I. Chairman Alexander called the session to order in MCUB 204 at 3:15 p.m.

II. With correction (Enclosure to minutes of April 13-27 meetings should be listed as Attachment F, Agenda, May 11, 18 1971: Personnel Policies Committee Draft) MSC (H. Rhoads, sec. J. Stuart) to approve minutes of April 13, 27, 1971 meetings.

III. Members present were:

R. Anderson R. Carruthers A. James M. O'Leary W. Rice J. Stuart
A. Andreoli R. Cleath C. Johnson B. Olsen H. Rickard D. Stubbs
W. Boyce R. Frost T. Johnston R. Pautz J. Rogalla L. Voss
M. Brady M. Gold A. Landyshev J. Peterson A. Rosen J. Weatherby
W. Brown D. Grant J. Lowry J. Price H. Scales R. Wheeler
S. Burroughs C. Hanks D. Morgan C. Quinlan H. Smith M. Whitson
B. Burton D. Head J. Mott R. Ratcliffe M. Smith M. Wilks
W. Boyce R. Frost T. Johnston R. Pautz J. Rogalla L. Voss
M. Brady M. Gold A. Landyshev J. Peterson A. Rosen J. Weatherby
W. Brown D. Grant J. Lowry J. Price H. Scales R. Wheeler
S. Burroughs C. Hanks D. Morgan C. Quinlan H. Smith M. Whitson
B. Burton D. Head J. Mott R. Ratcliffe M. Smith M. Wilks

Ex-Officio (Voting):

G. Clucas J. Ericson G. Gibson A. Higdon
C. Cummins C. Fisher G. Hasslein

Ex-Officio (Non-voting):

D. Andrews ASI: P. Banke
E. Chandler J. LeMaire
R. Kennedy

IV. Business Items

A. The results of the nominations and election of Senate Officers are as follows:

Chairman: Howard Rhoads (31-24)
Vice Chairman: Harry Scales (34-22)
Secretary: Barton Olsen (unanimous)

Executive Committee:
John A. Rogalla School of Agriculture & Natural Resources (u)
Maurice C. Wilks School of Architecture & Environmental Design (u)
Walter E. Rice School of Business and Social Sciences (u)
John H. Mott School of Communicative Arts & Humanities (u)
Thomas W. Carpenter School of Engineering & Technology (41-17)
Sarah E. Burroughs School of Human Development & Education (u)
Daniel F. Stubbs School of Science & Mathematics (u)
Marcus Gold Senator at Large (u)
B. Constitution and Bylaws Study Committee - Corwin Johnson

MSC (C. Johnson, sec. R. Ratcliffe) that the second reading of the proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws be adopted by the Senate. (See enclosure to minutes of the April 13 meeting of the Senate.)

C. Student Affairs Committee - Bill Boyce

Mr. Boyce moved (sec. R. Frost) that the Senate adopt the resolution that: "The Academic Senate recommend to the President the revised proposal on Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching" (see Attachment A, Agenda, May 11, 1971.) C. Johnson moved (sec. D. Grant) to amend Section D. of the Revised Proposal. The Johnson amendment was defeated by a vote of 22 ayes to 28 nays. The main motion was defeated by a vote of 3 ayes to 48 nays.

B. Boyce then moved (sec. R. Frost) that the Senate Chairman appoint a five-man Ad Hoc committee of Senators to meet with representatives of SAC to resolve the matter of student evaluation of faculty teaching. The motion was defeated by a vote of 22 ayes to 24 nays.

D. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads

MSC (H. Rhoads, sec. A. Rosen) to adopt the Committee resolution on Faculty Evaluation of Department Heads, as amended (Section 3a. to read "Which evaluation form shall be used [Forms I and II are attached as suggestions].") by a vote of 22 ayes to 2 nays. (See Attachment A, Minutes, May 11, 1971.)

