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Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.
CALL TO ORDER
The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

ROLL CALL
The Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum to be present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The Chairperson asked the members to look over the minutes which have been distributed to the members tonight. A motion (Mr. Baska, Mr. Madore) to approve the minutes as distributed was approved unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS
The Chairperson stated that we had a long agenda and, while everyone would be given a chance to speak, he hoped to expedite matters. He called upon the members to exercise restraint and to try to phrase their comments in such a way so that points are not repeated.

The Chairperson read letters of resignation from the Senate from Ed Koehl and Roger Potter. Mr. Koehl cited the press of academic duties and his participation in the Student Advisory program as his reasons for resigning; Mr. Potter will be on sabbatical leave. A motion (Mr. Madore, Mr. Rogers) to accept the resignations with regret was carried unanimously. The Chairperson announced that action would be taken to fill the vacancies immediately.

Mr. Sutherland read a letter of sympathy which he had sent as Chairperson of the Academic Senate to Mr. and Mrs. Orval Sprague upon the untimely death of their daughter Michelle Sue.

The Chairperson announced Dr. John Hill's formal resignation as faculty representative to the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities.

The Chairperson read a memorial statement for Vytas V. Gaigalas. (See appendix for statement.)

ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS
There were no administrator's remarks.

REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT
There were no remarks from the Student Association President.
ACTION ITEMS

VI, 19

A motion (Mr. Gordon, Mr. Chamberlain) to change the item order of business by moving item #1 - Chairperson Evaluation Procedures - to item #7 and moving the other items up was made. Mr. Gordon explained that he hoped to dispose of the other business by placing the chairperson evaluation last. He stated that it would expedite the nature of the business. Mr. Mead pleaded against the motion because they are people here to speak on the item; some of them had been present at the last meeting and had had to leave before the item was discussed. He stated his hope that we would keep chairperson evaluation as the first item of business. Mr. Mead stated that he had given some assurances to the chairpersons that they would be able to speak. Mr. Gordon withdrew his motion.

1. Chairperson Evaluation Procedures

Mr. Mead introduced the matter of Chairperson Evaluation, speaking for the Administrative Affairs Committee. Mr. Mead distributed a redraft of the proposal and explained the nature of the redraft. The Administrative Affairs Committee has had a meeting since the last Senate meeting in order to receive further input from interested parties. In light of the input at that time some additional revisions were being made in the proposal. (The revised proposals dated 9-5-74 are in the Appendix.) The only change in the proposal in reference to the College Councils is a change in the date. Mr. Mead stated that he would like to underline the fact that this proposal is merely a contingency proposal. He stated that data collected in this system is only advisory to the deans to be used as they see fit. In no way is it intended to be regarded as exclusive, but is based upon the assumption that the deans want more data upon which to operate. Mr. Mead stated that in all the months they have been considering this there has been very little general objection; some of the objections were quite specific. The greatest objection, Mr. Mead explained, was to the provision to furnish the data to the deans in an unsigned manner. Mr. Mead stated that in a University-wide questionnaire the faculty very strongly supported the concept of unsigned questionnaires. Mr. Mead said that in the interest of expediting the proposal he would suggest that the proposal be discussed first, exclusive of item #10; then item #10; and then the memo to the College Councils.

VI, 20

A motion (Mr. Mead, Mr. Tarrant) to accept the contingency proposal for evaluation of chairpersons as revised 9-5-74 with the exception of item #10 which has to do with quadriennial evaluation of department chairpersons was made. Mr. Mead, responding to Mr. Laymon's question about whether questionnaires were to be college-wide or departmental, stated that the committee understood this to mean departmental or college questionnaires. In response to a question if this contingency proposal included the questionnaire previously distributed, Mr. Mead replied that it would.

