**Response to CRAO charge Second Attempt**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| Previous Request | 17 | 5 |
| This Request | 13 | 0 |
| Feedback and Suggestions | | |
| Request for committee | It seems revising/updating PPM 1-19 would be good to include with a revision to 1-18. I would like to be included in that if it occurs since there are some perceived issues that I have heard of over the years. | |
| Change in opening paragraph (unchanged in revision from old policy) | There is some inconsistency between 1-18 and 1-19, in my opinion, about the role of the provost, president, and confirmation by the board of trustees in appointing dept chairs. | |
| Misalignment on old items to new items | I-5 goes to XII not IV  I-6 goes to XII not IV  I-7 goes to XII not IV  I-9 goes to XV  II-4 goes to XV  III-4 goes to V not X | |
| I-1 | Chairs are also responsible for overseeing post-tenure reviews … so this should read **… contract faculty, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty.** | |
| I-2 | and prudently manage the  funds allocated to the department.  Has been reworded from … Prepare the department budget request, developed in discussion with his/her faculty, and prudently manage the  funds allocated to the department. (Managing funds has moved to III.6 but managing funds is also a leadership responsibility) | |
| I-2 | Needs clarification/consultation with dean with budget | |
| I-3 | Needs addition-- Effectively manage the department budget | |
| I-8 | Department chairs are faculty members so PPM 9-3 should cover this without making it a separate leadership responsibility. I think it’s OK to add but not necessary. | |
| I-8 | Delete | |
| I-8 | Delete | |
| I-8 | Why was this added? Is there an underlying reason | |
| I-9 | Move to section 2 | |
| II | Needs addition-- Implement College policies and initiatives. | |
| II | Needs addition-- Ensure that department activities align with and support college initiatives. | |
| III-3 | * Concurrent Enrollment instructors could be included here also unless they fall under adjunct faculty * “and other satellite locations” is new language that seems appropriate. | |
| III-8 | We also oversee annual outcomes assessment reports | |
| III | Nowhere in this policy is language about being the lowest level of due process in handling conflicts related to students, staff, faculty, etc. Chairs work collegially and collaboratively to promote department programs to be in alignment with college and institutional missions and advocate for students, faculty, and staff. They routinely resolve conflict and ensure due process and other institutional policies are followed. | |
| IV | I think it is unnecessary to add this section and item 1 below was revised from the current PPM. I included the current language and new item 9 in the section II on responsibilities to the department. I feel that the duties of a department chair are already extensive enough for a 10-month contract, $3,000 stipend, and 50% teaching load reduction. If the institution wants to look at changing the current model of load and pay then additional duties could be added. Also, as the job title indicates department chairs have primary responsibility to the department not the community. | |

\*Items in purple were suggested by one faculty and supported by another

**Response to CRAO charges first attempt**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **YES** | **NO** |
|  | 17 | 5 |
| **Feedback** |  |  |
|  | I do like the organization scheme and the emphasis on community outreach | Other duties as deemed necessary seems too vague |
|  |  | When I read through the policy the first time, I liked the changes but realized that, had I been provided the opportunity, in due course, I would have taken some time to suggest revisions, raise concerns, etc. Given the opportunity, I would have even given thought to how the existing policy reconciles to what I actually do in the course of my job, again, informing possible recommendations to the Committee.--I am going to object to the policy to a small extent based on content, but significantly on the basis of process. --My recommendation is to take more than one step back and solicit, in a transparent way, input from department chairs - fully expecting that changes will need to be made based on those recommendations (after all, we are a strongly opinionated and experienced group.)--I believe there was a serious misstep on the part of CRAO in trying to revise a policy without input from the affected parties. |
|  |  | 2nd on the previous comment |
|  |  | I do not agree with the addition of Section IV to PPM 1-18.  Department chairs have to meet all of the duties of faculty (teaching, scholarship, service) plus the chair duties.  Even with re-assigned time, there are not enough hours in the day for the suggested additional duties. |
|  |  | I think that the process could have been better. I've engaged in rewriting job descriptions many times. I've never done it without front-end input from people in the job and supervisors. Post hoc input doesn't have the same effect in the process, as it's often based on reaction rather than thoughtful change. -- I'd like to see this process slowed down & a couple of deans and several chairs meet to talk through what else might be appropriately included. For example, I certainly expect my chairs to work to implement college policies and initiatives as a major part of their duties. -- Email just doesn't offer the same richness of discussion. I hope that we can have an open forum, at least, that will generate the best possible change in the PPM. |