V. As a result of a quorum no longer present at the Senate meeting, Chairman Will Alexander declared the session in recess at 5:20 p.m.
RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, a department head or director is selected to effectively administer a particular department or functional division, including optimum working relations with both the staff as well as the administration, and,

WHEREAS, it is desirable that he be made aware of his effectiveness as well as areas of deficiency so that steps for improvement may be undertaken, and,

WHEREAS, only faculty members who have been in the department for an adequate length of time can form a base for detailed evaluation, and,

WHEREAS, this evaluation should be carried out sufficiently often to provide adequate continuity in the evaluation process, and,

WHEREAS, some flexibility in the evaluation instrument and procedure is desirable,

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED:

That the following recommendation on faculty evaluation of department heads be directed to the President. Faculty members shall evaluate department heads and directors in accordance with the following provisions:

1. Each department should evaluate its department head once a year.

2. Department members participating shall have been employed in that department for at least one year.

3. The department shall decide, by majority vote of those eligible to evaluate, each of the following questions:
   a. Which evaluation form shall be used (Forms I and II are attached as suggestions).
   b. Whether evaluation forms shall be submitted directly to the department head or shall be submitted to a committee of no more than three tenured faculty elected by those eligible to evaluate who will summarize the results and comments and submit the summary to the department head.
The following questions are intended to suggest some of the important characteristics and functions of a department head. Comment only on those to which you feel qualified to respond and which pertain to aspects you feel are important to the successful functioning of your department. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be sent to other than the department head directly or through the committee.

1. Does the department head handle administrative routines efficiently and effectively? This includes class assignments, budgets, committee assignments, department meetings, and curricular planning.
   Comment:

2. Does the department head provide stimulating academic ideas (his own or others') at appropriate times?
   Comment:

3. Is the department head receptive to suggestions made by his faculty and does he support their innovative efforts?
   Comment:

4. Does the department head encourage faculty members to keep abreast of their field and occasionally even prod them to do research and/or take advanced graduate courses as appropriate?
   Comment:

5. Is the department head alert to progress in his field? Does he make an attempt to maintain his own professional growth?
   Comment:

6. Are the department head's actions sufficiently consistent so that the faculty can develop a sense of confidence in the direction of his leadership?
   Comment:
7. Is the department head forthright and effective in the recruitment of faculty?  
Comment:

8. Is the department head equitable and capable in his handling of personnel matters?  
Comment:

9. Is the department head aware of any actual or potential conflict between individuals or factions on the faculty? Do his actions help to reduce rather than increase discord?  
Comment:

10. Does the department head have good rapport with students, being courteous and interested in them as individuals?  
Comment:

11. Does the department head encourage constructive discussion about the relation of the department to the college and school? Or do negative responses discourage free discussion?  
Comment:

12. Does the department head make optimum use of the talent available in his department?  
Comment:

13. Are there important functions not included above? If so, please comment on them.
Please respond to the following questions. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be sent to other than the department head, directly or through the committee.

1. What are the strong points of the department head?

2. What are the weak points of the department head?

3. What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness of the department head?
MOTION: That the following language be substituted for the existing language in Section D of the Revised Proposal on Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Ability, as presented to the Academic Senate on May 11, 1971.

D. The implementation of the procedures shall be accomplished within criteria established under existing personnel policies. The results of the evaluation will be presented to the evaluated faculty member, in total or in summary. In the event that the evaluation is intended for use in personnel actions and decisions it must also be sent to the department head (or director), departmental personnel committees, and to the official file of the evaluated faculty member.

Rationale

Administrative Bulletin 70-8, "Interim Policy & Procedures Statement on Faculty Personnel Files," October 15, 1970, seems to require that all materials which form the basis for decisions in personnel actions shall be placed in the official personnel file. Those authorized to place materials in the file are administrative personnel, department personnel committees, and the individual involved.

Good personnel practice would seem to indicate that four possible routings for the evaluations or summaries exist:

(1) Faculty member only -- if self improvement is the objective.
(2) Faculty member, department head, and official file if use in personnel actions beyond the department level is anticipated.
(3) Faculty member and official file if only use in grievances or review in cases of disagreement is anticipated.
(4) Faculty member, department head, department personnel committees, and official file if use at lowest and highest level personnel actions is anticipated.