VI, 21

A motion (Mr. Woods, Mr. Quane) was made that any reference to an unsigned letter be changed to read a signed letter. Mr. Woods stated that unsigned letters would open up opportunity for irresponsible statements. Mr. Hicklin read a letter from Mr. Hickrod against signed questionnaires. (See appendix for letter.) Mr. Johnson spoke against the amendment. He argued that we should have faith in the professionalism of the person who is filling out the questionnaire. Mr. Young said that any member of the department has the option to sign the evaluation; he personally intended to sign whatever statement he turned in. Mr. Tarrant spoke
against the amendment. He said that the law unfortunately seems to protect the files of only priests, lawyers, and doctors. Therefore, there was no guarantee that these files could not be opened and the confidentiality of the statements violated. Mr. Tarrant stated that the identity of students was protected in student questionnaires so that the instructors could not try to get back at them. Mr. Mead asked the Chairperson to call on any visitors who wished to address themselves to this matter. Mr. Sutherland ruled that he would call upon people to speak on the specific amendment now and speak on the main motion later. Dean Uehling of the College of Arts and Sciences spoke to the Senate. She stated that the College of Arts and Sciences does have a sub-committee working on the problem of chairperson evaluation. She stated that evaluation should be divided into two parts—one part should be for the growth and development of the individual being evaluated and the other should be for administrative purposes. She stated that an over-elaborate procedure may have been devised here which would take away the major merits of the evaluative process. She hoped that we would not extend to chairpersons a format of evaluation similar to that being used for faculty with which we are already unhappy. The chairpersons in Arts and Sciences met and are unanimous in their agreement that the evaluations should be signed. Mr. Plantan asked how confidentiality could be protected. He reminded the Senate that it had already been stated by Mr. Tarrant that the only files that have any protection from court orders are the files of lawyers, priests and ministers. He stated that he didn't see how he could protect the confidentiality of signed evaluations. Dean Uehling stated that one of the fears with signed questionnaires seemed to be the fear of a leak of information by the dean. She stated that she would not comment on the legal ramifications. She stated that there was a great deal of evidence to show that a person exercises more caution when he signs the questionnaire. She asked Mr. Plantan if he hadn't been more cautious in rating instructors when he had to sign the questionnaire. Mr. Laymon stated that Dr. Hickrod had backed off from his previous position and would have to vote against the amendment. He stated that Dr. Hickrod through showing him the statutes of the State of Illinois had convinced him that anonymity could not legally be assured. Mr. Woods said that persons could go in and talk to the department head about other faculty members so that we are all in this thing together. Mr. Parr stated that Dean Uehling had said she is not going to accept anonymous, scurrilous comments. He stated that the deans would not take such a comment on face value but it might lead to an investigation. Signed comments would make it easier to conduct such an investigation. He stated that no one would make a decision on the basis of an unsigned comment alone. Mr. Ray White contended that the best instrument would be a question such as "what is your opinion about the operation of your department." Mr. White stated that we all know how to avoid libel, and we could all write a letter and sign it. Mr. Woods stated that his amendment is not really designed to prevent the unsigned questionnaire but to prevent unsigned unsolicited letters. The Chairperson read the motion back to Mr. Woods. Mr. Quane stated that his second was to a motion which would prevent all unsigned evaluations, not just unsolicited letters. Mr. Quane stated that he had misunderstood the intent of the motion. Mr. White called upon Mr. Woods to change his motion so that it would in fact apply to all unsigned materials. Mr. Woods stated that he would prefer for Mr. White to amend the amendment. Mr. Mead stated that the particular proposal in front of us contains no reference to unsigned letters. Mr. Quane stated that he would have to withdraw his second unless the amendment dealt with questionnaires. The Chairperson said that if in fact the amendment referred to the College Council document and not the contingency plan, it was out of order. Mr. Woods stated that he would remind the Chairperson that at the time
he introduced the motion he said that it might be out of order. Mr. Woods
said that he was trying to amend the second document. Mr. Laymon stated that
since one document is entailed by the other Mr. Woods's amendment is in order.
Mr. Mead reminded the Senate that his motion dealt only with the contingency
motion. Mr. Young called upon the Chairperson to rule whether Mr. Woods'
amendment was out of order. The Chairperson ruled that the motion is out
of order and, in addition, has no seconder.

VI, 22
A motion (Mr. White, Mr. Quane) was made that in the periodical evaluation of
chairpersons the contingency questionnaire not involve unsigned material. Mr.
Gavin asked about the manner of presentation of the aggregated data to the
chairperson and asked if names were involved at that point. Mr. White stated
that any alternate procedure should involve no unsigned forms or letters. Mr.
Mead stated that our concern is not just with the possibility of negative re-
sponses but with the likelihood of inflated positive responses. Ms. Frankland
stated that there was no way to prevent unsigned data from coming in and being
read by the committee. Mr. Madore asked if it was the intent of the motion that
the signed questionnaires would be transmitted back to the chairpersons. Mr. White
stated that this was not the intent of the amendment. He asserted that it would
be the prerogative of the dean to forward to other authorities or the the chair-
persons whatever materials are collected. He stated that it was the intent of
the motion to forward only summaries. Mr. Woods stated that he thought some of the
validity of the questionnaires would be destroyed if people were forced to sign them.
Mr. Woods stated that in his department they have shown that the student question-
naires are not necessarily valid but we do take them as being somewhat valid when we
have large numbers. Mr. Woods said that if there are sixty people in the department
the average would show whether the department chairperson was doing a good job or
a poor job. He stated that unsigned letters cast a different light upon the
situation since there are rarely unsigned complimentary letters. A motion
(Mr. Laymon, Mr. Young) to move the previous question was approved. Debate
was closed. A roll call vote was taken on the White amendment. The motion
failed, 8-29-4. Mr. Ficek made the observation that the vote seemed to change
from the voice vote to the roll call vote when the anonymity disappeared.

