

A meeting of chairs was held on 26 November 2006 to discuss concerns and problems common to chairing all departments. By the end of the meeting the group made the following recommendations:

1) To the CNU Faculty Senate: **It is absolutely imperative and of highest priority that a full study of the evaluation process, from the ground up, be completed and passed to the Provost by May 2007.** Rationale: 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 ten volume dossiers. It is also noted that each Eval 6 or dossier contains IDEA forms (which the Deans and Provost receive independently) and it is redundant to include the previous forms in each year’s evaluations (and to present six years accumulation for tenure evaluation). Most chairs feel that the annual full dossier for probationary faculty is unnecessary and should be replaced with full dossiers only for the first, third, and sixth years.

2) To the CNU Faculty Senate and all levels of Administration: **The chairs recommend that the Budget Advisory Committee, VP Bauer, Cindy Perry and Jean Filetti meet with the chairs immediately to discuss departmental budgets for 2006/2007, explain the current budget situation, and budgets for the future.** Rationale: the academic departments are paralyzed by the early termination of budgets last fiscal year followed by the very small budget allocations for the current fiscal year. The chairs are concerned that the academic departments are losing their ability to offer the education that is being advertised and that new buildings are being built, staffed and maintained at the expense of the CNU educational experience. It is further felt that the Administration is unaware of the impact of the reduced budget on classroom education.

3) To the CNU Faculty Senate and the Deans: **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) which would make the process more definitive.** Rationale: Some classes need rooms for specific purposes and cannot function properly without these rooms. The current situation of too few classrooms and too many students, compounded by the large number of AOI courses necessary for the new curriculum, has created an open competition for the rooms available and classes often have to be taught in inadequate rooms. This situation has also resulted in much larger classes than in previous years.

4) To the Faculty Senate: **The chairs recommend that the Senate continue to pursue the chair compensation question. The chairs further recommend that ALL chairs receive a two course load reduction for performing chair duties.** Rationale: The workload for chairs is ever increasing in quantity and quality. Chairs have become much more than “pencil pushers” and the modern CNU chair must be a LEADER, mentoring faculty and students and effectively leading their department to a place of prominence in the University. As leaders, chairs are required to assess faculty performance as part of the annual evaluation process and most chairs feel that they spend more time in a leadership role than they do in the administrative role. To be an effective leader takes time—a great deal of time—and all chairs, regardless of department size, feel pressured

by deadlines and work loads. At a minimum, all chairs need a two course release, and larger departments would greatly profit from an associate chair. Additionally, chairs of all departments have found that the rigors of chairing and doing for others have left little time for themselves and their own classes and professional development. **The chairs also recommend that a phase-in financial compensation package be pursued immediately, starting with an increase in summer pay for chair duties.** Rationale: Although a previously stated major concern from the chairs, at least four chairs received a CUT in summer compensation for 2006, without explanation or rationale, and all chairs received a contract that was much more restrictive than past years.