DATE: February 8, 2008
TO: Elizabeth J. Stroble  
Sr. Vice President, Provost and C.O.O.
FROM: Ronald F. Levant  
Dean
RE: Chair Review Guidelines

The attached guidelines have been approved by the Faculty of the Department of Political Science on February 4, 2008.

I have approved the attached guidelines.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines.

Department Chair or Faculty Representative

Date

Dean

Date

Senior Vice President, Provost 
and Chief Operating Officer

Date
Evaluation and Review of Department Chair  
Department of Political Science  
February 2008

During the final year of a department chair’s term of appointment the department will form a Chair’s Evaluation Committee. Department faculty will select two members from among department faculty by election. An additional bargaining unit member will be appointed to this committee by the Dean and another by the Provost.

The Chair’s Evaluation Committee (CEC) will conduct its review, consistent with the department’s mission and according to the procedures and criteria established here, once these criteria and procedures are approved by department faculty, the Dean, and the Provost. The CEC will meet and select a chair, who will call meetings and write the draft report.

The CEC will be responsible for the following tasks:

1. Ask Information Technology to distribute an anonymous electronic survey (see below) to all department faculty and staff.
2. Distribute the survey to the department chair, who shall complete it to self-evaluate her or his performance according to the criteria enumerated.
3. Establish and announce a deadline for responding to the survey that provides faculty and staff at least two weeks to provide their input.
4. Encourage all faculty and staff to complete the survey in time to include their input.
5. Ask Information Technology to collect and analyze the survey data, by providing basic descriptive statistics separately for each constituent group having a size of at least five to guarantee anonymity of responses.
6. Ask Information Technology to create an appendix for the final report which includes both forced-choice data and open-ended responses, without reference to specific individuals, but separated by constituent groups if group size is at least five.
7. Draft a formal report to send to the Dean using the survey data as a foundation.

Surveys not completed on time will be excluded from the report. The data in the appendix must be clearly marked as entirely confidential, for faculty use in evaluating the draft report only. This draft report will first be circulated only among CEC members and then will be presented, along with the results of the survey, to all department faculty to ensure that the evaluation process outlined here did indeed provide an opportunity for individual bargaining unit faculty to make an anonymous (to the extent permitted by law) written qualitative and summary evaluation of the chair. The committee’s report shall include a summary of the individual bargaining unit faculty’s evaluations before the report is sent on to the Dean.
Survey Questions for Department Faculty and Staff

The following survey will be administered to staff and faculty of the department. Staff and faculty will be asked to respond to these questions via an anonymous electronic survey. Responses will then compiled into a report and distributed to all faculty for review.

Please rate the chair’s demonstrated performance in enabling the department to excel in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the chair’s efforts in advancing the department in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining External Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Program Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chair makes administrative decisions in a fair manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair promotes collaborative decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair handles department business effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair effectively mentors faculty and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair prepares the department for meeting future challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair creates and supports a climate of collegiality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair supports diversity in the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair enhances the department’s ability to carry out its mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair has facilitated the department's creation of a vision and mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair interacts professionally with the students, staff and faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair is approachable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair's decision-making processes are transparent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair has a vision for the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair maintains confidentiality of personnel matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chair is an effective advocate for the department in university settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide your anonymous, written, qualitative and summary evaluation of the chair. Use as much space as needed.