VI, 23

Mr. Taylor suggested a revision on page two, section #7. A motion (Mr. Taylor,
Mr. Plantan) that the item #7 be changed to read "prior to the second Friday in
December the college deans shall provide for student evaluations of chairpersons.
These evaluations must be received by the college deans no later than the third
Friday in December" was made. Mr. Plantan explained that the original paragraph
doesn't necessarily require student evaluation of chairpersons. The intent of
this motion is to move toward requiring student evaluation. Mr. Taylor explained
that the "shall" means that the College Councils will come up with some form of
student evaluation of chairpersons. Mr. Tarrant stated that he supported this
idea. He stated that the deans will have to do some very stiff homework. Mr.
Mead stated that the motion seems to give the deans more leeway. He pointed out
some technical errors in the amendment that might be corrected. Mr. Taylor and
Mr. Plantan agreed to drop "prior to the second Friday in December" from their
motion. Mr. Arnold said that with the kind of leeway the deans have they can
decide what constitutes evaluation. Mr. Gordon stated that the particular time-
table that we have set is in the middle of final exams and student input would
be very difficult to obtain during this time of year. He suggested that we
correct this while we are amending this item. The motion to amend item #7 was
approved on a voice vote.
Mr. Gavin proposed an amendment to avoid the return of signed information to department chairpersons but the particular wording Mr. Gavin proposed did not seem to the Chair to be substantially different from Mr. White's amendment. Mr. Helgeson stated that his interpretation of item #4 was that it was aggregated data and that the concept of signed or unsigned questionnaires would have no meaning here.

Mr. Laymon requested that the Chair recognize people who had come in and who wished to speak to the proposal. Dr. Clayton Thomas, Chairperson of the Educational Administration Department, spoke in opposition to the main motion. He stated that he wanted to distinguish between policy and administration. He hoped that the Senate would look very carefully at this issue. In adopting a questionnaire line by line, the Senate was involved in administration, not in policy, Dr. Thomas asserted. He used as an analogy Senate involvement in making out department schedules.

Dr. Kay Easson of the English Department spoke and suggested that the chairperson evaluation proposal and the report from the University-wide APT Revision Committee be considered together. She cautioned against getting too much evaluation procedure, as we may be in that position right now. She recommended that we consider both reports together or that we might want to accept or reject either one or both.

Mr. Henry called for a point of clarification about the signed/unsigned nature of the questionnaires. Mr. Mead stated that if the deans do not receive signed data, which by the contingency proposal would be the case, then they cannot forward signed data to the chairpersons.

A question as to who would approve the proposals as they came back from the colleges was raised. Mr. Duty stated the willingness of the Administrative Affairs Committee to take this responsibility if the Senate gave it to them.

VI, 25

A motion (Mr. Ficek, Mr. Liberta) that the chairperson questionnaire be deleted from the proposal was made. Mr. Mead reviewed the history of the hearings of the committee, the input they received, and the questionnaires which they had received from other universities. He stated that he was a little bothered that at this late date a move should be made to abolish the questionnaire. Dean Helgeson stated that he had talked to each college dean, and that each college did in fact intend to come up with a college system of evaluation in keeping with the spirit of the material that was under consideration tonight. Mr. Helgeson stated that he was supportive of the sentiment to delegate some of this procedure to other committees. He noted that this could be done with a very simple amendment to the end of the material. Mr. Taylor took exception with Mr. Mead's statement that there had not been dissatisfaction expressed about the questionnaire. Mr. Taylor pointed out that if in fact a college council did not come up with an alternate questionnaire this questionnaire would be imposed. He stated that this is a violation of administrative procedures. Mr. Tarrant spoke against the amendment. He stated that the reason this came up was that in 1971 we passed a resolution for administrative evaluation and nothing happened. Mr. Taylor said that we do not have the same people sitting at the head table, i.e., the President, that he had sitting there in 1971. He stated that if we impose
an administrative act in the guise of policy we impugn the ability of the administration to administrate. Mr. Taylor said that the last time we were ignored was in a totally different situation than this administration. Mr. Mead repeated that if a college council does in fact come up with their own questionnaire then the questionnaire under consideration would not be imposed upon anyone. Mr. Ficek stated that this proposal would have a coercive effect upon the colleges. Mr. Liberta stated that if all the colleges are preparing their own forms then this questionnaire is superfluous. A motion (Mr. Plantan, Mr. Parr) to move the previous question carried unanimously. The Ficek amendment failed on a voice vote. Mr. Taylor, Mr. Ficek, and Mr. Liberta asked that their "yes" votes be recorded.

A motion (Mr. Laymon, Mr. Taylor) to delete items #5-11 and replace them with a statement that college deans be directed to devise a system of chairperson evaluation by January 1, 1975 was made. Mr. Henry stated that he was concerned that we were telling the deans what to do. His concern was that the first proposal was deemed to be advisory and we had been cautioned then about getting into administration. The latest proposed amendment by Mr. Laymon seems to direct the deans as to what to do and seems to be clearly outside the bounds of Senate authority. Mr. Taylor asked for a ruling of the chair to see if the amendment was in order and within the purview of the Senate. Mr. Young stated that a series of amendments was a delightful exercise in parliamentary procedure, but we should keep the deliberative nature of the Senate in mind. Amendment after amendment is in fact rewriting the proposal and is doing committee work which the Senate is not equipped to do. Mr. Young stated that we should vote on the main motion and either pass it or reject it. A motion (Mr. Young, Mr. Baska) to move the previous question was passed. The Laymon amendment failed on a voice vote.

Mr. Gordon asked the Senate to address a question to Dean Helgeson about what processes are already on the books. Mr. Gordon was reminded that the Dean had answered this question previously in prior discussion of chairperson evaluation when it was at the Information Item stage.

