

A meeting of chairs from both schools was held on 1 December 2005. 12 of the 18 chairs were in attendance and discussed problems common to chairing in all departments. By the end of the two-hour meeting, the group made the following recommendations:

- 1) To the CNU Faculty Senate: **The chairs recommend and endorse a full study of the evaluation process, from the ground up, to be completed and passed to the Provost by May 2006.** Rational: The chairs feel that faculty, like students, are bound by the Honor Code and the elimination of “proofs” of talks, thank you notes, etc. would greatly streamline the process and put an end to six volume dossiers. It is also noted that each Eval 6 or dossier contains IDEA forms (which the Dean and Provost receive independently) and it is redundant to include the previous forms in each year’s evaluation.
- 2) To the CNU Faculty Senate: The chairs are concerned about the ever-increasing workload (a survey of chairs present indicated that the average time spent in chairing was 32 hour/week). **The chairs recommend that departments with more than 20 faculty members also have an Associate Chair (with a three hour release) and that all chairs be granted a six-hour release each semester, regardless of department size.**
- 3) To the CNU Faculty Senate and the Deans: All chairs are having major problems with scheduling and room assignments as currently practiced. **The chairs recommend that current methods of scheduling be studied to determine if there is a better method and if there are unique ideas (such as assigned rooms for each department) that would make the process more definitive.**
- 4) To the Faculty Senate: The workload distribution for chairs is fundamentally different from the rest of the faculty. The responsibilities of managing a department significantly increases the service component of chairs’ workload while correlatively decreasing the time that chairs can dedicate to teaching and scholarship. **Therefore, the chairs recommend that the current weighting system for evaluation of faculty (50% teaching, 25% service and 25% professional development) be modified for chairs (for example, 30% teaching, 60% service and 10% professional development).**
- 5) To the Faculty Senate: Although paid on a ten-month contract like regular faculty, department chairs perform administrative duties twelve months of the year. The current means of remunerating chairs for work beyond the ten-month contract—the summer stipend—is inconsistent, unsystematic and does not reflect the administrative work that chairs do over the summer months. **Therefore, the chairs recommend that a study be done of the amount of work performed by chairs during the summer and an equitable and systematic form of compensation be devised and adopted (e.g., a university-wide stipend system tied to work hours, 11 or 12 month contracts).**