

### **Justification of changes made to Document XIX**

1. Previously proposed changes highlighted in the original document were accepted.
2. Line 2 Section II: the word “perhaps” was eliminated. Include other administrative officers or don’t, but be consistent.
3. Line 5 Section II: a one-week timeline was put back in the document. This ensures that faculty have adequate time to prepare for the meeting and don’t receive an agenda a day or an hour prior.
4. Lines 8 and 9 Section III: The sentence, as it was originally written did not make sense. The content was not changed and it now reads “In all cases, the total committee composition shall be at least two-thirds full-time faculty members of the department.”
5. Lines 6 – 8 of item # 5 Section IV: The original sentence as it was originally written did not make sense. The sentence now reads “Department faculty who may wish to meet individually with a candidate may do so if time permits.”
6. Line 5 of item #8 Section IV: “... the selection process resumes the appropriate stage”. The term “appropriate stage” is open to interpretation. Does the committee simply choose another candidate from the original list or do they re-advertise for the position? If the dean does not feel any of the interviewed candidates are suitable for the job, legally, the search should fail and re-start with a preliminary meeting of the department and Dean. Therefore, the sentence has been re-written to read “In the unusual event that none of the candidates recommended by the committee is suitable to the dean, the selection process resumes with item II of Document XIX.”

### **Justification of changes made to Document XXXVI**

1. Lines 10 – 12 of the first paragraph: “Further, the department head/director will encourage the faculty to share responsibility for making departmental decisions and for implementing the results of those decisions.” The word “encourage” appears to be a suggestion (which may or may not be followed) rather than a directive. Therefore, the sentence now reads “Further, the department head/director will involve the faculty in making departmental decisions and for implementing the results of those decisions.”
2. Line 2 paragraph 2: In the interest of consistency, “academic year” has been changed to AY.
3. Item # 7 under “Qualified Faculty and Personnel”: the term “high quality” has been deleted since it is a subjective term that varies within and between departments.

4. Item # 10 under “Governance”: This seems like the most appropriate place to address faculty concerns and grievances, which is not addressed elsewhere. Therefore, the item now reads “Enforces faculty responsibilities while at the same time protecting faculty rights and privileges including, but not limited to, faculty concerns and grievances, academic freedom, and tenure;”
5. “Unit Organization”: An additional item, #12, has been added. “Directs programs through QEP standards through the office of academic affairs”. This item is somewhat addressed in item #9 under “Instructional Programs”; however, QEPs will always be administrative, but not necessarily always academic. Including this item may also help faculty become aware of QEP initiatives at an early stage and as a result, increase faculty input.

### **Questions from the Ways and Means Committee**

#### *Document XIX*

1. Lines 6 and 7 Section IV: The committee would like clarification regarding the following statement: “in a strictly internal search, minor changes may be made.” Should internal search policies be independent of this document or at least contain an independent section within this document? As it currently stands, it is unclear what minor changes are made with internal searches.

#### *Document XXXVI*

2. Line 3 Paragraph 2: AY ends at spring commencement and summer appointment begins the start of the summer semester. There is (roughly) a three-week gap between spring commencement and the start of the summer. Does this mean Department Heads have no obligations during this time-frame? If department heads are expected to work during this time, should it be included here?
3. Item #2 under “Unit Organization”: Do department heads create job assignments for faculty? Typically, faculty volunteer for service work. This seems like an invitation for department heads to delegate tasks to faculty that do not have the interest or the time to devote to the task. Faculty and staff development are important, but are addressed in the “Qualified Faculty and Personnel” section. Can this item be deleted entirely?
4. Item #1 under “Communication”: It is unclear why this item is included in this document. While having an empathetic and ethical department head is important, this seems more like a candidate qualification than a communication issue. Would something along the lines of “Addresses concerns of students, faculty, staff, and administrators in an ethical and timely manner;” be more appropriate? Would this be more of a governance issue?