Dean Helgeson stated that in the questionnaire, one question refers to another term of four years. Mr. Mead agreed that this was a serious error to imply in the instrument or in any other document that we have such a thing as an elected term. Dean Helgeson explained that department heads are on a year-to-year contractual basis. Mr. Mead asked permission to delete the last few words of item #18 to remove any implication that there is a term of office of four years. The Chairperson stated that we could do this if it is the committee's intention. A motion (Mr. Young, Mr. Johnson) to move the previous question was approved. The Chairperson Evaluation Procedures proposal as amended by Mr. Taylor was approved on a voice vote.

A motion (Mr. Mead, Mr. Tarrant) to adopt item #10 dealing with quadriennial evaluation of department chairpersons as stated in the memo of 9-5-74 was made. In answer to a question from Mr. Reitan, Mr. Mead stated that this was also a contingency proposal if the college councils did not come up with a plan of their own. Mr. Young objected to the proposal, stating that no other officer or faculty member of the University is subjected to this particular kind of treatment and objected to the singling out of department chairpersons. Mr. Young stated that this item would imply that the four year term exists and that there would be a four year turnover regardless how much we qualify the procedure. Mr. Liberta asked why if yearly evaluation took place we needed a committee with what appears to be superpowers to evaluated the chairperson.
Mr. Tarrant reminded the Senate that there is a procedure going on now which is not strikingly different from this proposal. He noted that if we did not approve this, then we are implying that we should halt the present evaluation system that is now going on.

Mr. Ritt, Chairperson of the Mathematics Department, spoke at the invitation of the Chairperson. Mr. Ritt stated that while he is not a spokesman for the chairpersons, several chairpersons had asked him to object to this provision. He said that nobody wanted to feel that he was running for office every four years. Mr. Ritt stated that the Senate was probably overstepping itself in this section, getting into administration rather than policy making. His interpretation of the charge to the Senate is to push for guarantee that evaluation takes place. He stated that the Senate in this section has moved from evaluation to stating how department chairpersons will be retained. Mr. Laymon stated that he objected to this particular section. He stated that our previous action called for yearly evaluation and that item #10 is now not relevant. Mr. Laymon asked the Chair for a ruling if this is indeed the prerogative of the Academic Senate. The Chairperson outlined cases where the faculty have questioned the leadership of the department chairperson. He stated that procedures have been carried out on a disturbingly ad hoc basis, and that in the past, because of ineptitude and cowardice on the part of top-level administrators, departmental disasters had occurred. He said that out of these boondoggles arose the desire for regularized procedures. He stated that there has to be some means for routine and regular procedures where chairpersons who are not performing their duties can be easily removed and hopefully can drop back into the teaching ranks. The Chairperson read from the Constitution which stated that the Academic Senate does in fact have the duty to provide policy for appointment and retention, as well as for evaluation of academic administrators. Mr. Laymon pointed out that the passing of the yearly evaluation was in fact tantamount to doing this and that passing item #10 was redundant. Mr. Mead reminded the Senate that the only thing that item #10 did was to recommend an advisory policy under which the deans could get input about the retention of department chairpersons. Mr. Mead said that he wanted to underscore the positive intent of this. He stated that in some cases the chairperson would be given an additional mandate. A motion (Mr. Madore, Ms. Workman) to move the previous question failed on a roll call vote, 24-15 with a two-thirds majority needed for passage.

