the timeline for review and the evaluation criteria.
 - b. Requests relevant information to be considered during the evaluation. At this time, the Provost and the Dean may specify topics, questions, or concerns for the Review Committee to consider in making its evaluation, as well as particular individuals whose input would contribute to a complete review.
 - c. Informs the Provost and the Dean of:
 1. Their right to object to one member of the Review Committee, which shall trigger the search for a new member.
 2. The right to communicate with the Review Committee throughout the evaluation process. That is, the Committee must guarantee the Provost and the Dean the right to provide input at any time during the evaluation.
2. The Review Committee shall notify the faculty of the Dean under review of the procedures guiding the evaluation process and how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency shall be realized.
 - a. The notification shall include information about data collection, administration of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, how the identity of participants will be protected from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law, and the Review Committee's guarantee to grant full access to anyone wishing to provide input at any time during the evaluation, unless a significant conflict of interest can be demonstrated.
 - b. Among its procedures, the Review Committee must administer the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire to the Dean's constituency. The Dean's constituency shall include, but not be limited to, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, the faculty

- and staff of the unit, the faculty governance body of the unit, and any other individuals who interact with the Dean on a regular basis.
- c. In addition to the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, the Review Committee shall gather information related to the topics, questions, and concerns noted by the Provost and Dean in their initial meetings.

F. Components of the Evaluation:

1. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria should be based on the duties specified in Article III, Section 2 of the Policies and Procedures of the University of West Georgia and the By Laws of the unit of the Dean under evaluation.

2. Evaluation Report

The Review Committee shall produce an Evaluation Report of its findings, which shall be descriptive in nature. The Evaluation Report shall not include interpretations of the findings, nor recommendations regarding personnel actions; however, the Review Committee may synthesize the data they collect relative to the evaluation criteria, to include the authority to edit, shorten, paraphrase or select qualitative comments as exemplary for presentation in the report. All of the comments received shall remain anonymous and shall be presented to the Provost in an appendix, in order that the unbiased nature of the synthesis can be verified. The full Evaluation Report shall remain in the Office of the Provost for the length of time mandated by BOR Standards and may be obtained by individual request.

The Evaluation Report shall include, but not be limited to, the following sections:

Introduction

- a. Purpose of the evaluation.
- b. Description of how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency have been realized through the process.
 1. Description of the procedures that guided the composition of the Review Committee.
 2. Disclosure of conflicts of interest, if any, and how they were handled.
 3. Discussion of the timeline of the evaluation.

Methodology

- a. Data collection efforts (e.g. description of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, distribution methods, response rate).
- b. Procedures to protect the identity of participants from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law.

Results

- a. Descriptive analysis of data from the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire.

- b. Descriptive summary of additional data collected to include interviews with dean's peers, supervisors, and relevant external community when useful).

Conclusion

- a. Purpose of the evaluation (briefly revisited).
- b. Timeline for the next periodic evaluation, per guidelines in Table 1 in Section 104.0601.

G. Post-Evaluation Conference with the Faculty. The Chair of the Review Committee shall present the Evaluation Report (minus the appendix) to the faculty of the unit no later than April 30th.

104.0602 Dean Evaluation Questionnaire

The Review Committee shall use the following questionnaire to evaluate the Dean. However, each unit may include additional context-specific items to the instrument. Additional items must be placed at the end of the questionnaire in a new section labeled Unit Specific Items.

Please tell us, what is your role at UWG?

- A. Faculty Member and/or Faculty Administrator
- B. Staff Member

Your responses may be quoted in the full report, but only anonymously and as part of aggregated data.

In your role as administrator, faculty, or staff, please rate the Dean's unit on the following questions related to leadership, faculty and program development, fairness and ethics, communication, and administration. Please use the following scale to help with your answer:

0 = Unable to Judge; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat Disagree; 4 = Neither Disagree Nor Agree; 5 -Somewhat Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree

If you have insufficient experience to make an informed judgment, please choose "Unable to Judge."

Leadership

The Dean...

1. articulates a clear vision for the future of the unit.
2. involves the faculty in developing plans for the unit.
3. demonstrates a commitment to intellectual integrity and the pursuit of knowledge.
4. demonstrates administrative leadership of the unit.
5. is a professional role model for the unit.

6. weighs the opinions of all segments of the unit.

Faculty and Program Development

The Dean...

7. promotes a favorable environment for individual faculty development.
8. emphasizes teaching in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
9. emphasizes service in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
10. emphasizes professional growth and development in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises. (Note: each unit should adapt item #10 to reflect its P & T standards. For example, replace the term “professional growth and development” with “scholarship.”)
11. encourages creative approaches to teaching, research, and program development.
12. is responsive to the educational needs of the region when developing new programs.
13. supports student learning outcomes in work related to faculty and program development.

Fairness and Ethics

The Dean...

14. treats all members of the unit fairly irrespective of age, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or veteran status.
15. respects views that are contrary to his or her own views.
16. exhibits high ethical standards in his or her official duties.
17. strongly encourages high ethical professional standards for all members of the unit.
18. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to faculty promotion and tenure.
19. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to staff hiring and promotion.
20. arbitrates disputes among faculty, staff, and department heads fairly.
21. affords departments opportunities to explain their resource needs.
22. affords all members of the unit opportunities to explain their individual needs and concerns.

Communication

The Dean...

23. welcomes constructive criticism from all members of the unit.
24. creates an environment where individuals are free to communicate without concern of rejection or reprisal.
25. provides feedback in a constructive manner.
26. is well-informed about my department’s accomplishments, challenges, and future plans.
27. communicates changes affecting all the members of the unit in a timely manner.
28. recognizes and expresses appreciation for the accomplishments of all members of the unit.
29. fosters and maintains positive external relationships.

Administration

The Dean...

30. uses administrative procedures that are clear and unambiguous for promotions, tenure, merit raises, leave, and other personnel actions.
31. exercises sound judgment in appointing associate and assistant Deans.
32. attends to administrative matters in a timely fashion.
33. conducts productive meetings.
34. handles concerns from all members of the unit well.
35. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of the undergraduate programs.
36. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of graduate programs.
37. integrates planning, assessment, and budgeting when making decisions.
38. is transparent about the unit's budget.
39. makes evidence-based decisions.
40. is a team player.

Open Ended Items

41. In your opinion, what are the Dean's strengths and/or contributions?
42. In your opinion, what are the Dean's weaknesses?
43. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Dean in carrying out the academic mission of the school.
44. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Provost.

Unit Specific Items

Units may use Likert scale or open-ended items; regardless, the items should begin with number 45. Units that opt to use a Likert scale must employ the same response options used in items 1-40.