Mr. Reitan stated that he felt the system of annual evaluations precluded the need for quadriennial evaluations. Mr. White asked if present provisions for four year evaluations would change arrangements in departments who desired a shorter period. Dean Helgeson stated that he had some question about the implications of the four year term. He stated that he was also concerned about the appeal provisions that have been suggested. Mr. Helgeson stated that he was negative about this particular point because of the inclusion of an appeal procedure which would be humiliating to the department chairperson. Mr. Quane raised the point that it was important to keep a built-in program of program evaluation every four years even though the chairperson evaluation might not be adopted. Mr. Mead stated that the Administrative Affairs Committee had passed on to the Academic Affairs Committee a recommendation for program evaluation. Mr. Mead responded to Dean Helgeson's concern about the inclusion of an appeal process. In the original draft of this proposal, he explained, there was no appeal process; it was at the insistence of department chairpersons that the appeal process was included. Originally it was put into the APT process, but was taken out of that process because it confused the lines of authority. Mr. Boyd stated that the implication seems to be that the quadriennial evaluation is a different kind of evaluation than the yearly evaluation. Mr. Smith
stated that he had some qualms about the appeal procedure. He thought the overall proposal should be included anyway. Mr. Gordon raised some reservations about how the persons would be elected and who would serve on such a committee for evaluation of the chairpersons. He thought this raised the problem of internal conflict within the department. Mr. Gordon stated that this proposal seems to overlook some interpersonal and procedural problems that might be implied by this proposal. Mr. Laymon asked Dean Helgeson what effect he thought this proposal might have on recruitment of department heads or administrators. Dean Helgeson stated that at least one former department chairperson, Dean White, used to run this kind of evaluation for himself in his department voluntarily. Dean Helgeson stated that others would be able to speak better on the effect this would have on recruiting department heads. Dean Helgeson also cited the fact that Dr. Kinneman, former head of the Department of Social Sciences, initiated chairperson evaluation procedures over twenty years ago. Mr. Helgeson stated that he was not greatly disturbed over the process of evaluation of chairpersons. He said that some of it had to be left to the particular style of the college dean, and he hated to see everything spelled out so that we left no room for individual style. Dean Helgeson described a hypothetical situation where there might be a difference between the yearly evaluation as opposed to the combination of programmatic and chairperson review. Dean Helgeson did explain the possibility that some departments might need to move in new directions and the department chairperson might want to step down after several years because the department was to take a different direction. Mr. Mead stated that the four year framework does enable department heads to step down with some grace than the yearly evaluation cycle would provide for. Dean Porter, Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology, said that the only part of these proposals that troubles him is the four year term. He said that we might want to say at least four years; in some cases we might want to do this more frequently. A motion (Mr. Young, Ms. Frankland) to refer this item back to the Administrative Affairs Committee was made. Mr. Mead stated that this was a contingency plan. After this was passed it was intended to send this whole thing to the college councils for implementation. He stated that he did not think there was anything productive in prolonging it. Mr. Taylor stated that Mr. Mead's use of the word contingency was like saying to a man you will jump twenty-five feet and if you don't we will give you a contingency plan to make you jump thirty feet. A motion (Mr. Laymon, Mr. Baska) to move the previous question was passed unanimously. The Young motion was defeated on a voice vote. A motion (Mr. Laymon, Ms. Workman) to move the previous question was approved. The proposed item #10 to be incorporated into the contingency plan was approved on a roll call vote, 21-14-5. A motion (Mr. Mead, Mr. Young) to adopt the proposed memorandum to the College Councils was made. Dean Helgeson supported this but moved to add the following amendment (Mr. Helgeson, Mr. Young): "Unless these proposals are accepted by the Administrative Affairs Committee by January 15, 1975." Mr. Duty supported the amendment. Mr. Mead said that it would be logically entailed to incorporate the same amendment to the previously approved proposal. Mr. Mead stated that he would accept on good faith that the College Councils would go ahead with the development of an instrument. The Helgeson amendment was approved on a voice vote.

Mr. Laymon stated that it was his interpretation that the College Councils should have the actual instruments developed since the later date was accepted. Mr. Mead agreed that this would be the case. Mr. Reitan asked what the spirit of the request for student evaluations was as far as their being annual or not.
Discussion took place about the advisability of the date. There seemed to be some confusion generated by the date change. Mr. Mead said that the committee would be meeting with the college councils and would be in constant dialogue with them. Mr. Mead stated his preference for the December 11 date for the evaluation. If things are delayed until January 15 as the amendment provides, Mr. Mead stated, if nothing is acceptable from the college council then there could be no evaluation during the 1974-75 year. Mr. Mead, in response to a question from Mr. Gordon as to what would be the effect of the rejection of the college council memo, stated that the rejection of this particular proposal would in fact kill the entire proposal for chairperson evaluation. The motion to accept the proposed memo to the college councils was approved. Mr. Gordon asked to be recorded as voting "no" on the adoption of the college council memo.

2. Administrative Selection Committee Chairman's Panel

The Chairperson exercised the prerogative of the Chair and moved item #6 - Election of members to the Administrative Selection Committee Chairman's Panel - to the next item on the agenda. Balloting for the Panel of 10 ensued.

3. Codification of the Advisory Committee on Affirmative Action for Minorities, Codification of Enlarged Entertainment Committee Membership, and Committee Appointments

A motion (Mr. Liberta, Mr. Helgeson) to accept agenda items 2, 3 and 7 was approved.

A motion (Mr. Laymon, Mr. Ficek) to adjourn failed.

Mr. Hicklin explained that relative to the Rules Committee recommendation of Mr. Charles Edwards to fill a vacancy on the Parking Committee there was an alternate to the committee, Mr. Walter Vernon. The Rules Committee chairperson, Mr. Roderick, stated that he was not aware of this since the Rules Committee meeting took place during the changeover of civil service secretaries. Mr. Edwards' recommendation came from Mr. Duncan of the Parking Service. Mr. Hicklin reminded the Senate that this was not the first time that the Senate had departed from the seating of alternates, but they should be aware of what the effect of this action was.

4. The Jeff Kolasa Amendment

Mr. Kolasa introduced his amendment and described his discussion with Mr. Goleash. Mr. Goleash stated that he was unable at this time to give a legal opinion of the effect of recent amendments to the education act. Mr. Goleash stated that his general opinion was that there was nothing illegal about the proposal by Mr. Kolasa. A motion (Mr. Kolasa, Mr. Henry) to accept the Kolasa amendment was made. Mr. Taylor asked what the recommendations of Mr. Schwelle were on the proposal. Mr. Schwelle was seated at the table to answer questions. Mr. Schwelle stated that he would prefer not to make a recommendation at this time. Mr. Schwelle stated that this may be much more complex than it appears, affecting Placement Services and other agencies. He stated that he thought that the Kolasa Amendment was very probably legal. He suggested that the amendment be referred to the Student Affairs Committee where a definite legal opinion could be sought. Mr. Schwelle said that another way of dealing with the amendment
would be to delete any idea of parental notification and to utilize the student records policy. He stated that Mr. Kolasa had done an excellent job of homework in seeking out resources supporting his amendment. He stated that this could be discussed from the philosophical point of view as to whether the Hearing Panel should have the discretion to notify parents of a student's actions. Mr. Gavin stated that he was an adult and he didn't see why anyone should send a letter home to his parents about his actions here. Mr. Rogers stated that he had changed his mind on the amendment from the last meeting and would now support it. Mr. Taylor asked why the Student Affairs Committee had not met to consider this in toto rather than to try to solve it with an amendment. Mr. Kolasa stated that this whole situation has been under study since March and had gone through thorough study. Mr. Laymon raised a question about forbidding SCERB to ever notify parents of any problems. Mr. Steinbach summarized the problem of an unclear law, the lack of a legal opinion. He said that the Student Affairs Committee and SCERB should work together to form a coherent total policy. A motion (Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Ficek) to recommit the Kolasa Amendment to the Student Affairs Committee was made. Mr. Henry stated that this was stalling for time. He stated that we have explored the issues thoroughly. Mr. Arnold stated that SAC had met and discussed the Kolasa Amendment. He stated that the Senate always had the right to amend a policy when it comes to the floor of the Senate. He stated that we should get on with passing the amendment. Mr. Kolasa said that he had not always been able to meet with the Student Affairs Committee. He stated that he had been working on this problem for five months and would go out of office in February. He stated that he wanted to see something done on this. Mr. Schwelle stated that SCERB would hold all letters of notification until such time as the legal implications of the Federal Education Act were clarified. A motion (Mr. Gavin, Mr. Parr) to move the previous question was approved. The motion to recommit was defeated on a voice vote.


A motion (Mr. Henry, Mr. Plantan) to move the previous question was approved. The Kolasa Amendment was approved on a roll call vote, 33-3-4.

5. Election of Faculty Representative to the AACMU.

A motion (Mr. Henry, Mr. Taylor) to accept Thomas Nelson as the faculty representative to the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities was approved on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEM

1. Tuition Waiver Benefits for Faculty, Staff and Families.

Mr. Smith stated that the Board of Governors have such a proposal now for waiver of tuition. He stated that the Economic Well Being Committee had previously reported this. Mr. White stated that there was not full and unanimous endorsement of this policy on the part of the committee.
COMMITTEE REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairperson reported that Ms. Anita Chambers had resigned as civil service secretary and that Ms. Leonhard was back on a pinch-hitting basis and would be moving back permanently.

Mr. Chamberlain reported for the Student Affairs Committee that he had invited the two new officers of the University Union Board to the Senate meeting to be introduced but they had had to leave earlier. He read a statement from the Union Board President and requested that it be entered into the minutes. (See appendix.)

Ms. Chesebro reported that the Academic Affairs Committee planned to attend the open hearing on Master Plan IV on Wednesday, September 18, in the Old Main Room of the University Union.

The Chairperson reported that Louise Dieterle, T. C. Ichniowski, and Elwood Egelston were elected to the remaining positions on the Administrative Selection Committee Chairman's Panel.

A motion (Mr. Laymon, Mr. Liberta) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baska</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlanga</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesebro</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickrod</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehl</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolasa</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loymon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberta</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madore</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reitan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinbach</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgeson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The untimely death of Dr. Vytas V. Gaigalas on July 15, 1974, after an illness of one year's duration leaves a void in the hearts of his many colleagues and students which will be impossible to fill. A kindly father, a devoted husband, a gracious host, an inspiring teacher with high expectations from his students, a publishing scholar and a patient man, Dr. Gaigalas will be sadly missed by all who knew him. Blessed with an understanding nature and a sly sense of humor, he was a quietly benign person who sought tirelessly to perform his task as teacher and scholar.

Dr. Gaigalas' academic specialty was nineteenth century French literature and in particular, Ernest Renan, upon whom he was a recognized authority. To his students, he was an inspiring teacher who dealt with majestic themes in a majestic fashion. They recognized his genius and his solid preparation and attested their esteem in many letters of thanks for his courses. He brought to the classroom not only the wealth of knowledge he had from his excellent academic training but also the knowledge obtained from a life as a child in Lithuania, as a soldier in the icy wastes of the Arctic Circle, as a forced laborer in Nazi Germany, as a refugee student in Belgium and as a displaced person in the United States where by dint of hard work in the traditional fashion of immigrants, he carved a place for himself in the minds and hearts of his students and colleagues.

A European gentleman who offered to his students an example of intellectual and scholarly attainment and personal integrity, honesty and courage, Dr. Gaigalas will not be forgotten by those who had the pleasure of knowing him.
TO: College Councils
FROM: Academic Senate
RE: Development of Systems of Chairperson Evaluation

Feedback from a university-wide questionnaire administered in May 1974 indicates that a very strong majority of faculty, chairpersons, and administrators feel a need for a new, systematic, and periodic form of chairperson evaluation. The Administrative Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate has had this matter under consideration for the past two and a half years.

A year and a half ago the Administrative Affairs Committee and the Academic Senate passed a resolution asking college deans to devise more adequate systems of chairperson evaluation. No action was taken on this at the college level. Therefore the Administrative Affairs Committee has again taken up this matter and developed its own proposal for chairperson evaluation. However, in the interest of encouraging and augmenting the participation of the colleges in the governing process, the Administrative Affairs Committee wishes to invite college participation in developing a system of evaluation.

To assist in this procedure the Academic Senate has provided a set of basic principles for compliance by the college councils in their development of systems of chairperson evaluation:

1) Periodic input to chairpersons regarding role expectations placed upon them by their college deans.

2) Opportunity for chairpersons to advise college deans and faculty within their departments regarding their perceptions of their roles and problems they confront.

3) Opportunity for chairpersons to advise college deans of the broad spectrum of their activities and accomplishments for the period being evaluated.

4) Periodic and unsigned advisory input to college deans allowing for direct and candid faculty evaluation of chairpersons in regard to the broad spectrum of significant chairperson functions.

5) Opportunity for student input into the evaluation process.

6) Aggregated or summarized feedback of evaluations to the chairperson where this can be done without compromising confidentiality.

7) Opportunity at longer-term and regular intervals for faculty to advise whether chairpersons will be continued in that capacity.

8) Opportunity for affected chairpersons to appeal both short-term and long-term APT evaluations.

This proposal for chairperson evaluation that accompanies this memo provides an example that incorporates the listed principles. This proposal represents the most recent in a series of many drafts thoroughly deliberated upon by the Administrative Affairs Committee and passed by the Academic Senate after the studying of proposals.
from other universities, the analysis of university-wide questionnaire survey data at ISU, and consultation with administrators, chairpersons, faculty, students, and legal counsel at ISU. Your college council may wish to adopt this proposal in its present form, suggest a revision of this proposal, or draft a different proposal.

College councils are urged to begin to formulate their systems of chairperson evaluation immediately. Members of the Administrative Affairs Committee stand ready to receive suggestions and provide consultation in this process. Unless college councils submit to the Administrative Affairs Committee prior to November 20 their own proposals for a system of chairperson evaluation consistent with the principles endorsed by the Academic Senate and implementable for the 1974-75 school year, and unless these proposals are accepted by the Administrative Affairs Committee by January 15, 1975, the attached proposal will automatically become effective for the 1974-75 school year in regard to those colleges lacking their own systems of chairperson evaluation. At the beginning of the fall semester 1975 the Administrative Affairs Committee will review and evaluate all the systems of chairperson evaluation on the basis of a poll of all faculty, chairpersons, and administrators within each college.

Members of the Administrative Affairs Committee

Walter Mead, Chairman 438-8145
Robert Duty 438-2697
Alan Hickrod 438-3636
Alan Johnson 452-9939
Patrick Tarrant 436-7193
Felicitas Berlanga 452-8873
FROM: Administrative Affairs Committee
TO: Academic Senate
RE: Proposal for a System of Chairperson Evaluation, Final Revised Draft 9-5-74

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: The purpose of this proposal is positive. It is intended:

(a) to provide chairpersons with clearer guidelines in regard to role expectations from those to whom they are presently accountable;
(b) to provide chairpersons with supportive feedback in areas where their performance is meritorious;
(c) to suggest to chairpersons areas in which performance might be improved;
(d) to provide to college deans a broader and more reliable range of data for their assessment and advisement of chairperson performance.
(e) Finally, it should be noted that all of the items in the following proposal are (and can be) merely advisory and can provide no more than a part of the data that college and university deans must take into consideration in their advising and evaluating of departmental chairpersons. The effective implementation of this proposal will depend, in the end, upon the commitment of deans, chairpersons, and faculty to collegial spirit and judicious purpose in promoting the broader interests of the university.

1. Early in the school year the college dean and chairperson will develop an understanding in regard to the chairperson's role objectives for that school year.

2. Each chairperson will provide annually, prior to the first Friday in December, to the dean of his/her college and to each faculty member within his/her department a brief statement focusing upon his/her goals and objectives as chairperson and his/her assessment of the problems that require confrontation for the meeting of these goals and objectives.

3. Each chairperson will provide annually, between the first and second Fridays in December, to the dean of the college, information regarding his/her activities and accomplishments in the three categories of "teaching," "scholarship," and "service" on the form used for faculty evaluation.

4. Each chairperson will be evaluated in the area of teaching, as is the case for the rest of his/her department, through student response on course evaluator questionnaires, administered by a staff person other than the evaluatee. This staff will aggregate (or have aggregated) the response on the questionnaires and submit the aggregated data directly to the college dean. This aggregated data will be returned to the chairperson, but not until the semester evaluated has terminated.

5. In addition, standard college-wide questionnaires will be completed annually, between the first and third Fridays in December, by the full-time faculty within each department. These questionnaires will be unsigned and will be returned directly to the dean of the college by the third Friday in December. Only those faculty who, at the completion of that semester, will have served fully three consecutive semesters under the chairperson (in the capacity of either full or acting chairperson) will be eligible to respond. In order to provide the chairperson with adequate time to make progress toward accomplishing his/her long term objectives, a chairperson shall have served more than one academic year before the questionnaire will be administered. The dean of the college will distribute and collect the questionnaires. The data provided by these questionnaires will be regarded as advisory to the dean of the college and shall be supplemental to whatever other data the dean may choose to consult in his/her APT considerations relating to the respective chairperson.
6. Aggregated data from the computerized portion of these questionnaires and summaries of the remaining portion of these questionnaires (inasmuch as individual faculty indicate their permission to reveal the latter information) will be returned as soon as possible to each chairperson, but not before APT evaluations of faculty are due in the college dean's office.

7. The college deans shall provide for student evaluations of chairpersons. These evaluations must be received by the college deans no later than the third Friday in December. Inasmuch as individual students indicate their permission, summaries of these evaluations will be returned to each chairperson after the end of the semester in which they are received.

8. The dean of each college will provide during the final month of each school year to each chairperson (acting or full) continuing under his/her jurisdiction evaluation of that chairperson, based upon the previously mentioned data and such other data as he/she may request.

9. An appeal procedure and schedule will be established by the university and college deans whereby the final annual evaluation and recommendation by the dean may be appealed by the affected chairperson.

10. At least one semester prior to the end of each four year period of service as chairperson (time served in the capacity of acting as well as full chairperson will be combined where the chairperson has served consecutively in both capacities), each chairperson will indicate to the dean of his/her college whether he/she would be available to serve as chairperson beyond the four year period.

If the chairperson does thus indicate his/her future availability, a committee will immediately be constituted consisting of four members elected -- three from within the department and one from outside the department -- by full-time faculty within the department, and one member appointed by the dean of the college from outside the department and within the university. This committee will assess all the previously mentioned data, and utilizing also personal interviews and such other information as it may deem appropriate, will advise the college dean as to the desirability of continuing the chairperson in his present capacity. The dean will consider this advice in addition to whatever other data he/she may wish to consider. (The committee members themselves will be considered ineligible for consideration for the chairperson position under evaluation.)

An appeal of the final decision may be made by the affected department chairperson according to procedures to be established by the university and college deans. This will apply immediately to those chairpersons who will have served at least three and one-half years at the end of the fall 1974 semester. Exception will have to be made in the initiation of this program for the College of Arts and Sciences, where -- in the order of greatest seniority of chairpersonship first -- evaluations will be made of about one-third of the fourteen presently most senior chairpersons each year over the first three years.

Programmatic evaluations of departments will be administered at four-year intervals concurrent with chairperson evaluations.

11. Unless college councils submit to the Administrative Affairs Committee prior to November 20 their own proposals for a system of chairperson evaluation, consistent with principles endorsed by the Academic Senate and implementable for the 1974-75 school year, and unless these are accepted by the Administrative Affairs Committee by January 15, 1975, this proposal will automatically become effective for the
1974-75 school year in regard to those colleges lacking their own systems of chairperson evaluation. At the beginning of the fall semester 1975 the Administrative Affairs Committee will review and evaluate all the systems of chairperson evaluation on the basis of a poll of all faculty, chairpersons, and administrators within each college.
CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Within the limits placed upon your chairperson by budgetary, administrative, and other constraints beyond his/her control:

1. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in the motivation of, and assistance given to, research activity by members of the department?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

2. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her development and motivation of good teaching within the department?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

3. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her support of high standards and expectations regarding student performance?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

4. How do you rate your chairperson in his/her professional correctness in the assignment of courses to faculty?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

5. How do you rate your chairperson in providing for appropriate faculty participation in decision making and departmental governance?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

6. How do you rate your chairperson's fairness in dealing with matters such as salaries, work loads, schedules, travel, and summer assignments?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

7. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her ability to attract highly professional and qualified faculty and staff into the department?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

8. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her ability to retain highly professional and qualified faculty and staff in the department?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

9. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her ability to weed out or deny rewards to inferior faculty and staff in the department?
   (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

10. How do you rate your chairperson in his/her professional standards in making promotion and tenure recommendations?
    (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

11. How do you rate your chairperson as an active member of his/her profession (i.e., chairperson's own scholarly development and professional service beyond the university)?
12. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her presentation and sponsorship of departmental interests at the college and university levels?

(1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

13. How do you rate your chairperson's accessibility to individual members of his/her faculty and staff?

(1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

14. How do you rate your chairperson in terms of his/her non-manipulativeness, his/her openings and honesty in discussing matters of concern with members of the department?

(1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

15. How do you rate the success of your chairperson in his/her making of sound, even if difficult and unpopular, decisions when necessary and his/her ability to stand by these decisions?

(1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

16. How do you rate your chairperson in an overall way?

(1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Average, (4) Poor, (5) Very Poor

17. What other important assets or shortcomings would you list in regard to your chairperson?

Assets:

Shortcomings:

Other comments:

Enter your responses to question #17 below this line if you do not wish them to be included in the aggregation and summary of data from this questionnaire to be returned to your chairperson for his information.

Assets:

Shortcomings:

Other Comments:
THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WILL BE SUBMITTED TO FACULTY ONLY AT FOUR-YEAR INTERVALS:

18. How desirable would it be for your chairperson to continue in his present position?
   Desirable __________ , Indifferent __________ , Undesirable __________

(Optional) If in a composite department (as Geography-Geology, Sociology-Anthropology, etc.) my discipline is ________________________________.

(Optional) My appointment designation is:
   __________ Regular
   __________ Temporary